

of \$226 million. It will take an increase of 22.4 million new smokers to fund it. It will fund, at 300 percent of poverty, families of four in my State earning \$77,473. It will crowd 2 million kids off of the private family and business, job-funded insurance rolls, cost \$6.5 billion to fund the illegals that are participating in programs that today are barred from so and add taxes to cigarettes of 61 cents a pack.

Now, you add that all up, those are the facts. Those are the stubborn things. Those are the inconvenient truths that the other side of the aisle has to deal with. I simply called it SCHIP, "Socialized Clinton-style Hillarycare for Illegals and Their Parents."

So, Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time, I think that I should do a bit of a demonstration for the sake of popular demand. I wanted to point out for the body that we're spending \$8 billion on our southern border, and this is supposed to keep us from the \$6.5 billion in costs that are accumulated here under this SCHIP bill that came out of the Pelosi Congress.

But on that border that's 2,000 miles long, \$8 billion, that's \$4 million a mile. So I thought, you know, I've got a mile of gravel road that runs west of my house, and if Michael Chertoff came to me and he said I'm going to give you \$4 million but it's your job to make sure that only 75 percent of the people that want to cross that road get across and 25 percent of them stay where they are, that's our current efficiency rate that we're getting out of our \$8 billion and \$4 million a mile on our southern border today. We interdict about 25 percent of those trying, and about 75 percent get across. You might argue it's one out of three, but they'll testify one out of three, one out of four. We stopped 1,188,000 going across that border in the last year that was reported to me. That means about 4 million try. That's about 11,000 a night, 11,000 a night. Twice the size of Santa Anna's army pouring across our southern border, not in the day, at night. Every single night, Mr. Speaker.

What would I do if Michael Chertoff said, I'm going to offer you a contract. I'd bid it. It wouldn't be a no-bid contract. I'd want to compete for this, \$4 million for my mile of road. What would I do?

Well, I'd get out there and build something because I know the Humvees cost a lot of money, and uniforms and retirement programs and health plans for our Federal employees cost a lot of money. Now, I love our border patrol. They're doing a great job, and I've been down there to work with them, but I would submit they could use some help. I would give them a little structure. I'd go in there and say, Your job would be a lot easier if we build you a physical barrier. I'd want it double. I'd put the fence in, and I'd build the wall. The wall would be something that would last a long, long time.

This would be the trenched footing that I would put in. It would be slip form, Mr. Speaker, and I would set this trench footing into the ground. I'd drag her along, and I'd pour slip form right behind it. It would look like this from the end. Then I'm going to set it up in this stand, and I'll show you how easy it is to build a wall. It will take about, let me say, \$1.2 million, about \$1.2 million a mile, and you just simply put this in about like that. That would be a piece of concrete that would be about 13 feet high, 13-and-a-half feet high, about half that for width, and then you pick up your little crane and drop this thing in here. That's about 12,000 pounds per formation.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard your gavel as I dropped that in the hole. I apologize for that. I was making a little too much noise.

I would wrap this up simply by then submitting that I believe I have demonstrated how we can protect America at about \$1.2 million a mile as opposed to \$4 million a mile. I'd encourage this Congress take a good look.

SAFETY RECALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to talk about a growing, a disturbing trend of food and consumer product recalls in this country, safety recalls. Mr. Speaker, the danger is real. That danger has been widely documented. It's been widely discussed in the media, in committee hearings, the Lou Dobbs show and around the watercooler at work.

Mr. Speaker, parents are afraid. They're afraid that their children are playing with lead-tainted toy sets. Parents are afraid that the magnets in toys or charms may cause internal damage if a child accidentally swallows them. Families are afraid that the food they eat or the food they feed their pets may actually be contaminated with plastic that can cause harm or death to their beloved pet. People are afraid their toothpaste may contain antifreeze. People are afraid that the fish they serve to their families may contain dangerous antibiotics.

Now, I could elaborate about additional concerns, but generally, people are afraid about the source of these products and the dangers attendant to them and rightfully so. Mr. Speaker, people are afraid about defective products being imported into our country, and honestly, it seems like most of these concerns focus around a single country, the People's Republic of China.

