

United States economy, especially for our agriculture sector. Of critical importance will be the role the European Union plays in these negotiations along with the United States.

I would like to point out some things, Mr. Speaker, regarding our situation with the European Union. First of all, as far as the economy of both the United States and the European Union is concerned, they are fairly equal. We have an economy of \$11.7 trillion, European Union is \$9.4 trillion. And in spite of that equality, our tariffs are very different. Those commodities from the European Union coming into the United States are tariffed at 12 percent. Our commodities going into the European Union are tariffed at 30 percent. So it is more than double. It is hard to understand why with roughly equivalent economies, we have this disparity.

The agriculture trade deficit, partly because of this and some other things I am going to discuss in a minute, for the United States last year was a minus \$6.3 billion. The European Union obviously benefited to the tune of \$6.3 billion in trade.

Now, the interesting thing is that the European Union provides \$3 billion in export subsidies. The United States provides \$31.5 million. These are subsidies that enhance the opportunity to trade with other countries. So that difference is 90 to 1. They spend 90 times more money to export subsidies than we do, and of course this apparently is allowed under WTO rules. This is one of the major complaints that other countries have about the whole trade situation internationally.

Another issue that is of some interest to those of us in the United States is the fact that we subsidize our agriculture to the tune of \$38 per acre. By contrast, the European Union subsidizes their agriculture \$295 per acre. Now, the reason this is important is that within the next year, we are going to start rewriting the farm bill and we will have tremendous pressure, particularly from the European Union, to do away with these subsidies here that amount to \$38 an acre, even though they are providing \$295 an acre.

The reason for that is they are priding themselves on the fact that they have gone with what they call decoupled payments in the past year. This means their payment is not linked to production. It is simply a payment to the farmers. Our payments are largely linked to production. It will be interesting to see what impact this has on our farm bill because we may be forced to some degree to go away from some of our subsidies as we now provide them, even though they are much less than what the European Union provides.

Another issue that is rather interesting is that the United States has had a total of two cases of BSE, or what is commonly referred to as "mad cow disease." In contrast, the European Union has 189,102 cases of BSE.

Now the reason that is interesting is they have effectively eliminated our beef exports into the European Union even though we have demonstrated that we have probably the safest beef supply in the world.

You say, how in the world can they do this? Last year in 2004, they had 756 cases of BSE where we had one this last year. And so the reason is that they simply have said, Well, you are using hormones with your beef and, therefore, it is unsafe. And, of course, the WTO has filed a suit against them and they are paying a fine, but it is just the cost of doing business.

In addition to this, they are also disallowing our imports of pork, our imports of poultry and also genetically modified corn and genetically modified soybeans. So in every one of these cases, they have used various means and methods to keep our products out.

So what we are seeing here is in this next round of talks, if the European Union is not brought around to the point where our farmers feel they are being fairly treated, we are going to have a hard time getting any kind of a trade agreement through this body.

You often hear our farmers say, we like free trade, but we especially want fair trade. I would say right now the biggest obstacle to what appears to be fair trade within the WTO framework is our relationship with the European Union. So we certainly think that these things need to be pointed out. We would like to see those things addressed in the next round of talks.

NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 2002, Peter Troy purchased a .22 caliber semi-automatic rifle with no questions asked.

The seller ran his name through the Federal background check system and nothing came up. However, Peter Troy had a history of mental health problems and his own mother filed a restraining order against him because of his violent background.

It was illegal for him to purchase a gun, but he, like so many others, he simply slipped through the cracks in our background check system. Four days later, Peter Troy walked into Our Lady of Peace Church in Lynbrook in my district, opened fire, and killed Reverend Lawrence Penzes and Eileen Tosner.

Peter Troy had no business buying a gun, and the system created to prevent him from doing so has failed. It is only a matter of time before the system's failings provoke larger tragedies.

Earlier today, I submitted an amendment to the Department of Justice authorization bill that will help ensure that others will not be victimized because of our flawed background check system.

NICS, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, is the database used to check potential firearm buyers for any criminal record or history of mental illness. In large, NICS has been a great success.

Since 1994, more than 700,000 individuals have been denied a gun because of a felony conviction or other qualifying item on their background check. However, the NICS system is only as good as the information that it has. 25 States have automated less than 60 percent of their felony convictions into the NICS system. In these States, many felons will not turn up on the NICS system and would be able to purchase guns with no questions asked. For example, if someone is convicted of a crime in Texas, that disqualifying offense might not appear on a background check conducted in New York.

In 13 States, domestic violence restraining orders are not accessible through NICS. Common sense would tell you and dictate to you that you do not sell a gun to someone who has been served a restraining order.

□ 1930

Thirty-three States do not have automated or do not share mental health records that would disqualify certain individuals from purchasing a gun.

This amendment is similar to the stand-alone legislation that I have introduced. This amendment would require all States to provide the FBI with all of the relevant records needed to conduct effective background checks.

It is the State's responsibility to ensure this information is current and accurate. However, I recognize many State budgets are already overburdened. This legislation would provide grants to States to update their NICS system. States would get the funds they need to make sure records relevant to NICS are up to date.

We need the NICS Improvement Act to become law, and we need more bills like this to pass. These are ideas that impose no new restrictions on gun owners, but give the government tools to ensure existing laws are effective and enforceable. In fact, the NICS Improvement Act already passed this House in the 107th Congress by a voice vote. The bill had the endorsement of the National Rifle Association. Unfortunately, the other body never acted on the bill.

