away from brutality against their own people. And I agree that current U.S. Policy is failing badly, not achieving any of these goals. But I fear this legislation is a step backward, not forward. In my judgment, this bill will likely not work, for four reasons.

First, economic sanctions simply do not work in today's world when the United States acts alone. The Soviet grain embargo is the greatest example of a unilateral sanction with terrific goals and utterly ineffective results that cost billions in dollars of U.S. exports. But the same can be said for any number of U.S. unilateral sanctions.

Iran has 65 million people and a $300 billion economy. Libya has 5 million people and a $33 billion economy. Neither country can be isolated, geographically or economically. In both countries, exports are growing. From 1988 to 1994, Iran's exports grew nearly 50 percent, to $19 billion. Libya's exports grew nearly 10 percent, to $8 billion.

The reality is none of Iran's or Libya's major trading partners will go along with our sanctions. Not Germany. Not France. Not Italy. Not Spain. And not Japan. Without their cooperation, how will our sanctions ever work?

This brings me to the second flaw in this bill. This legislation would impose a secondary boycott on our closest allies. The sponsors argue that the bill will force Europe to choose between trading with us and trading with Iran and Libya. This will never work.

The primary effect of this bill has been to unify the European Union—all 15 members—against our policy toward Iran and Libya. Just like the extraterritorial reach of the 1982 Soviet pipeline embargo unified Europe. If this becomes law, we should expect blocking statutes to prevent European companies from complying, as well as retaliatory actions. Libya is a major source of petroleum for Western Europe. How can we expect those countries to forego Libya's oil? It simply will not happen.

Aside from Europe's interests in Libya, the Moslem countries of the Middle East, South Asia, and the Caucasus will not comply. Look what is happening with Iran. Pakistan now has an economic alliance with Iran. The Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Turkmenistan, and Azerbaijan all are pursuing trade and investment with Iran. With these countries, Iran is likely to be a major partner in developing oil and gas resources in central Asia.

We have invested a lot in cultivating good relations with these former Soviet Republics. Are we now going to impose sanctions and throw away all our work over the past 5 years? If we do sanction these countries, how will they respond?

This legislation will not isolate Iran and Libya. It will isolate us. No one should be surprised. After all, the Arab League boycott of Israel has been a total failure. We and the Europeans all prevented our companies from complying. The same thing could happen with this legislation.

Third, this bill could prove a mistake because it provides the leaders of Iran and Libya with a convenient excuse for their own failures. Both regimes have inflicted great suffering on their people. The elites siphon off more and more money to prop up their own positions. But as the discontent rises among the Libyan and Iranian people, Qadhafi and the Ayatollahs will just point to the United States and say: ''See what the Americans are doing to you.''

Fourth, I am concerned that this is the easy way out for the administration. Enactment of this bill will replace the more necessary need. The administration, I'm convinced, will continue to fail to do the harder work of leading a coherent, multilateral response to the appalling policies of Iran. The test of our policy must be its impact on Iran's current regime. It is not enough that our goals are laudable. Our actions must be focused on stopping Iran's dangerous behavior, and this takes the hard work of multilateral action.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, Iran and Libya threaten international peace and security. Our goal must be to change their behavior. Whatever we do, it must be effective. We need our allies with us, not against us. There was a time when the United States could sound the alarm and Europe would rally to our side. That day is over. Economic sanctions and secondary boycotts have not—and will not—work when they are unilateral.

With enactment of this bill, I'm concerned we will have jeopardized our relations with the very countries whose support we need to eventually reach the goal of turning Iran and Libya away from their current terrorist behavior.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran-Libya Oil Sanctions Act. This bill is important to the United States because it seeks to limit Iran's and Libya's ability to destabilize the Middle East. These sanctions will limit both countries' ability to export terrorism and upset the peace process in the Middle East.

I am a strong advocate of this bill because it will hit these parish nations where it hurts—oil production. By limiting foreign investment into the petroleum sector, this legislation will prevent both nations from funding the expansionist military policies. It will make it more difficult for Iran to purchase additional diesel submarines whose sole purpose is to close off oil exports from the gulf. It will hinder Libyan efforts to increase their stockpile of chemical weapons. And most importantly it will constrict Iran's ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

This bill sends a clear message to both Iran and Libya that America will not sit idly and watch them build up their military capabilities for the sole purpose of regional intimidation. I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1627) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Food Quality Protection Act of 1996''.

TITLE I—SUSPENSION-APPLICATORS

SEC. 101. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

Subtitle A—Suspension

SEC. 102. SUSPENSION.

(a) SECTION 6(c)(1).—The second sentence of section 6(c)(1) (7 U.S.C. 136d(c)(1)) is amended to read: ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), no order of suspension may be issued under this subsection unless the Administrator has issued, or at the same time issues, a notice of intention to cancel the registration or change the classification of the pesticide under subsection (b).''.

(b) SECTION 6(c)(3).—Section 6(c)(3) (7 U.S.C. 136d(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''The Administrator may issue an emergency order under this paragraph before issuing a notice of intention to cancel the registration or change the classification of the pesticide under subsection (b) and the Administrator shall proceed to issue the notice under subsection (b) within 90 days of issuing an emergency order. If the Administrator does not issue a notice under subsection (b) within 90 days of issuing an emergency order, the emergency order shall expire.''; and

(2) by striking ''In that case'' and inserting ''In the case of an emergency order''.

SEC. 103. TOLERANCE REEVALUATION AS PART OF REREGISTRATION.

Section 4(g)(2) (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) As soon as the Administrator has sufficient information with respect to the dietary risk of a particular active ingredient, but in any event no later than the time the Administrator makes a determination under subparagraph (C) or (D) with respect to pesticides containing a particular active ingredient, the Administrator shall—

''(i) reassess each associated tolerance and exemption from the requirement for a tolerance issued under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a);

''(ii) determine whether such tolerance or exemption meets the requirements of that Act;

''(iii) determine whether additional tolerances or exemptions should be issued;

''(iv) publish in the Federal Register a notice setting forth the determinations made under this subparagraph; and

''(v) commence promptly such proceedings under this Act and section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as are warranted by such determinations.''.