Consumers' health and well-being are being endangered on two fronts: the food we eat, the goods we use. Let's use some time tonight, let's spend some

time tonight discussing both fronts and what we in Congress can do and should be doing to protect American families from harmful products.

In the arena of food safety, you might ask the question, has anyone in Congress been paying attention to the safety of the food we eat? Well, I feel the answer to that question is yes. We've spent some time in the committee on which I sit, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and we are pursuing an aggressive investigation and an aggressive legislative agenda to confront the problem.

Now, as a member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, we have taken an active role in investigating the safety of our Nation's own food supply. In August, a bipartisan team of investigators was sent to China to see firsthand if they could elucidate the cause of the problem. Now, the committee staff report, the investigators came to the following conclusions from their trip and from their investigation thus far.

Quoting directly from the staff report now, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Chinese food supply chain does not meet international safety standards. It is, in fact, responsible for very serious domestic Chinese food poisoning outbreaks.

Number 2, the Chinese Government appears to be determined to avoid embarrassing food safety outbreaks in export markets due to the damaging and potentially lasting effect that this would have on their "Made in China" brand.

And thirdly, the lack of meaningful internal regulation of farming and food processing in China, the advanced development of the document counterfeiting industry, and the willingness of some people to simply break the law, the willingness of some entrepreneurs in both China and the United States to smuggle foodstuffs that do not meet quality standards, necessitates a much more vigorous program of inspection and laboratory testing in China and at U.S. points of entry than the Food and Drug Administration has been able or willing to pursue.

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, because it's so important. This necessitates a much more vigorous program of inspection and laboratory testing in China and at U.S. ports of entry than the Food and Drug Administration has been able or willing to pursue to date.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are important conclusions, and we must not simply watch the problem worsen. We must be willing to confront the problem head-on and transform the Food and Drug Administration into an agency that can fully cope with the importation problems of a 21st century world.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is doing their part to do just that. In addition to the staff trip to China, they're in the middle of a series of five hearings to discuss the topic: Can the Food and Drug Administration

assure the safety and security of our Nation's food supply. And what have we learned so far?

Well, let me recapitulate. At the hearing on July 17, 2007, on this very topic a former FDA associate commissioner, William Hubbard, testified that in 1999 the Food and Drug Administration drafted a legislative proposal which would have given the Food and Drug Administration authority to require foreign countries to take more responsibility for the foods that they send into the United States. The agency's proposal would have allowed the Food and Drug Administration to embargo a given food from a given country if there were repeated instances of that food being found contaminated when it arrived in the United States. Countries that send safe food would have no reason to be concerned, as they would be unaffected, but countries that demonstrated a pattern of disregard for U.S. safety standards would have to increase their oversight of food exported from their country.

Unfortunately, Congress did not accept this recommendation in 1999, and neither did the Clinton administration, and the situation with some imported foods from some countries has obviously gotten much worse.

Congress has a chance to examine the problem and consider recommendations on how to solve the problem, but you know, Mr. Speaker, the world was a different place then, and it was difficult to anticipate the acceleration of foreign products coming into our country. Was the safety of food products from foreign countries not a priority for Congress back in 1999? Well, the answer likely is not as much as it should have been, but then, the amount of globalization, the amount of imports was nowhere near what we see imported today.

The question is why we have allowed the problem to persist when we know how much harm these unsafe products have the potential to cause. We may not know the answer to that question right now, but as I stand here tonight to tell you about it, it is absolutely a priority of mine that I intend to do something about it.

October 11, the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held the third part of a five-part series on hearings of the Food and Drug Administration's ability to assure the safety and security of our Nation's food supply.

According to testimony given by Mr. David Nelson, the senior investigator for the Energy and Commerce Committee, currently the Food and Drug Administration does not go over and see if the products that are produced in China are done so under the same standards as we depend on here in the United States of America. These are the products that are produced in China that are sent over to the United States for consumption, the products that Americans will be consuming, and they are not produced under American standards.

Now, Ranking Member WHITFIELD asked Mr. NELSON that, well, if you're speaking to a group and a member of the audience asks the question about how safe it is to consume the products produced and imported from China, he answered, and I quote, You are taking your chances on any imported food, end quote.