This is common-sense gun legislation we can all agree on. This bill will save lives while not infringing on anybody's second amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on Rules accepts my amendment and we pass it on the floor tomorrow by a voice vote. If we can prevent another tragedy like the one that occurred at the Our Lady of Peace church, and those that are happening around this country, with a simple voice vote, we should do it right away.

We can make a difference in this country in reducing gun violence for

over 30,000 people that are killed a year and for those that are injured, not to say how much it would save on our health care costs. We have the laws on the books. We must enforce them, but we need the tools to do so.

THE LADIES OF THE GULF

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the second lady of the gulf named Rita came across the shore of Texas and Louisiana, howling her winds and bringing her thundering rain this past weekend. Like her sister storm, Katrina, she took aim at the low-lying towns and the energy capital of the world that is located in southeast Texas and southwest Louisiana.

Nine of the 26 refineries in Port Arthur, Texas, alone were shut down. These refineries in and around Port Arthur refine 27 percent of the Nation's gasoline. Sixty percent of the Nation's gasoline is refined from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, Texas. Offshore drilling rigs were also shut down, and the start-up time is still undetermined.

Being a target in the hurricane alley, these refineries and oil rigs are vulnerable to nature. That is one reason why the United States must explore opening up new oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico, off the coast of Florida, off the coast of California.

This is a national security issue; and we must, with proper environmental safeguards, drill in these areas so that the energy does not cease because of the anger of the ladies of the gulf.

POLITICAL APPOINTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, words that will be remembered for a long time, unless the White House can erase them: "Brownie, you're doing a heck of a job." That was the President to Michael Brown, the political appointee head of FEMA, while people were drowning in New Orleans and in the southeast. The President was apparently unaware of the lack of assistance being provided by FEMA. Mr. Brown was shortly thereafter sent back to Washington and then resigned.

That might be good if it was an isolated instance. Unfortunately, it is not. This permeates the entire 3,000 so-called plum jobs that the President gets to appoint without any regard to qualification.

I mean, Mr. Brown's predecessor was the President's campaign manager who downgraded, demeaned, and ultimately submerged a previously very functional agency, FEMA, into the Homeland Security bureaucracy. Since then, many of the top people have left, and the agency has become totally demor-

alized, although we do find with new focus in the last week. Hopefully, that will last.

Just about the same time that Mr. Brown was going down, the government's top procurement official, that is the person in charge of all purchasing by the Federal Government, \$300 billion a year of taxpayers' money, a gentleman by the name of Safavian, was being led off in handcuffs by the FBI, but not before he had let out a few more billion dollars in no-bid contracts to the usual suspects in the wake of the Katrina disaster.

He has been found to have not only perjured himself but has taken illegal gratuities and bribes from the now-infamous lobbyist Mr. Abramoff. That was the top procurement official appointed by George Bush.

Beyond that, he also, of course, like Mr. Brown, had no qualifications for the job. He once had interned as a law student, helping in some minor way on a helicopter purchase at the Pentagon, and he jumped from there to his political associations with the President, to being head of all purchasing for the Federal Government.

Basically, we have here a government run by people who disrespect government. They do not like government. They do not believe in government. Their spiritual mentor, Mr. Norquist, says he wants government so small that he can strangle it in a bathtub. We find out that people drown when government starts to get kind of small because government is not there to respond. Now they are backpeddling and they are trying to pretend, oh, that is not really what it is all about, but it has been.

Incompetence threads through so many agencies, conflict of interest, and there might be other things. The one thing they do respect government for is its ability to extract money from all the working people of the United States of America and put it in a place, the Federal Treasury, that they can raid to benefit a very few people and major corporations. Government is a profit center is the way they see it, and they have a wonderful revolving door.

They have a fellow over at the FDA in charge of reviewing medical safety, 33 years old, who is a former columnist in The Wall Street Journal, stock analyst, right-wing think tank guru, attacking the FDA who is not supposed to be in charge of new drug approvals; but when a few very potentially profitable drugs did not get approved, he, as the Assistant Secretary, started leaning on the bureaucrats, the professionals, to say why do you disapprove that drug. Pfizer is going to make \$1 billion a year on it; it is a great drug. So what if a couple of people died? They probably would have died anyway.

So there is another fellow, Mr. Gottlieb, yet another outstanding appointment. Unfortunately, the government is rife with these people. There are too many to document, and what they are

engaged in is the systematic looting of the Treasury of the United States to benefit a few, to make government less functional so it cannot serve the needs of the many in times of need, like Katrina, or even in less routine times of need, like education, health care, border control.

They have got a beauty here. They have got a woman they want to put in charge of the border control of the United States of America who even the Republican Senators have questioned whether or not she has any capability, a woman named Julie Myers, another political hack. Ohio Republican Senator GEORGE VOINOVICH said he would really like to hear from Mr. Chertoff, the head of Homeland Security, come spend a little time with us, tell us personally why he thinks she is qualified for the job, because based on the résumé, I do not think you are. That is a Republican Senator. This is the woman who would be charged with keeping terrorists out of the United States of America, and that is a dysfunctional bureaucracy and has been for a long time.

That is new to the administration, but it is more essential today than ever. We need to clean house at this administration, put competent people in charge so government is there when the American people need it and stop looting the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

IRAQ AND THE MARCH IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Cindy Sheehan, who was arrested yesterday for simply exercising her constitutional right to freedom of speech outside the White House, has awoken a