This is a chance we simply cannot afford to take. America has to have the authority to prohibit these foods from coming into our country if they are not safe. We have to be able to stop the food that we would, quote, be taking our chances on, close quote.

Chairman DINGELL asked Mr. NELSON whether or not the Food and Drug Administration can protect the United States' citizens from unsafe imports with the resources that they currently are applying towards this problem, and the answer was that would be an emphatic no. Not just no, not yes, no, but an emphatic no.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I also asked Mr. NELSON, You were over there for some time. What did you all eat when you were over there? And he replied that they ate the food that was served to them, and this was the food that was also eaten by members of their host country. And I asked him if he had any problem, and he alluded that, yes, some members of the committee did have problems while they were over there.

Now, I also asked him, when I got my chance to question, what protocol they will follow after discovering a contaminated food supply of foods, specifically poultry. And we had a witness during that day, and during my questioning of Mr. James Rice, the vice president and country manager for Tyson Food in China, I asked him, So when you find a problem, do you communicate that to, say, the United States authorities so that they know to be on the lookout for similar products in other facilities? Well, do you know what he said? He simply said, No, we don't.

He explained to me that, because Tyson was using local Chinese suppliers and the products were mostly for the Chinese markets, he simply felt it would not be necessary.

□ 2045

In essence, there would be no dialogue whatsoever. Mr. Rice told me that if persistent problems from one supplier were identified, no one would alert others as to this problematic supplier. There is no system in place to let others know about a bad apple. Well, this is a serious, serious problem.

It was important, so important, that I introduced legislation that relates to the 1999 proposal that was not acted upon by Congress. This is H.R. 3967, the Imported Food Safety Improvement Act of 2007, eight years late. I firmly believe that the Food and Drug Administration needs the ability and the explicit authority to immediately stop dangerous foods and products from coming into this country.

Let me give you an illustration. I could think of it like this: goods are

coming into this country on a giant conveyer belt. When you find a bad apple coming down that conveyer belt, the Food and Drug Administration needs to be able to push a big red button with "stop" written on it and immediately stop the apple from continuing into the line of commerce.

This legislation would give the Food and Drug Administration this great big red button to push. The idea is simple. If enacted, the Food and Drug Administration would have the authority to embargo a specific food from a specific country if there were repeated instances that the type of food produced had been contaminated.

We frankly need to be able to stop countries from sending harmful food, harmful food products into the United States. So H.R. 3967 will allow us to finally take control of the food that is being sent to America. It would also send a strong message to countries that have, in the past, sent harmful products our way. Solve the problem on your end, or we will take steps to solve the problem on ours.

After a summer of recall upon recall, it's time to take matters into our own hands. I don't know about you, but I am sick and tired of hearing a different news story every week about the new and dangerous products coming in from the People's Republic of China that are being sent to America and then subsequently have to be recalled.

The Health Subcommittee, of which I am also a member, had a legislative hearing on September 26 regarding a bill from Chairman DINGELL, H.R. 3610, the Food and Drug Import Safety Act of 2007.

Having reviewed this legislation, I think the intentions are certainly good. We will look forward to working with the chairman on this issue. I don't support every single provision, but I do support the spirit of the proposed law.

I believe we need to look toward how other Federal agencies have dealt with this issue and whether it would be appropriate to give the Food and Drug Administration similar authorities. According to the Government Accountability Office, 15 Federal agencies, 15 Federal agencies collectively administer at least 30 different food laws related to food safety.

The Food and Drug Administration, which is part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Food Safety and Inspection Service, which is part of the United States Department of Agriculture, together comprise a majority of both the total funding and the total staffing of the government's food regulatory system.

However, the food safety laws vary greatly from agency to agency, and not all foods are treated equally. For example, the United States Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over meat, poultry, eggs, has established an equivalency determination, a determination standard for those specific foods.

On October 11, at the third oversight investigation hearing on the Food and

Drug Administration's ability to assure food safety and the security of our Nation's food supply, Under Secretary for Food Safety at the United States Department of Agriculture, Dr. Richard Raymond, gave the following testimony about equivalency. Again, I am quoting: "Equivalency is the foundation of our system of imports. It recognizes that an exporting country can provide an appropriate level of food safety even if those measures are different from those applied here at home. Food safety and inspection service has always required an assessment of foreign inspection systems before those nations can export to the United States of America. This prior review is mandated by our laws, which originally required that a foreign system be equal to our system before any foreign product can be admitted."

It has to be equal to our system before they have the able to import under rules put forth by the United States Department of Agriculture. So that's one set.

He further went on to state: "An exporting country has the burden of proving that its system is equivalent to our own if that country wishes to export to the United States."

Now, I understand that applying a system of equivalency, the system of equivalency that has been developed by the United States Department of Agriculture, taking that same system and applying it to the Food and Drug Administration, is tough. Because, in fairness, the Food and Drug Administration has about 80 percent of the jurisdiction of imported food to roughly 20 percent that is imported under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture. So, clearly, this will be an extremely difficult and onerous task for the Food and Drug Administration to undertake.

Currently, only 33 countries are eligible to import meat or poultry products into the United States. If the exact standard that the United States Department of Agriculture employs was used by the FDA, it would drastically change, and some people might say it would hinder or even cripple the food system if there were not enough resources available to support it.

As former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich says: "Real change requires real change." Maybe the system should be drastically changed. Consider this: in 2005, 15 percent of the overall food was imported. Between 1996 and 2006, a decade, the amount of U.S. imports of agriculture and seafood products from all countries increased by 42 percent. Furthermore, in the last decade, the volume of Food and Drug Administration-regulated imports has tripled.

Chinese imports to the United States have increased more rapidly than the global average. Between the years 1996 to 2006, the volume of Chinese imports, of the imports of Chinese agriculture and seafood products, increased by 346 percent. China is now the third largest exporter of agriculture and seafood

products in the United States only behind our neighbor to the north and our neighbor to the south.

So perhaps our food import system should change drastically. The Food and Drug Administration was created in a time when we were still domestically growing the majority of our own foods. While we do have real issues here at home to deal with regarding our food regulatory system, at least we have a regulatory system to deal with that problem.

This is not the case for all of the countries involved from which we receive food. It seems that it would be common sense that we would only import food from a country if they can prove that their system is as safe as ours. Yet only the U.S. Department of Agriculture can require this, which, once again, controls 20 percent of our food supply, 20 percent equivalency, 80 percent, no match. It seems to me that it may be time to rebalance that portfolio or at least make the 80 percent of the food that's imported as safe as the 20 percent that's under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture with their equivalency standards.

Now, it seems to be very arbitrary that the system the United States Department of Agriculture can employ is so much tougher than the system the Food and Drug Administration can employ. Yet at the end of the day, all that food, all that food winds up on the same kitchen table. No one makes a distinction that, well, this is the 20 percent that we got under the jurisdiction of the FDA or the United States Department of Agriculture, and this is the 80 percent we got from the Food and Drug Administration, so we will be much more circumspect about this 80 percent of the food that's on our table than the 20 percent that's under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

That's nonsense. We know that doesn't happen in American homes. Americans don't discriminate food upon the agency that regulates them, nor should they, nor should they be asked to. But it's curious that Congress does. Congress sets forth these dual standards, you might say dueling standards, and Congress must have a candid discussion on whether or not we need to make the systems more comparable. Again, former Speaker Newt Gingrich: "Real change requires real change."

Now, Chairman DINGELL's food safety bill is tentatively scheduled to be marked up at both the subcommittee level and the full committee level the week of November 5, that's next week. It's my goal to encourage this frank conversation at the committee level and hopefully Members of both sides of the aisle will continue to have input on this important issue.

Now, we all know, although it hasn't been the experience of late, we all know that the system works best, and we have the most effective legislation

for the American people, if the bills are allowed to go through the regular prescribed order.

For the sake of the safety and the sanity of the American consumer, I implore our leadership of the House, our Democratic leadership of the House to allow this important piece of legislation to go through the regular process, let it go through the normal process.

We saw what happened with the reauthorization of the Food and Drug Administration early this year. It was a good product. Although the bill was vastly different coming out than it was going in, I think we have got a better bill at the end of the process. It was worked on by staff, worked on at the subcommittee level, worked on by staff, worked on at the full committee level, went to conference and ultimately we got an FDA reauthorization bill that I thought was quite serviceable.

We saw the system at its worst in the past eight weeks with the State Children's Health Insurance Program where regular order was subverted: here is the bill, up or down, take it or leave it, got to ram it through the committee in 8 hours, got to ram it through the House floor the next day. But, guess what, it's so bad even the Senate won't touch it.

So we come back with a Senate bill, but it's not really a conference product. That SCHIP product that came from the Senate in September was, in fact, a new bill. It could have gone to the subcommittee level, it could have gone to the full committee, it could have been modified, it could have been amended, it could have been reworked, there could have been input from both sides.

If your goal is only the next election, then you are going to do things like we have seen the last 8 weeks with the State Children's Health Insurance Program. If your goal is focused on near-term, mid-term and far-term priorities, if you are worried about what your legislation is going to do to Americans 10 years, 20 years, 30 years from now, you will take the time to do it correctly.

Well, I hope we take the time to do it correctly with the food safety import bill that we will be taking up next week.

Well, let's not allow the issue of protecting our families from harmful and dangerous goods coming over from other countries to become a debate of R versus D, one side versus the other, a political bludgeon, a political wedge, make all the political hay you can because 2008, after all, is going to be a year where it's all politics all the time.

No, we cannot do that. This is something that I am certain holds some resonance in the minds of us all working together, find the most efficient and effective method of solving this crisis and solving it now. It ought to be the priority for every one of us in this House.

Well, let's move from food safety and consider the issue of consumer product

safety recalls. It seems like the Nation is very focused on this issue as well. These days it seems like every time you turn on the TV or open the newspaper, you learn about yet another consumer product safety recall.

While people are generally concerned about the issue of recalls, many people, myself included, are concerned about the source of all of those recalls since it appears to be, and maybe it's just me, but it appears to be that the majority of those recalls all emanate from a single source, a single country. Of course, those are goods that are manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

Christmas, if we can say Christmas on the House floor, Christmas is rapidly approaching. I cannot help but think there would be a huge market, a huge market for any manufacturer who wanted to put the "Made in America" label on their toys and products, maybe a little bitty American flag on that toy or product as well.

I encourage retailers, I encourage retailers to think about this. Stock as many "Made in America" products as you can. I will bet they are big sellers this year. Since the majority of all of the products that are being recalled this year were made in China, quite honestly, this year, myself and my family have made the personal decision to try to not buy anything with a "Made in China" label. We regard it as a warning label, just the same as you would see on a package of cigarettes. Warning: purchasing this product may be hazardous to your health, your child's health or your loved one's health or your pet's health.

Given all the circumstances, it seems like the right thing for me to do and my family. I feel certain that other American families have made similar decisions. I know because I heard about it over and over again during the August recess at town hall meetings. I got the feeling that the Lou Dobbs family is probably among them.

Well, this concern about imported products is real, and it has been substantiated with real data. The United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, which is tasked with the job of trying to safeguard our society from unreasonable risk of injury and death associated with consumer products, informs me that as of this week, 2007, the year 2007, not even completed yet, but so far in year 2007, year-to-date, a record-breaking 472 consumer product safety recalls. Of the 472 consumer product safety recalls, more than 60 percent were manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

Are you beginning to pick up on the repetitive nature of this theme? More than 60 percent of all recall products this past year were made in China.

□ 2100

Furthermore, of the 472 total consumer product recalls, 61 of those recalls affected whom, our most vulnerable members of society, our children.

Sixty-one consumer recall products were toys. And how many of those products were manufactured in the People's Republic of China you might ask? Well, I'll tell you. And the figure is illuminating. The figure is astounding. The figure is staggering. The United States Consumer Products Safety Commission estimated that over 90 percent of the toy recalls were made in China.

We'll take our stop button down for a minute because it doesn't seem to be doing any good anyway. Let's look at this. It's not doing any good because we don't have one and we need one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm just a simple country doctor who ran and won the race for Congress several years ago, but I find myself asking myself over and over, what in the world can we do to protect ourselves and our families?

Here's a poster from the Consumer Product Safety Commission that shows just a few of the consumer product recalls for the month of October: trick-or-treat bucket, some type of sword, a sprinkler that looks like a turtle, a child's gardening equipment, a bendable dinosaur, a crash helmet. I don't know what that is. I don't know what that is. A skull and cross bones and a boot. All of these things, and this is not the total amount of recalls, but all of these things were recalled, issued recalls in the month of October alone. For the safety of our families we need to get to the bottom of the cause behind all of the recalls.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I also sit on the Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over this issue, and our committee is investigating the problem, and in the weeks to come, legislation will be introduced on this issue. We've passed bills individually recently that have dealt with specific issues, the specific safety concerns of consumer products, including a bill that I amended to make ornamental pools safer, and the committee is currently formulating comprehensive bipartisan legislation to strengthen the consumer product safety system in this country. A lot of topics are on the table, including enhancing the commission's recall authority. I firmly believe that we must improve the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission's ability to notify consumers about dangerous products more quickly and on a broader scope.

I am very concerned that there may be a large gap of people and associations that are not receiving the information about the product recalls in a timely manner. As we all know, products are recalled because they have been found to have some element of danger to the consumer and they need to be immediately gathered in and usage stopped and somehow safely discarded.

We always wonder: What are you going to do with all of those lead based toys that come into this country? You can't burn them because we don't want

to breathe the lead fumes. You can't bury them in a landfill because we don't want to drink the water that has now had the lead leached out into it. So what are we going to do with all of those lead-contaminated products that are finding their way into our country?

And another aspect, what do you do about nonprofits, Salvation Army, Goodwill? In my hometown of Lewisville, Christian Community Action, that's located in Denton County, they can provide some invaluable resource to their communities because of what they do with recycling used products. But they also have an obligation to make certain that they comply with all of the issues resulting from a recall.

Now, I've been informed by some of the nonprofits back in my home districts in Texas that, through no faults of their own, they are unaware of many of the product recalls and, therefore, the fear is that they could inadvertently sell or resell a recalled product to a family or to an individual. So I'm currently working with the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission to try to close this gap.

Now, this is, Mr. Speaker, this is just a blowup of the Web site listing the Web site up here at the top, www.cpsc.gov, Consumer Product Safety Commission. And on the opening page there is a place where, I've got the arrow pointing to it, but there's a place on the page where you can sign up for e-mail announcements of product safety recalls and certainly encourage nonprofits to take part in that. But realistically, any American consumer, any consuming American family may well want to do the same thing so they get immediate notification through an e-mail-based system if there is a product recall.

Unfortunately, based on the testimony and the work we've seen that has occurred in our committee, I've got to believe that we're nowhere near the end of this. And unfortunately, as we drive further into the Christmas season, we may see other product recalls and they may yet dwarf the size of the recalls. As big as they've been, they may dwarf the size of the recalls that have already occurred this year.

Well, while we continue to try to close the gap through legislation, I encourage Members of Congress and, Mr. Speaker, I know we can't directly address the audience on C-SPAN, but if I could do that, I would ask them to perhaps consider signing up for the product recall safety alerts. It's easy, it's free, and it just might save a life. If you have access to an e-mail account and the Internet, all you've got to do is go to the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission's home page, again, www.cpsc.gov and sign up for free recall and safety news. So, again, www.cpsc.gov. And yes, for people who English is not the primary language, you can sign up in English and in Spanish.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission also has a neighborhood safety

network which is for organizations or even civic-minded individuals to help disseminate information about recalls and posters to members of society who may not be aware of the recalls.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, education can save lives. Unfortunately, though, certain groups of Americans, such as the elderly, urban and rural low-income families, and some minority groups often don't hear about the safety messages from the government. Certainly, additional outreach is needed.

One of the reasons to sign up for the product e-mail alerts is, you know, Mr. Speaker, there may be some unscrupulous vendors out there who, after a recall, after a recall has been issued, may take up and resell these products in a bargain house somewhere. So we want people to have easy and free access to the information so, obviously, they can make the best decisions.

So please help make your community safer by getting the word out about how to get notification on these product safety recalls.

I'm a member of the Neighborhood Safety Network and will disseminate information through my Web site, www.house.gov/burgess. Information available in linking you to the CPSC Web site is available through that Web site as well. Again, www.house.gov/burgess.

Well, with all the talking I've done on this, I'm sure some people, Mr. Speaker, would ask, is there a downside? Is there a dark side of this that we should consider? And the answer is, of course, yes. You must always be cautious of jumping over the line. We all worry about the encroaching reach and grasp of an ever-expanding Federal Government. We worry about things like federalizing our child's toy sets. But at the same time, the Federal Government does have an important duty to the safety and welfare of all Americans. And the last thing you want is for the Federal Government to have control over every item that you buy. But there's got to be a balancing test. And right now, I'm afraid the balance has tipped too far the other way, and the actual protection for the consumer doesn't exist.

I started out the beginning of my talk talking about recalls, and certainly the summer that we've just gone through has been the summer of recalls. We've had several of the individuals come in and testify in our committee about where the process broke down, where it went wrong. Again, there's a way to avoid the recall after recall after recall that we've witnessed the past several months in products coming in from overseas and from one country in particular; and one way to do that would be for manufacturers to increase the manufacturing that takes place in the United States of America. I can think of no better way to market your products than to say with a little American flag and a little "Made in America" label on that toy.

I mean, we talked about food safety, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this.

You know, if I walk into a place that sells chicken, for example, and I can buy 1 bucket of chicken where the product might harm me and it costs \$8, and I can buy a different bucket of chicken where the product won't harm me and it costs \$9, I'm going to take the \$9 bucket of chicken, thank you very much. And we hear over and over again, well, consumers don't want to pay higher prices. They want lower price. No, the consumer wants safe products, and if the consumer has to pay a little bit more to ensure that those products are safe, they're willing to do that, because everyone is sick of recall upon recall upon recall. Don't let the summer of recalls become the fall of recalls, become the winter of recalls, become the election year of recalls in 2008. We have it in our power to stop this process. Begin more manufacturing in this country. Manufacturers who step up and do that, I think, will be handsomely rewarded. Food importers who actually stop all of the importation and work with American farmers to buy American products, I think, will be rewarded. I would pay the extra buck for a bucket of chicken that wasn't going to poison me or my family. And most Americans would feel the same way. I would pay the extra buck for a 50-pound bag of dog food that's not going to give my beloved pet kidney failure and take them from me early.

This is a pretty simple concept. If we can assure the safety in this country, let's move the manufacturing, let's move the production, let's move the farming production to where we know we can have the safety and the oversight that's required.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be vigilant in our plight in restoring safety and trust back to the foods we eat and the products that we use. I believe that the legislation introduced, H.R. 3967, the Food Import and Safety Act of 2007, will further this goal, as will the enhanced recall authority by the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission that we've also talked about tonight.

Compromising the safety of foods we put on our tables is, frankly, not an option. Compromising consumer products we buy for our families is, frankly, not an option. Compromising the security of Americans can never be an option. Compromising cannot be an option that we take because we lack power. H.R. 3967 gives us back that power, gives us that big red stop button. If something's coming in from overseas and, hey, we see it's wrong, we see it's tainted, stop. Stop. Don't let it even come on our shores. Don't let us be the ones that have to dispose of the stuff. Stop it. Send it back where it came from.

We can no longer sit back and allow harmful products to reach our homes. All Americans, my family included, have the choice to take a stance individually and not buy products with those warning labels on them. The

warning label, remember, says, "Made in China," because those products have proven to be unsafe.

But we could go a little farther than that. Stricter rules are necessary. And at this juncture I would say it's up to Congress to create and enact those rules and earn back the trust of the American people in the process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've been very indulgent.

I will yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 3 p.m.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CUMMINGS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOHMERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, November 6.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, November 6.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, for 5 minutes, October 31.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3678. An act to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium on certain taxes relating to the Internet and to electronic commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles: