

this killer. Amazingly, nearly two-thirds of women who died suddenly of heart attack had no prior history of heart disease, and no risk was detected.

Public health experts have drawn many links between the difficulties poor and working women face and increased risk of disease. Cardiovascular diseases are no exception to these health effects of inequality.

Furthermore, cardiovascular diseases strike African-American women particular hard. African-American women die of heart attacks at twice the rate of other women, and die from strokes at a 33-percent higher rate than white women.

The risk factors that increase likelihood of cardiovascular diseases are also greater for African-American women than white women, including a higher incidence of diabetes, higher percentage with elevated cholesterol levels, less physical activity, and a greater rate of obesity.

These factors—often stemming from stress and struggle of trying to make ends meet—are commonly known with health care professionals—yet these factors and the deadly cardiovascular diseases that result are almost invisible in the policy debates and public discussions of our Nation's health and welfare.

That is why I urge you to join me in supporting the Women's Cardiovascular Diseases Research and Prevention Act. We who know better must create the kind of pressure, through broad education and study that will put this issue at the center of our public health initiatives, not stuck on the fringes, while striking, literally, at the heart of the women in America.

This bill aims to lay the critical foundation for the research and public education that is needed to turn around this largely silent killer of America's women. The bill authorizes \$140 million to the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health to expand studies on heart diseases to include women and conduct outreach that will reach women. This authorization will start to make up for the many years in which women and minorities have been greatly underrepresented in heart and stroke research.

Currently, most if not all, diagnostic equipment and treatments are based on studies limited to men. The results of this research bias has meant many health care professionals remain unaware of the varied and often subtle symptoms of heart diseases women may have, like dizziness, breathlessness, and arm pain.

This bill will provide those responsible for detecting and treating women with the knowledge necessary to combat these diseases among women.

This bill seeks to use the results of this research as well, spreading this knowledge beyond the hospitals and laboratories. This bill would establish targeted outreach programs for women and health care providers alike to educate all of us on the common symptoms of and risk factors contributing to cardiovascular diseases among women.

The Women's Cardiovascular Diseases Research and Prevention Act can be a crucial first step in getting timely diagnosis, effective treatment and broad, effective prevention measures for the leading killer of American women. I look forward to working with the members of the Congressional Caucus of Women's Issues, and all other interested Members of Congress to pass this legislation.

Again, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, HOUSING OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1997

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (during the special order of the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-81) on the resolution (H. Res. 133) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the United States Housing Act of 1937, deregulate the public housing program and the program for rental housing assistance for low-income families, and increase community control over such programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 867, ADOPTION PROMOTION ACT OF 1997

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (during the special order of the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-82) on the resolution (H. Res. 134) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 867) to promote the adoption of children in foster care, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD the statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] under the remarks of this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say to my friend and colleagues that I am joined this evening by a distinguished colleague of mine from the State of Vermont who has been a champion on fair trade in this country, BERNIE SANDERS. If I could, I would like to make a few brief remarks and then yield to my

friend from Vermont, [Mr. SANDERS] or whomever else would like to engage in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have been meeting here on a weekly basis to talk about the effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Let me just begin by saying after 3 years, actually 40 months, we are now able to look closely at the effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement, and I would recommend to my colleagues an editorial today in the New York Times because this editorial really shows us how the issues of trade and protecting the environment are really inseparably linked. We are going to talk about the environment a little bit, and then we are going to get to some other issues with respect to corporations. The editorial discussed the environmental challenges that the Nation of Chile is facing.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a copy of that editorial that was in the New York Times this morning.

The article referred to is as follows:

#### SLIGHTING NATURE IN CHILE

When Augusto Pinochet stepped down as President in 1990, Chile's people hoped that democracy would bring an improvement in the country's environment. The dictatorship had listened mainly to its friends in industry, and Chileans hoped that a new government would heed conservationists and public health advocates. What they did not count on was that in Chile, like most developing countries eager to attract foreign investment, the desire for growth outweighed environmental concerns.

As a result, air and water pollution remain serious threats to public health. Chile is also destroying irreplaceable natural resources through logging of old-growth forests and overfishing.

Chile has some tough environmental laws but, as in other Latin nations, they are not well enforced—in part because of the desire for growth. Chile is justifiably proud of a decade of growth at more than 5 percent, much of it from exports from mining, forest products and fishing, which damaged the environment unless carefully regulated.

These extractive industries exercise great political influence. Moreover, unlike their American and European counterparts, business leaders in Chile see no particular public relations value in supporting environmental causes. The Chilean industrialists' group has even hinted that it will organize a boycott of "Oro Verde," a prime-time soap opera with an environmental theme.

Businesses commission the required environmental impact statements, and the government board that evaluates them often cannot afford to hire experts to do a thorough job. On several occasions when the board has rejected major investment proposals, political commissions have allowed the projects to proceed. President Eduardo Frei has often said he will not let environmental concerns stand in the way of growth.

Chile's environmental groups are small and rely heavily on volunteers. But they have helped raise public awareness of environmental issues to the point where politicians cannot risk ignoring them. And they have mounted successful court challenges. Chile's supreme court just blocked a major logging project by an American company, declaring that Chile's basic environmental law was too vague. New regulations were quickly passed.

The court is surely on the right track. No one has calculated the yearly cost of environmental damage to Chileans' health and

resources, but the figure is probably greater than the annual increase in Chile's economy. Other Latin nations have found profit in protecting the environment. That would be a natural step for Chile, whose responsible Government and strong regulatory structure have helped make it an economic model in the third world.

The linkage of trade and the environment is an issue that we will need to address in the coming weeks and the months ahead as a proposal for granting fast track negotiation authority for the Congress, the proposal that the administration wants. As the editorial shows us, we must realize that sacrificing the environment for growth will not be sustainable in the long run, while it may appear to be sustainable in the short run, and if we simply expand NAFTA to include other nations without including strong environmental standards, we will lock into place a trade agreement that will eventually include environmental degradation. Corporations should be held to the same high standards of the environment no matter where they operate, but under the agreement that we passed during this debate 40 months ago, under NAFTA, corporations are not held accountable. If they exploit the environment or if we find that a nation's environmental laws are not being enforced, all we can do is consult, just consult. There is no fines, there is no sanctions, there is just talk.

□ 1945

And that is not right. The last 3 years of experience we have had with NAFTA shows us that this system does not work. And it is true that our border areas with Mexico was an environmental mess before NAFTA went into effect. We were told that, once we pass NAFTA, the problems on the border would get better. Instead they have gotten worse.

Mr. Speaker, the border area has grown rapidly. It is known as the maquiladora area. It is an area along the California, New Mexico, Texas, Arizona border with Mexico. Its workforce has expanded by 45 percent. But with the population growth and the increase in manufacturing, not even the old environmental and health problems have been fixed. Families along the border continue to live near and bathe in water from rivers in a region that the American Medical Association has called a cesspool of infectious disease.

Not a single meaningful grant has come out of the North American Development Bank, which was put together as an answer to try to resolve some of these problems. Our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], had this language adopted and has worked very hard, but folks have dragged their feet.

So what we try to do is create an institution that will help finance border cleanup projects, but neither our Government nor the Mexican Government has shown a serious commitment to it. The Sierra Club guesstimates that it would cost about \$20 billion, that is bil-

lion with a B, to clean up the serious environmental problems along the Mexican border. But at that rate, the bill is just going to grow. It is not going to get any smaller. And it is no longer that contaminated strawberries from Mexico could get into our school lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, in Michigan we had a serious problem with our school lunch program and the strawberries. We see these conditions happening because of the open border. Most people probably know the story about the contaminated strawberries that came from Mexico about a month ago. Students in Michigan started to get sick, and they were coming down with hepatitis A. All told, 179 young people became sick, and more than 11,000 students in Michigan and California had to get shots. Why? Because these strawberries, which were grown in Mexico, illegally got into our school lunch program.

Now, no one will ever be able to say for sure how these berries became contaminated, but let me tell you the evidence seems clear to show that the plant in San Diego where the berries were processed had no evidence of contamination during a routine inspection conducted there at the same time that the berries in question were processed. And it is well known that there is significant pollution in the irrigation and drinking water of Mexico.

In fact, listen to this figure, 17 percent of Mexican children have contracted a hepatitis virus from contaminated drinking water, 17 percent. Now since NAFTA has gone into effect, fresh strawberry imports from Mexico have more than doubled, with only 1 percent of food coming in from Mexico getting inspected. And of this tiny portion of food that gets inspected, fully one-third of it fails inspection over dangerous pesticides. So what you have along the border in Texas, you have got 11,000 trucks coming across the border every single day. They call it a wave line because just one out of every 200 get inspected. And of those that get inspected of this tiny portion, one-third fail the test for dangerous pesticides.

Mr. Speaker, 99 percent of the food that comes across the border is not inspected. As a Nation we have seen food inspection decrease dramatically over the years in the name of free trade and deregulation. So it is not surprising that 33 million Americans become ill every year as a result of eating contaminated food.

So, Mr. Speaker, the proponents of NAFTA told us that our food standards and food safety would be harmonized upward if we passed the NAFTA. What does that mean, harmonized upward? It means that their standards would increase to meet the high level of standards that we generally have here in the United States. But, well, they were wrong. Uninspected food is surging in from Mexico at an unprecedented rate. And we know that some of it is not safe and at the very least we should require imported foods to be inspected.

But we must also strengthen the food safety requirements in our trade agreements. Now, free trade is not just about tariff rates and investment protection and intellectual property. It is an issue that affects us every day in ways that we do not even realize. We must begin to recognize the fact that the issue of human health must have a place in our trade agreement.

As the debate on the fast track proceeds, we must make sure that human health and environmental protection are recognized as trade issues. We must give these issues the same standing as we give to corporate investment and intellectual property.

Now I have just about a minute to make two more points, then I am going to yield to my colleagues, who have been so patient here. I want to talk about NAFTA's corporate bonanza. It is astonishing what some of these corporations have done.

In February of this year, a group called Public Citizens did a study to look at the record of companies who had promised to create jobs if NAFTA was passed; and they tracked all the job promises, and they found that 90 percent of these companies broke their promises, 90 percent. They did not create jobs in America as a result of NAFTA.

I want to show you this chart here, NAFTA's corporate bonanzas are good for profits, bad for workers. This new study points out just last week they tracked 28 named corporations that spent millions of dollars to pass NAFTA. They came here and lobbied, told us what a great deal it was, how it was going to create jobs. Their record is one of greed and profit at the expense of workers on both sides of the border. And 12 of these corporations laid off a total of over 7,000 workers and shipped those jobs to Mexico. These are the companies that promised to create jobs in America if we passed NAFTA.

The sad thing is that all of this has paid off for these companies. They shipped our jobs over there. The main NAFTA boosters have seen their profits go up nearly 300 percent since NAFTA, compared to 59 percent for the top 500 U.S. firms since 1973. So they are making these profits by plowing over the rights of workers. And when they get down there, they do not pay, you know, they reestablish these jobs in Mexico, they do not pay them anything.

Mr. Speaker, during the NAFTA debate, workers were getting paid a dollar an hour. They were making a few dollars a day. Now they are making 70 cents an hour. I was down there just about a month and a half ago and workers were making \$5 and \$6 a day working in modern facilities, working very hard, very productive, but with no environmental safety standards, nobody to really bargain and organize for them, no unions to represent them. And they are making \$5 and \$6 dollars a day, and their wages have dropped 40 percent.

So where is all the money going? Where is it going? Well, it is going to the corporations. You see, six of these corporations bust the unions by threatening to move jobs to Mexico. And you know the story goes on and on and on.

So it is with great sadness that we have to come to the floor and talk about these issues, because it is very clear from the record that NAFTA has not lived up to the promises that were made by the corporations or those that were concerned about the environment.

So at this point I yield to my friend from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, who has been vigilant, very watchful and determined that, before we move on and do any other trade deals, we have got to correct the ones we are engaged in. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and it is a pleasure to work with my colleague who has helped lead the anti-NAFTA effort for many years and has demanded a sensible trade policy which represents the needs of workers, as well as corporate America. It is nice to be here with the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KUCINICH], who is also joining that fight in a very strong way.

I remember some 4 years ago the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BONIOR] came to the State of Vermont and addressed a rally in Montpelier in Vermont, where we had 300 or 400 Vermonters who were out protesting NAFTA; and the sad truth is that much of what he and I said on that day, much of what he and I predicted would happen has in fact occurred.

NAFTA is part of a disastrous trade policy, which is resulting in record-breaking trade deficits, which is costing us millions of decent-paying jobs. I wish very, very much, as important as the national deficit is, that the Congress would pay half as much attention to the trade deficit, which is costing us millions of jobs and which is lowering the wages of workers from one end of this country to the other.

The essence of our current disastrous trade policy is not very hard to comprehend. You do not have to have a Ph.D. in economics to understand that it is impossible and wrong for American workers to be competing against very desperate people in Mexico and other parts of the world, who, because of the economic conditions in their own country, are forced to work for 50 cents an hour or 70 cents an hour.

One of the interesting developments in recent weeks, I do not know if my colleague has seen it, is the front page of Business Week. Their cover story reported that CEOs last year earned 54 percent more than the preceding year. In other words, the compensation for CEOs in this country of the major corporations went up by 54 percent, while workers are struggling with 2 or 3 percent increases in their incomes.

Now, these very same people who are now averaging over \$5 million a year are precisely the same people who told us how great the NAFTA would be.

Well, I suppose that they are right. NAFTA has been very good for them, but it has been a disaster for the average American worker.

What we know is not only that hundreds of thousands of decent-paying jobs have disappeared from this country, as corporation after corporation has said, why should I pay an American worker \$10, \$15, \$20 an hour when I can get a desperate person in Mexico to work for 50 cents an hour or a dollar an hour. Not only have they done that, but in addition to that, they are moving jobs all over the world.

I was interested in this last week to read, if it were not so sad, it really would be funny, where Nike, which seems to have the inclination to move to that country in the world which is now paying the lowest wages, they have now gravitated to Vietnam. And my colleagues may have seen in the paper that in Vietnam there is now a demonstration that they are paying below what they even promised the Vietnamese workers, which I would imagine is 20 cents or so an hour.

So what we are seeing is these corporations who used to hire American workers at decent wages are now running to Mexico, to other Latin American countries, they are going to China, they are going to Vietnam, where they are hiring people for abysmally low wages. And that is part of our current trade policy.

I think I speak for the vast majority of the people in this country who say that what we have got to have is a fair trade policy which represents the interest of the vast majority of our people and not just corporate America, rather than a so-called free trade policy, which forces American workers to compete against desperate people throughout the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that concerns me terribly much is that every day that I turn on the television and I listen to the radio and I read the newspapers, I keep hearing about how great the economy is. I am sure the economy must be great for somebody, but it is not great for the vast majority of the people in my own State of Vermont.

The fact of the matter is that while the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well, while CEOs now earn over 200 times what their workers earn, the middle class continues to shrink and most of the new jobs that are being created are low-wage jobs, many of them part time, many of them temporary, many of them without benefits.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SANDERS. I sure would.

Mr. BONIOR. Because I want to elaborate a little about the disparity between those at the top and the average worker in this country. In 1960, the difference between what a CEO earned and the average worker was about 12 to 1. In 1974, that increased to about 35 to 1. And as you have just correctly pointed out, now it is 209 to 1.

The average worker in America today, the 80 percent of people who pack a lunch and go to work and make this country work, their wages for the last 20 years have basically been frozen, their real wages. They are not going anywhere. It is the top 20 percent that are doing very, very well; and the very top are doing exceedingly well. But they are not moving anywhere. They are frozen.

If you have one of these people who have worked all your life at a company or part of your life at a company and they decided they are going to Mexico and your job is gone, those people are able to get jobs again but about at two-thirds of the wages that they had formerly been earning, at about two-thirds of the salaries that they were making. That is what is going on, there is an incredible downward pressure on wages.

There was a study done by Cornell University for the Department of Labor, which the Department of Labor, by the way, suppressed; and you will understand why when I tell you what was in the study. They found that 62 percent, 62 percent of corporations in America today were using Mexico and other countries that pay low wages as a hedge against raising wages or keeping wages flat in this country.

□ 2000

They would tell their workers, listen, you want an increase in wages or salary, you are not going to get it. You are going to stay where you are, you are going to take a cut in health benefits or pension benefits, and if you do not we are going south. We are going to Mexico. Sixty-two percent of the companies are doing that.

So I thank my friend for raising that point, because it speaks to the increasing disparity we have in economic reality in this country.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me just say a few words and then I am going to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KUCINICH]. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] knows, 23 years ago the United States led the world in terms of the wages and benefits our workers received. Today, as a result of a number of factors, not least of which is our absurd trade policy, we are now in 13th place as a result in terms of wages and benefits. The fact of the matter is that the average American today is working longer hours for lower wages and they need that extra time in order to compensate for the decline in their income.

Clearly, there is something very wrong when from one end of this country to the other, we are seeing the loss of good paying manufacturing jobs and the substitution of those jobs in the service industry which pays people \$6 an hour, \$7 an hour, and often does not have benefits.

So I think that probably the most important issue that this Congress should be debating is to demand in one way or another, and I have some

thoughts on it, you and Mr. KUCINICH have thoughts on it, in one way or another we have got to tell corporate America who have made their money in this country that they have got to begin reinvesting in Vermont, in Michigan, in Ohio, back into the United States of America, put people to work at decent wages, rather than running all over the world to hire desperately poor people at starvation wages.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH].

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues on this issue which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has led the country on in examining and exposing the deficiencies in the NAFTA agreement.

I come from a district in Cleveland, OH, which was really built with the labor of steelworkers, auto workers, people in machine shops. It is a blue collar town in many ways. It was part of that great industrial strength of America that helped sustain this country through two world wars and really made America preeminent among industrial powers in the world.

I have seen the changes that have taken place in Cleveland and throughout Ohio since NAFTA, and it is not a pretty sight. The State of Ohio alone has lost many jobs. As a matter of fact, I was able to secure a list of jobs which I have here, and I would just like to read some of the cities which have lost specific plant to Mexico since NAFTA. When I read this list I would like my colleagues to keep in mind that these are not cold, sterile statistics: Franklin Disposables which lost 50 jobs to Mexico, Dayton Rich Products which lost 146 jobs to Mexico, Green Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company lost 60 jobs.

In each case, the statistics have behind them a story of a family whose breadwinner could no longer produce and sustain a family. I have a story of a young person who lost out on an educational opportunity because the money was not there to sustain it. There is a story of a family which worked a lifetime to have a home and, suddenly, holding on to that home is impossible; a story of medical bills that cannot be met; a story of a dream that is shattered, a dream that is deferred, a dream that is denied.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to come forward with information and to show that in Greenville, OH, for example, 180 people were laid off from Allied Signal. Those people made air filters, oil filters and spark plugs.

Mr. Speaker, that is one snapshot because we have a \$39 billion trade deficit because of NAFTA, and much of it, three-quarters of it is in the automotive related sector, so multiply one family, one dream times thousands and thousands across this country and we have a sea change occurring in this country, and the American dream is changing.

This country was built with steel, automotive, aerospace. Basic indus-

tries provided the muscle for America, gave us might, helped to preserve this country and protect our democratic values, and any change which undermines those industries undermines, I contend, our basic democratic principles and traditions, because if we do not have the ability to produce steel, if we do not have the ability to have a strong automotive industry, if we cannot be strong and secure in our aerospace, we undermine our national security.

Of course the greatest security we have, as we all know, is a job, and NAFTA has cost this country thousands upon thousands of jobs. As a matter of fact, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] probably knows, because we were talking about this last week, the last count was 118,000 jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. And that is a conservative estimate. If you use the formula that the proponents of NAFTA gave us in terms of creation of jobs, if we use that very formula we have lost about 600,000 jobs as a result of NAFTA. And of course we know many, many people just do not apply for trade adjustment assistance.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, and the Trade Economic Policy Institute estimates that, in fact, jobs were lost or never created because they were created in another country due to NAFTA.

Now, the next question is, What kind of jobs are being created. We know we are losing manufacturing jobs which are good paying jobs, which have enabled people to have a decent life, live in nice neighborhoods.

Mr. BONIOR. Sure, buy a home, send your kid to college, take a nice vacation, be able to retire with dignity with good health care.

Mr. KUCINICH. One needs to be making a good wage to do that, but what is happening is that this transition in our economy, while it is wiping out good paying manufacturing jobs, it is creating jobs, according to the Department of Labor, among the top 20 occupations having the largest numerical increase in the next decade in the United States: Cashiers, now cashiers are very important, very important jobs. Janitors, retail sales clerks, waiters and waitresses. Those are all important jobs and those are our constituents. But in order to sustain those jobs, in order to sustain this economy, we have to do it with manufacturing and we have to keep creating new industries, and we are not doing that.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker I yield to my friend from New York [Mr. OWENS] to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I want to go beyond what has been said here so far and say that what we have in motion here is that NAFTA has been giving an incentive to the corporate powers to wipe out the

American work force as we know it. American labor shall not exist in 10 years as we know it if they are able to continue as they are moving.

The incentive to make more and more profits on the backs of cheap labor has led to a situation where it has been concluded by corporate power that they have to wipe out the American labor movement. Working conditions and environmental conditions are just as important as wages in these considerations with respect to cheap labor costs, and they want a situation where they are in a position to dictate not only the low wages, but also the working conditions and to be free of any environmental regulations.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, what I have noticed is that all of the talk in this particular session of Congress about bipartisan cooperation and civility does not apply to anything related to organized labor. We have seen an assault start in this Congress on labor, unprecedented.

Several hearings have been held on the right of labor unions to use their money for political education, and they have gone out to where it hurts a great deal in terms of how they can spend their own funds and they are challenging their ability to make decisions as a majority, that if one member of any union objects to his money being used some way, his money should be segregated from the rest and the majority rules as to how funds are spent cannot apply. That is one way to cripple unions.

Another way is, of course, to come after the Fair Labor Standards Act. A lot of people think that the comp time bill is related to families, giving people an opportunity to have time off, but the comp time bill is all about the Fair Labor Standards Act as a major weapon of labor. If you get into the heart and soul of the Fair Labor Standards Act, you have to cripple unions.

OSHA continues to be under attack. We just had a hearing on methylene chloride, a substance which causes cancer, causes pneumonia. Clearly every study has shown it to be more dangerous than they previously understood it to be, and OSHA regulations after 10 years are being resisted, and they will take the business of methylene chloride, all the businesses that need it will take it overseas.

Airplanes, for example, have to use it in order to take the paint off when they check the body of airplanes to see if they are still sound and that is probably the largest use of methylene chloride. It is a huge business. They are threatening to take it to places overseas if we have the regulations installed by OSHA, just as they are threatening, of course, on any other environmental condition we set which safeguards the health of workers.

So we have an attempt by corporate power to create a new class of workers, something between servants and peasants, in order to maximize their profits. They will come back and they will

bring the jobs back once they do that. But NAFTA, GATT, allows them to make huge profits and use the cheapest labor in the world to make those profits and acquire the power necessary to destroy the labor force and the organized labor in this country.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a good point the gentleman makes.

I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] to answer it, and then I want to comment on it, because it is a very good point.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me just pick up on the gentleman's point, and that is essentially, if you have desperate people in Mexico who are making 50 cents an hour, who are living in shacks, whose kids may be begging out on the street, who are forced to work under the most horrendous conditions imaginable, what corporate America is saying is hey, if we can get people to work in those conditions over there, we can drive wages and working conditions down here, because what we say to the American worker is, hey, if you do not like what you are getting today, we are going to go over there.

I just got a letter today from a corporate entity in the State of Vermont who told us about how high the wages are in Vermont, he could go elsewhere and so forth and so on. So I think it is not only a labor issue, it is an environmental issue, it is a union issue, and that is what our entire trade policy is about.

It is the race to the bottom, it is saying to American workers, there are people in China, Mexico, throughout the world who are prepared to work for almost nothing, and we are going to lower your wages and lower your working conditions, lower the environmental standards that you work under, lower and lower and lower. Not raise the other people's, but lower ours until we have an equalized work force around the world. A very, very dangerous trend, which as the gentleman indicated, is wiping out the middle class and creating pathetically low-wage jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, years ago there was a large middle class like we have today, people struggled the same way, they did not have good wages here, they did not have any benefits. But they got together and they believed that they had certain inalienable rights, and among them were the rights to organize, the right to assemble, the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike. And that is how the movement got started, because of the abuse of the labor movement in this country. It was only through the labor movement that we built this expansive middle class in this country.

I saw something the other day, I was driving to work and I saw a banner over a bridge that said, let me recall the exact words, "The labor movement, the people who brought you the weekend." And I thought to myself, that is really creative. There could have been a lot of things up there. The people

that brought you a livable wage, the people that brought you safety protection, that brought you health care, that brought you Social Security, that brought you Medicare, that brought you compensation if you got laid off. I mean all of these things could have been up there on that banner. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. OWENS. The Fair Labor Standards Act, that is how the weekend came.

Mr. BONIOR. That is right. What is going on is they are trying to break labor in this country today, the corporations, and they are doing it through a variety of different ways. There are hundreds of law firms in this country that specialize in nothing else but busting unions in America. That is how they make their living.

I just came back from a very interesting discussion. I came from the Methodist Building across the street, and I was listening to a group of people talk about the K-Mart strike that occurred in Greensboro, NC, in 1993.

□ 2015

A lot of workers wanted to form a union in Greensboro, NC. They were prevented from forming a union. They got together and they signed cards. And the majority of them wanted a union. And the union would not negotiate a contract. And they got the whole community involved that this was the right thing to do. It was the moral thing to do. People wanted to be represented and they needed to be represented. But the corporation, the multinational corporation, which, by the way, is located very close to my district, about 2 or 3 miles outside my district, they would not recognize them.

So what happened and what has to happen today in America and in Mexico and in other places is that you have got to get the community involved to get people organized again so they can stand up for those basic inalienable rights of being able to assemble, to collective bargaining and the right to earn their own bread.

And they did that down in Greensboro. They got the churches together. They got the progressive people in the business communities and they said, This is wrong. These people decided they wanted to come together for a decent wage and decent working conditions, and they ought to be recognized. Through a 3-year struggle they finally did it.

But even more importantly, they formed a sense of community out of that process and that is now being used to work on education issues and a whole variety of other issues. We have gotten off the track a little bit.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is very much on track. That process is being endangered now. If you wipe out the ability to organize and you wipe out unions, who have the resources and the know-how to organize, then you are going to shut off that whole process.

There is an article in the February issue of Atlantic Monthly by a very successful capitalist named George Soros where he is saying capitalism is out of control and capitalism is going to destroy itself because there is so much great abuse of power. It is going to end the open society, what I call the society of checks and balances. Institutions like organized labor become a check on the power of corporations. Corporations are running rampant over everybody so the process of being able to organize is going to be wiped out.

Mr. BONIOR. There is no countervailing force today like there used to be. Unions and government used to provide a balancing against runaway greed.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me pick up on that point, if I could. Let us examine that point for a second.

In terms of distribution of wealth in America, you have the richest 1 percent now owning 42 percent of the wealth, which is more than the bottom 90 percent. One of the problems that all of us have is in dealing with the media. In terms of getting information out to people, one of the reasons that half the people in America no longer bother to vote is they are not getting information that is relevant to their lives. Who owns the media? When we talk about NAFTA, I remember this very clearly, it was quite unbelievable, poll after poll showed that the country was pretty evenly divided. Some were for NAFTA; some were anti-NAFTA.

We went through every single major newspaper in the United States of America, every single one of them. Were they evenly divided? Were they two-to-one pro-NAFTA? Every single one of them was pro-NAFTA, as was virtually every corporation in America. So you see who owns the media, we are seeing in terms of contributions to both political parties. Not an accident that you have this trade policy. This is a trade policy that works well for corporate America. It hurts the working people.

Where does the money come from to fund the parties? It comes from the wealthy people. And we see the results of that in terms of our trade policy. In almost every aspect of our lives we are seeing a greater and greater concentration of wealth and power. And in many ways I must say this country is beginning to look more like an oligarchy than it is like a democracy.

Mr. OWENS. Every new NAFTA, every new GATT adds to that corporate power. It allows them to make higher and higher profits, 59 percent since 1993. That is light stuff compared to what is going on now, I am sure, in terms of the stock market still booming. They get more and more wealth to use to oppress the people who are, the overwhelming majority in America who do not have a voice. Like the gentleman said, they own the media. They snuff out open society. They snuff out the checks and balances. And they are going to snuff out the consumer, the

consumer market that is the driving engine for capitalism. As Soros puts it, they are going to destroy themselves if there is no check and balance on them.

Mr. BONIOR. When you have people like Soros and the Goldsmith fellow from Europe, these are very wealthy and prosperous and well-known capitalists in the world starting to speak out like maybe we are going too far here, when you have that kind of voice starting to be heard, then you know something is really out of whack.

When the people at the very top start to say, wait a minute, maybe we are piling up too much greed here by getting 294 percent profit increases since 1993.

I want to make one other quick point here and that is with respect to labor unions. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

When labor unions were at their peak in this country, when 35 percent of the American people in the work force belonged to a labor union, they would produce 90 percent. I will give you the figure. Late 1950's, they were producing 90 percent in productivity. They were getting about 99 percent back in wages.

In about 1974, they were getting about half of what they were getting in wages in what they were producing. And then in the 1980's, it was about a third of what they were getting back in terms of wages from what they were producing in productivity. So as labor's numbers started to decline in terms of representing people in this country, from 35 percent in the 1950's down to the present, I think 14, 15 percent, their take, workers' take in terms of what they took home was less and less of what they produced in terms of proportion.

And that is one of the tragedies of this equation that has now allowed the corporate folks in America to move with impunity down to places like Mexico and exploit workers down there at 70 cents an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH].

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, when you think about the history of the growth, the economic growth in this country, which permitted the rise of the middle class, which permitted people to go from \$10 to \$15 to even \$20 an hour, it is really somewhat of a miracle that America sustained this. And then comes trade agreements like NAFTA and people start to see those jobs slip away.

And the question arises, why would someone pay \$20 an hour, let us say, as opposed to 91 cents an hour, as some workers in Mexico, are making for basically doing the same work that someone who had a job that paid \$20 an hour did prior to that job leaving?

The reason why you pay that amount is, in order to maintain a democracy, you have to make sure people have a lot of choices, and they have to have a good income. And that income gives them the ability to be free economically. Because let us face it, if you do

not have economic freedom, your political freedom is compromised.

Mr. OWENS. And consumer spending is still two-thirds of our economy. We are going to wipe out consumer spending.

Mr. BONIOR. There was a piece written by Stanley Sheinbaum, a friend of mine who lives in California, in his quarterly that publishes entitled, who is going to buy the goods. He kind of lays it all out. If we keep driving wages down, downward pressure on wages, at some point in this process, we are not going to have and our families are not going to have the wherewithal to make the purchases that make the engine of this country run.

Mr. KUCINICH. In 1997 in January, the Economic Development Corporation of Tijuana was advertising that they would pay wages and benefits together of 91 cents an hour in maquiladora areas. Those are the kinds of jobs that are moving to Mexico from areas like Ohio, manufacturing jobs.

The problem is, though, if you are making 91 cents an hour, you are not buying a new home that costs \$60,000, \$70,000. You are not buying a new car that costs \$18,000 to \$20,000. You are not purchasing an education for your child if you are making 91 cents an hour.

The wage level promotes economic activity in this country that sustains the type of society we have. If we were to turn that around and say, what happens if you make 50 cents in some cases or 91 cents an hour, you cannot aspire to those kinds of things which we in this country have come to expect as what we call the American way of life.

And the great thing about this country is that we think we can reach even higher. Once we reach a certain niche, we are going to reach a little bit higher. We get there, we reach a little higher. Now we are finding we cannot do that because the jobs are starting to go away and out of this country.

My colleagues raised the issue earlier, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], all raised the issue of the attack that is going on on working people due to NAFTA, how people are being threatened, look, if you start organizing, we are going to move your jobs, your jobs are gone. I got a hold of a Cornell University report which I am sure you are familiar with.

Mr. BONIOR. That is the one I referred to, the Labor Department, Cornell did for the Labor Department. They suppressed it by the way. The Labor Department would not let it out, and it finally came out.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has seen it because this is close to his district. And as I read it, I was shocked when I saw the kinds of tactics that were used. Would it please the gentleman, could I read this into the RECORD. This is a very interesting report from Cornell. Here is the kind of things that they found out:

In our follow up interviews with organizers in campaigns where plant closing threats occurred, we learned that specific unambiguous threats ranged from attaching shipping labels to equipment throughout the plant with a Mexican address, to posting maps of North America with an arrow pointing from the current plant site to Mexico, to a letter stating the company will have to shut down if the union wins the election.

This is just part of the kinds of things that were put. They gave the example of the ITT automotive plant in Michigan where the company parked 13 flatbed tractor trailers loaded with shrink-wrapped production equipment in front of the plant for the duration of an organizing campaign that had a hot pink sign on it which read, Mexico transfer job.

Now, think about that. That is just one example. How can people then try to aspire to a higher wage? How can people hope for better benefits? How can they get their health benefits improved? How can they hope that they will have more time to spend with their families? They cannot, because they are held captive by this.

That is one of the reasons why I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, having an opportunity to participate in this debate with these gentlemen and in this discussion of the importance of this issue to the American people, because it has real effects. I started off this discussion, I have a list of dozens of cities that are losing the life blood of the community because of this trade agreement.

Mr. SANDERS. I think, picking up on the point of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH], that the truth of the matter is the average American worker is scared to death.

Mr. BONIOR. Very scared.

Mr. SANDERS. People are scared to death precisely because of what the gentleman is saying. Because if they stand up for their rights, their company is going to say, we do not need you anymore. We are going to Mexico; we are going to China.

Ultimately I think, after all of this discussion, after all of what is said and done, it seems to me our challenge is a very simple one. It is to tell corporate America that they no longer have the right to run all over the world and throw American workers out on the street and then be able to bring their products back into this country duty free. You do not have to be a genius to know that you would make a lot more money paying a Mexican kid or a Chinese young lady 20 or 30 cents an hour than paying an American worker a living wage. And the problem is, we have allowed them to do that. We have allowed them to run all over the world. And the end result is what the chart of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] tells us, corporate profits are soaring.

The end result is what Business Week told us two weeks ago, that the top

CEO's in this country saw an increase in their compensation last year of 54 percent, and they now earn 209 times what the average American worker earns. I had not realized that one person is worth 209 times more than another person, that their children are worth 209 times more than the children of a worker. It is obscene. It is wrong.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, it is possible that many Americans for years and years have understood and even accepted those kinds of disparities as long as they had jobs. We all expect that the bosses and the people that head the corporations are going to make more money. What is happening now, though, is that the salaries are going up for the officers, and I am all for people making good salary, but the workers are losing their jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. They are losing jobs and finding other jobs that pay considerably less.

What happens when that occurs? That starts a cycle. Well, you work overtime or you work two jobs or you work three jobs, and that cycle produces a situation where you are not home at night to see your son or your daughter's soccer game. You are not there for the PTA meeting. All those other social maladies that we all talk about and we all wrestle with and struggle with around here occur. And it is a vicious cycle. It starts with wages often.

Mr. KUCINICH. It goes to family values and democratic values which underpin our ability to celebrate family values.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] was implying before that the challenge to us is to stop them from making products in other countries with the cheapest possible labor and then bringing them back here to sell them duty free. That option is gone already. NAFTA is like the international law. GATT is international law. You cannot stop them anymore from bringing those products back. We will be violating the treaties that we have already agreed to.

□ 2030

Mr. SANDERS. That is why we have to repeal those pieces of legislation.

Mr. OWENS. That is the task before us, to repeal those pieces of legislation; also to do everything possible to get laws in place which will not allow them to keep beating down the work force, to wipe out organized labor.

There are a lot of things we can do right now to stop this. Our own tax laws allow the CEO's of American corporations to earn these obscene salaries. By the way, they earn the highest salaries in the world.

Mr. SANDERS. By far.

Mr. OWENS. The Japanese CEO's, the German CEO's, and other CEO's around the world are not earning those kinds of salaries.

Mr. BONIOR. Not even close.

Mr. OWENS. And if we had some tax laws with the people who are making

the profits, instead of the present situation where individuals and families are paying 44 percent of the income tax in this country while corporations are paying a little more than 11 percent, there are a lot of things we could do to help to begin to bring some sense back into American capitalism.

It was capitalism that worked before. It worked. Henry Ford recognized it when he said, "I really need these people to make more money to buy my cars."

Mr. BONIOR. So he paid them 5 bucks an hour.

Mr. OWENS. That was the basic principle that ought to be the bedrock of American capitalism, and they are throwing it away because we are not producing workers that can buy the products any more.

Mr. KUCINICH. I remember a time when a label that said "made in America" was something you could not help but see no matter where you went, and now it is difficult when you shop for goods and check for a label to find things that are made in this country. Again, if they are made in America, somebody has made them, they had a job, and they were supporting a family.

And I want to stay on that because, to me, the essence of supporting the Democratic tradition in America is to make sure that people have jobs.

I take issue with our friends over at the Fed. In a Democratic society, I do not think there is any such thing as a certain amount of unemployment necessary to the functioning of the economy. The fact of the matter is that in a Democratic society, if we want to maintain that democracy, we have to make sure people have a chance to participate through their jobs and with a decent wage level.

That is what NAFTA has affected. There is a myth. People talk about the benefits of NAFTA. We have heard people say that exports to Mexico have increased. That is true, but what they do not tell us is that the imports have increased at a higher rate so, therefore, the trade deficit grows and the job loss continues.

We will hear people say that the Mexican workers have a better life. Well, that is not necessarily true. Because what has happened, and this will surprise many people, people think that it is the Mexican workers that are benefiting. Not necessarily true. In 1994, before the peso collapsed, real hourly wages were 30 percent lower than in 1980, in Mexico. After the peso fell, the wages fell another 25 percent.

I know that the gentleman from Michigan has tracked this. Listen to this. The earnings in the maquiladora sector are only 60 percent of the former manufacturing sector. So the Mexican workers are being attacked as well.

Mr. BONIOR. I was down in Mexico, in Tijuana, on the border, in the maquiladora area about 6 weeks ago, and I had the chance to talk with workers, visit their villages and their colonia. They work at very modern fa-

cilities. The Hyundai Company from Korea and Samsung from Korea and Panasonic. These are new plants, efficient.

These workers are good workers, they work hard, but they get paid \$5 a day. 5 bucks a day. And they live in just very terrible conditions. Their housing is not good. They live, as I said earlier, in situations where the water that they bathe in and drink is contaminated. The American Medical Association called it a cesspool of infectious disease.

These corporations do nothing about establishing any type of a tax base to improve the environment, to improve wages or health conditions. I talked to one leader of a colonia, that is a village, where most of the people worked at this factory, and he told me that a lot of his friends and relatives in this village were losing fingers and hands because the line was going so fast. Enough to alarm people. It was not just one or two.

So since there was no real union representation, they decided to shut the place down for a couple of hours one day to protest. Of course, he was fired as the leader. He eventually ended up in jail when he tried to form an independent union.

That is what these people are up against. They cannot buck an indifferent government and a corporate mentality that just does not want to deal with this at all. That is the hedge. That is the wedge, I should say, which our workers are competing against. It is this drive to the lowest standard, as the gentleman from Vermont has said. What we need to do is raise their standard up to our level.

Mr. KUCINICH. And that is something that certainly fast track must be challenged to do, but it does not do that. It does not provide for the kinds of worker and environmental protections which we need to see established so that we do not find our standards under attack.

Mr. BONIOR. These trade agreements have all kinds of wonderful protection for property. Intellectual properties, CD's, all this type of stuff. We have an agreement with Mexico where we can go to jail if we do that, if we pirate the stuff. When it comes to properties, there are sanctions and they are tough. But when it comes to people and the environment, there is nothing on the books to protect them.

Mr. KUCINICH. The importance of us taking a stand on this cannot be repeated enough, because I remember when I was first starting my career, back in the city of Cleveland, and as all politicians do, I went through a crowd and shook hands, and I remember some of the older men in particular who worked in the assembly lines. I would shake hands, but occasionally someone would come up and they would be missing fingers or part of their hand was gone or part of an arm was gone, or maybe they lost sight of an eye because a piece of steel went into it or something at work.

We realized in this country over a period of decades that it was important to maintain certain safe working conditions and America helped set world standards for that. We were the ones, because of the standards we set, which gave workers everywhere a chance to be better protected on the job and, therefore, also help industry become more efficient because they were not losing the services of workers who were performing needed work and did not want to interrupt it through injury. So through a whole series of laws, occupational safety acts and through acts that dealt with safety in the workplace and environmental laws, we were able to guarantee that workers would have a little bit of protection on the job.

Now, what happens if we do not keep that standard up there, that standard starts to slip? Then we are back to the days where people are not safe in the workplace.

Mr. SANDERS. If I can interrupt for a moment, it is not a question of is it happening. It is happening. Let us not be naive about this. What is going on now is the standard of living of the average American worker is in serious decline. The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider. The control of the political parties is growing sharper by the very wealthy.

Ultimately, I think as a nation, we have to ask ourselves how much is enough? When does it end? How much do they want: 209 times more than the workers, 500 times more than their workers? Will we hear a movement here to bring back slavery? When does it end?

We have people in this country, in my State, that are not working one job, they are working two jobs and three jobs, as the gentleman from Michigan said. I have met a husband and wife who hardly ever see each other. They are both working three part-time jobs. When does it end?

This is a wealthy country. This is a great country. But we need policy so that we redevelop our manufacturing sector; we create decent paying jobs in this country. With all of the new technology, the working hours should go down, should they not? With all these new machines, people should be producing more.

Mr. BONIOR. And working less.

Mr. SANDERS. And working less. Yet what is happening? Just the opposite is happening. And what is the end result? The end result is corporate profits soar, CEO salaries soar, and distribution of wealth becomes more and more unfair.

Mr. OWENS. We had a capitalism that worked for both the owners and the managers and the corporations and the workers. We had a capitalism that worked. Common sense will tell us that the present measures that are being undertaken, the abuses by the corporate powers, are going to destroy that capitalism.

I think one appeal we can make to the American people and the American

voters is to say enough is enough. We will put some chains on the abilities of corporations to dictate how our economy is run.

We need to begin right away to make the necessary laws, to stop the tremendous abuse of power that is taking place. We need to exercise common sense and say we will not take conditions like the present post office is about to negotiate for a single source for the postal uniforms. We should say to the post office, "No, we demand those uniforms be made in this country. Do not go all over the world for these things." The policeman, the post office man, whatever uniforms are being made, we should demand that they be made in this country.

There are a lot of other common sense arrangements that we should start demanding now before we move to try to repeal NAFTA and GATT and some of these other laws. We must wake up because the hour is quite late.

Mr. BONIOR. The tragedy about all these trade issues, to me, is that we are moving backwards to the 19th century. We are establishing wages and working standards and human rights standards that are over 100 years old and that our mothers and our fathers and our ancestors and grandparents fought very hard to change.

People struggled hard to get a livable wage in this country, to get the right to organize, the right to strike, the right to collective bargaining, to establish a lot of the things in the environment that were important to us. And we are just kind of giving it all away because we are moving to this lower standard. We are moving to a lower standard.

This is the most important fight I have been involved with since I have been in elected political life, and it is up to us, I think, to try to demonstrate and to show our colleagues and the country that we are in a very, very serious slide unless we develop some moral force and a countervailing force to this runaway greed.

The capitalist system is what we have, and it works well when it works together with workers and the community. But when workers and the community are not part of the equation, what we see is what we find in our society today, and I do not think many people like it.

So I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening. I guess our time is just about up, and I appreciate their efforts. If they have a last word or two, I would be delighted to entertain it.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman for organizing this special order. We are fighting for our lives, we are fighting for our parents, we are fighting for our kids, and I would hope the American people would get actively involved in this struggle.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, after 3 years, we need to ask the question: Has NAFTA been fair to the American people? Would its expansion be fair to workers and the environment? Would it be fair to American

consumers? Based on the past 3 years, we'd have to say, "no."

The basic premise of free trade—that the manufacturer who makes the best product at the cheapest price wins—does not constitute fair trade unless consumers know what they are buying. Otherwise, that cheap price may mask dreadful working conditions, inadequate pay, exploitation of children or environmental practices that, were they known, would cause American consumers to make other purchase decisions: To avoid Mexican tomatoes sprayed with pesticides banned in the United States; to refuse to purchase vegetables picked by children who work in the fields instead of going to school; to reject tuna harvested by slaughtering thousands of dolphins.

Most of us remember the TV commercials "Look for the union label." Americans took that message to heart, and many shop specifically for products labeled "Made in USA." Even in those cases where consumers purchase imported goods, however, they have a right—and some would argue an obligation—to know the conditions under which merchandise has been manufactured, and to avoid purchasing products manufactured under conditions considered abhorrent in this country.

NAFTA is premised on the notion that consumers, not governments, should make decisions about what to purchase. But consumers cannot make those choices unless they are provided full information about the products offered to them. And make no mistake: When we purchase products manufactured under shocking conditions, we are encouraging those conditions to persist with our dollars.

It seems like a simple premise: American consumers have a right to know what they're buying.

Who can argue with it? The United States is the most sought-after market in the world. Americans purchase more food, more clothing, more cars, and more toys than anyone else in the world. It would follow that we'd like to choose our purchases wisely. What manufacturer or retailer wouldn't support the consumers' "right to know"?

The sad truth is, many manufacturers do not support that right, and neither do some high in our own government who should know better.

Two weeks ago, while the parents of Michigan schoolchildren were still reeling from an outbreak of hepatitis traced to Mexican strawberries, Members of Congress from California and Florida introduced legislation to require that the country of origin be clearly labeled for all fresh fruits and vegetables sold in the United States.

Who could disagree? Consumers should know whether their strawberries came from Mexico or California, or whether their tomatoes were grown in Florida or Chile. But amazingly, it's not at all that simple—because importers and many retailers—and some in our own government—don't want the American people to know where their purchases come from, and they certainly don't want you to know how they were grown or made. Because they know—and the polls indicate—that, given accurate information about the effects of a product on the environment, children, women, or worker rights, most consumers will purchase responsibly.

Does all this sound melodramatic? Let's look at the facts.

Right now, retailers and importers—led by the American Frozen Food Institute—are vehemently opposing requirements to label frozen foods with the country of origin on the front of the package, where consumers can see it clearly at the time of purchase. In fact, Canada has already filed a protest against such labeling. Why? Because other countries believe clear, easy-to-read, conspicuous labels are a “nontariff trade barrier.” In other words, American consumers may choose not to purchase an imported item.

Nontariff trade barriers are trade-speak for anything that might help American consumers to choose American-made or American-grown goods over foreign products. And under the rules of free trade, nontariff trade barriers are illegal. In fact, under the rules of free trade as imposed by NAFTA, anything that restricts trade in any way is illegal—and that includes information labels on where and how your purchase was made, harvested, or grown.

If Mexico has its way, and we expand NAFTA to other Latin American nations, American consumers will be unable to determine where the next load of hepatitis-infected strawberries came from, and they'll no longer be able to assure their children that their tuna fish sandwich wasn't caught at Flipper's expense.

Within the next few weeks, Congress will be voting on a bill that will change the meaning of the famous Dolphin-Safe label found on every can of tuna in this country for the past 7 years. Dolphins will be chased with helicopters and high-speed boats, caught in nets, seriously injured, mothers separated from their calves—and as long as no dolphins are observed to die, that tuna will be labeled “safe” for dolphins.

Why?

Because Mexico insists on it. Mexico is well aware that American consumers will not choose to purchase tuna caught by harming dolphins; therefore, to gain a large share of the U.S. tuna market, they are lobbying to dupe American consumers into purchasing tuna labeled with a redefined “Dolphin Safe” label.

The Administration, supporting this change, offers a thin defense for their capitulation to Mexico: the Administration asserts that no studies have been conducted to indicate that the capture method was not safe for dolphins. Applying this view to other products would result in the application of a “Child Safe” label to toys provided that no studies have been conducted to prove them harmful to children. This is a sweeping and damaging precedent for other U.S. labeling laws designed to protect and inform American consumers.

This is where NAFTA has brought us.

Now, I do not pretend that these problems exist only in other nations. Just last week, I joined with human rights and labor groups to release a report documenting the systematic exploitation of foreign workers—mostly young women—in the sweatshops and other manufacturing industries located in our own territory of the Northern Mariana Islands. My legislation would compel that territory to meet Federal standards for minimum wage and immigration, and would deny manufacturers there the right to continue to use the “Made in USA” label on their products unless they were manufactured in full compliance with our own labor laws.

I conducted that investigation and introduced that bill for the same reasons that motivate me on NAFTA and international trade:

American consumers should not inadvertently promote and support, with their dollars, the exploitation of workers, or the rape of the environment, or other practices that we will not tolerate in this country and should not subsidize in the name of “free trade.” The trade may be free, but the workers sure aren't.

Let's face the fact that there are nations and there are businesses that rely on the exploitation of children, women, or the environment to attract investment in their country. And let's face the fact that these nations rely on the rules and rhetoric of the free trade game to pull all of us down to the lowest common denominator. The American people should be outraged.

#### UNION JOBS LOST DUE TO CUTS IN DEFENSE SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to focus on several major concerns of mine. But let me say at the outset before beginning my discussions that I am of the other party from the gentlemen who just appeared in the well and spoke against NAFTA, but I as a Republican opposed NAFTA, voted against NAFTA, and even more than that, appealed the ruling of the Chair on the bailout of Mexico which the President and the Speaker and the majority leader all had agreed should not come to a floor vote in this House and which we were not given privy to vote on.

I think the loss of jobs in this country because of the North American Free Trade Agreement is very pronounced. It has certainly hurt the northeastern Midwestern area, the rust belt area, and it is something that continues.

I would grant that the white collar industries have benefited from NAFTA, but by and large our manufacturing industry has, in fact, lost.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me kind of move into the topic that I want to focus on tonight, because from the broadest possible context it, too, deals with the jobs issue, and for those Members who may be in their offices listening to the discussion of NAFTA, perhaps there is another segment of the job loss that was not even discussed over the past hour. That relates to the 1 million union men and women who lost their jobs over the past 5 years, Mr. Speaker, as this President cut defense spending to a level that we have not seen since before World War II.

Now, we do not hear any talk coming out of the AFL-CIO leadership on this issue, and we do not hear much talk coming out of the mainstream side of the opposition on this issue, because they have largely not been supportive of stabilizing our defense industrial base. But let us talk about that impact, Mr. Speaker, as I start off my 1-hour session this evening.

Over the past 5 years, under this administration, over 1 million American workers have lost their jobs, workers

who worked for large defense companies, small machine shops, subcontractors, and because of the cuts that this Congress and this administration have imposed, largely through an administration totally unsupportive of adequate defense spending, 1 million union workers have become unemployed.

□ 2045

These are not the fat cat CEO's that we heard about being discussed during the previous hour. These are UAW workers, these are IUE workers, these are machinists workers, these are the building trades workers who do in fact the bulk of our construction work at our military sites around the country that are required under Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws to be given a priority in terms of the jobs that are provided through our military construction budget.

We have not heard the AFL-CIO issue a peep about the loss of these 1 million jobs nationwide. Yet these workers too, Mr. Speaker, were paying their union dues, these workers too were out there concerned about their families and being able to feed their kids, but nothing came out of the AFL-CIO or this administration to protect those workers and the loss of their jobs.

I will grant, Mr. Speaker, that it is a different world today. I would argue that one could make the case that it is actually more destabilized today than it was when we in fact had Communist domination of the former Soviet Union. Then there are those, Mr. Speaker, who would say we are spending so much more on the military today that it is outlandish, that it is outrageous.

Let me take a moment, Mr. Speaker and talk about defense spending, because I think we have to put things into perspective. For those of our constituents who are thinking that we are spending so much more money on the military today, let me do a very simple and basic comparison. There are two basic ways that a country can compare its level of defense spending or its level of Federal spending in any particular given area. The first is what percentage of our gross national product as a nation is being used to fund our military.

Let us take a period of time when we were at relative peace. The 1960's, when John Kennedy was President, we were at peace. It was after the Korean war and yet it was before the Vietnam war. We were not involved in a major international conflict. During those Kennedy years, Mr. Speaker, we were spending 9 percent of our gross national product on the defense budget. In fact, 52 cents of every Federal dollar coming into Washington went back to pay for the military, 52 cents of every Federal dollar. That was during John Kennedy's era.

What about today? In today's budget, Mr. Speaker, we are spending less than 3 percent of our gross national product on the military, and we are spending 16 cents of the Federal tax dollar coming

into Washington on the military. Anyone who would compare numbers I think would admit that is a substantial decrease in the total amount of Federal revenues that we are spending on the military. As we have drawn down that significant, we have in fact drawn down a significant number of jobs. But there are those who say, well, out of that 16 cents that we are spending of the Federal tax dollar on the military, it is providing so much money for these big corporations.

Let us look at that issue, also, Mr. Speaker, because back when John Kennedy was the President, we did not have an all-volunteer military. Kids were drafted out of high school, 17, 18, 19 years of age. They were drafted and they served for far less than the minimum wage. In fact, it was 10, 15 cents an hour. They were required to serve their country for a period of 2 years. Today, Mr. Speaker, we no longer pay people peanuts to serve in the military. We have an All-Volunteer Force. Our kids in the service today, Mr. Speaker, in fact our men and women, are very well educated, many of them have college degrees, they have technical training. In fact most of them have families. They have spouses, they have children.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to support the new military we have today, a much larger percentage of that 16 cents goes to pay for education, health care costs, housing costs, benefits and all of those quality of life issues that are important for our new military. So even though we are only spending 16 cents of the Federal tax dollar on the military today as opposed to 52 cents when John KENNEDY was President, a much larger portion of that 16 cents goes for the quality of life for the men and women who serve in the military.

So when we talk about the defense budget, Mr. Speaker, we need to put things into perspective. When someone says there have been massive increases in defense spending, go tell that to the unemployed UAW worker who lost his or her job 2 years ago. Go tell that to the machinist who lost his or her job 3 years ago, or go tell it to the union member from the IUE who was displaced because his company was consolidated with another major defense company, or tell it to one of the building trades members who had their basic industry sold down the river because we have cut back so far in terms of military construction projects. The cutbacks in defense spending have been real, they have been substantive and they have caused a significant amount of turmoil in the lives of American people, not just a few hundred, not just a few thousand, but over 1 million men and women out of work. That does not include the cutbacks in the Pentagon itself. What I am talking about are the union workers across this country who have negatively been impacted by the cutbacks in defense spending.

What can we do about this, Mr. Speaker? The President is driving all of this debate from the bully pulpit at the

White House, and I want to end my comments later on this evening talking about how the President is using the bully pulpit to convey the wrong message to America and to our people. But let me talk about some options that we in the Congress are in fact pursuing. The President has some options in terms of defense spending, and I would support any one of these options.

First of all, he could raise the top line in terms of the amount of money that we spend on the military, and I would vote for that and I would support it. I do not want a massive increase, but I do want a stable funding level, because the reason we have a strong military is not just to respond in wars but to deter aggression. There has never been a nation that has been attacked or taken down because it was too strong, and so a stable funding base for the military is the key number one priority that we should work for.

I would support the President if he asked me to vote for additional money for the military, as this Congress provided in each of the last 2 years. But the President has not yet said he would do that. There is a second alternative, Mr. Speaker, for the President. He could decrease the amount of money coming out of the Defense Department's budget for environmental mitigation. Most people do not realize this, Mr. Speaker, but as we have cut defense spending to 16 cents of the Federal tax dollar collected in Washington, we are currently spending \$12 billion of that money not for guns and missiles, not for the salaries of our troops and not for the CEOs of the defense companies; we are spending \$12 billion of that DOD money for what is called environmental remediation. In fact, much of that money is going to lawyers who are suing each other over how clean we are going to leave a former military site.

What is especially troubling to me, Mr. Speaker, as someone who takes great pride in my pro-environmental voting record is that we have gone too far in this area. What was at one point in time a military base where the children of military personnel lived and played on the playgrounds and went to the schools on that base, as soon as that base has been closed through the base closing process, then we are told that that facility is unacceptable, that it is a danger, it is a toxic site. It was okay when the kids of those military personnel were there, but now all of a sudden it is being closed, we have to take extreme measures because that complex is no longer safe for human beings to be around.

We do have to clean up sites, Mr. Speaker. Everyone acknowledges that. But \$12 billion out of the DOD budget this year is too much of a price to pay when we have other needs that are currently not being met.

So I have said to this President publicly that I will support him if he will work to help us reduce the amount of environmental spending coming out of

the DOD bill. That would provide some support for these workers that we have heard about tonight who have been displaced from their jobs.

There is a third alternative, also, Mr. Speaker, that I would support, and that is the need for this President to do more than just commit our troops around the world in terms of peace-keeping operations or stabilization operations. There was a huge debate on the floor of this House about whether or not we should commit to the President's decision to put our troops into Bosnia. The debate was not about whether or not we support America's need as the world leader to go into Bosnia with our allies. That was not the concern of most of our colleagues. The debate, Mr. Speaker, was why should the United States put 36,000 troops in the theater of operation of Bosnia when the Germans right next door are only committing 4,000 troops or perhaps the Japanese, who cannot provide troops, are not putting enough in the way of dollars in to support that operation?

The problem in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration has an internationalist foreign policy with an isolationist defense budget. There have been more deployments by this President in the last 5 years than in the previous 50 years, more deployments in the last 5 years than in the previous 50 years. Every time this President deploys our troops to Haiti, to Bosnia, to Somalia, to Macedonia, the taxpayers foot the bill. Where does that money come from? Since the President did not plan for any of those deployments, he goes into the defense budget and he robs the accounts to pay for the weapons systems that then cause these union workers to lose their jobs.

That is unfair, Mr. Speaker, and so the third alternative for this President is to say that he will work with us so that when he commits to deploy our troops that he is willing to go out and get the support of our allies to help pay for that deployment. That is what President Bush did in Desert Storm. In fact, in Desert Storm the total cost of that operation was around \$52 billion. The amount of money that we collected from our allies to help pay for that was around \$54 billion. It was entirely funded by those people who benefited from our presence. That is not the case in Bosnia, and that is not the case in Haiti.

In fact, we are going to be asked to vote in a few short days on a supplemental appropriations bill to provide more money for Bosnia. It is not again a question of paying our fair share, it is a question of why should the U.S. pay the brunt of this cost alone, especially when it has not been programmed in the defense budget and is simply robbing other programs that are important to the security of our kids as they serve around the world on the deployments made by this President.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we need to send a signal that while America will be a vital partner in helping to stabilize these regional conflicts, America cannot and should not go it alone in terms of funding these operations. We should not be the only entity in the world that picks up the tab.

In fact, we found out in Haiti that we not only were paying for our troops, we were paying for the housing and food costs of other troops, in one case about 1,000 troops from Bangladesh. We found out in Bosnia that we were paying the housing and food costs of troops coming from other European and Scandinavian countries.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what is in the best interests of our country, and that is not helping us maintain our defense industrial base and also these jobs that my colleagues talked about over the past hour that have been lost not just because of a free trade agreement like NAFTA, which I opposed, but also because of the unprecedented cuts in defense spending.

There are some things this Congress is doing separate from this administration that I think we can be proud of, and I want to talk about those for a moment. We are looking at every possible opportunity to see where we can take the money that we are spending on the Defense Department and use that to help us solve other problems. In fact, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have 2,000 of the Nation's emergency responders come to Washington. Many of them are already here this evening in their hotel rooms, perhaps watching our program this evening. They are coming to Washington because tomorrow evening we will have the Ninth Annual Congressional Fire and Emergency Services Caucus dinner.

This dinner, Mr. Speaker, brings leaders from every State, from every large city and small community of those people who day in and day out respond to our disasters, not just fires. These are the men and women who respond to the Murrah office building in Oklahoma City, to the World Trade Center that was bombed, to the recent floods in North Dakota and the Midwest floods that occurred, to the Long Island wildlands fires, the California forest fires, the hurricanes in Florida and the Carolinas and the earthquakes in California. These are the men and women who day in and day out respond to every disaster this country has. They represent 1.2 million men and women in 32,000 organized departments across this Nation, in every county and every city. They are here tomorrow so that we can celebrate who they are and what they do.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, you will be our keynote speaker tomorrow evening and you will follow the speakers we have had in the past. Last year we had Vice President AL GORE and we had Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole. The year before that we had President Clinton, and the year before that we had President Clinton. In previous years to President

Clinton, we had President Bush, we had Vice President Quayle, we had Ron Howard and the entire cast of "Backdraft" the year that it was unveiled. It is our way of showing our thanks to these men and women who respond to our disasters day in and day out in this country.

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of these people are volunteers. They are not paid for what they do. It is kind of interesting, we just had the volunteerism summit in Philadelphia and up until I raised a lot of stink with the administration the volunteers were not even invited to participate in that event. They are the only group of volunteers that I know of each year in America that lose 80 to 100 of their people, who lose their lives in the course of performing their volunteer activities, because that is how many fire and emergency services personnel are killed each year. On average between 100 and 120 and on average between 80 and 100 of them are volunteer fire and EMS personnel. They will all be here tomorrow as we talk about how we can assist them.

What does that have to do with the defense bill? Our military is our international defender. It is the group of people who protect us overseas. The fire and EMS people are our domestic defender. But there are many lessons that could be learned one to the other. So as a major part of our day tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we are going to focus on that interaction, an interaction that began years ago that we continue today.

□ 2100

In fact, in the morning we will have a 1½ hour session where I have the leading research and development people from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marines and the Department of Defense and DARPA coming in, showcasing new technology that we are developing for terrorist incidents that can be made available for fire and EMS people in every city in the country. We are going to be showcasing resources. We are going to be showcasing training so that these men and women who are first responders in this country to every disaster will have the best possible tools and resources as they approach these situations on a day-to-day basis.

As 12:45, Mr. Speaker, here in the Capitol, actually outside the Rayburn Office Building, we will showcase the new Marine Corps capability to deal with chemical and biological incidents. We will simulate a gas attack on one of the office buildings, and our Marine Corps special response team that was initiated in Congress last year will be deployed from Camp LeJeune, and they will come up and they will showcase the way they would handle an incident of this type in any city in America.

Now that is a beginning of a process of bringing together our military with those domestic responders who have to meet these needs on a daily basis in

our cities and our towns. So what are we doing with the military? As we face the threat of terrorism in our cities and our towns, we are beginning to bring together the local emergency response personnel with the professionals and the Defense Department so that they can learn from one another, so that they have access to the resources that will allow them to respond to these situations wherever and whenever they might occur.

In fact, we will also be announcing, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a new series of legislative initiatives to assist the fire service. We will announce the fact that the Federal Communication Commission has decided to set aside the megahertz that are necessary to protect the communications capability of our emergency responders to the 21st century. We will be announcing a plan to allow the use of community development block grant monies, up to 25 percent to be used by local counties and cities to assist in fire and emergency planning and response. We will be announcing an effort to establish a national low-interest loan program not to give money away, but to provide low-cost financing assistance so that local fire and EMS personnel can have the money available to them at a discounted rate to buy the equipment and the materials that we are going to showcase that are being developed through our military today.

We are also going to announce efforts to establish an expedited process for excess Federal property so that local fire and EMS personnel across the country can get access to that surplus Defense Department material when it first becomes available. We are also going to be announcing the establishment of an effort to have in place a national urban search and rescue training center and a national chemical biological training center. And finally, Mr. Speaker, we will be announcing plans to complete a study as to what it would take to connect to the Internet all of our emergency response institutions in America, all 32,000 of them.

The point here is, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, we are cutting back on the Defense Department's budget, but we are looking at every possible opportunity to showcase defense technology to be used and applied in our inner cities, to be used and applied in our small communities so that where we have training and where we have preparation taking place that can benefit and help us and we have disasters, that is in fact taking place on a regular ongoing basis. That is saving the taxpayers money, and it is making the best possible usage of our Defense Department investment.

There is another area, Mr. Speaker, that we are also working on that is giving us a great return as we look to find ways to improve the investment in our Defense Department. In fact, last year in a series of hearings that I chaired as a chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee, I found out

that we had nine separate Federal agencies that were responsible for studying the oceans through oceanographic efforts, nine separate Federal agencies. I learned through our hearings, Mr. Speaker, one hearing in Washington, one up in Rhode Island and one out in California, that these agencies were not coordinating their effort, that each of them was doing oceanographic work, but none of them were sharing information and technology in a real-time way.

I also learned, Mr. Speaker, that the largest funding for oceanographic work is done by the Navy. The Navy does this because it is important for our Navy to understand the mapping of the ocean floor. It is important for our Navy to understand sonar for transmitting data and information through the oceans. It is important for our Navy to understand literal waters. And so in convening these hearings we found out the Navy, in fact, through the Office of the Oceanographer, is leading the country in terms of research in the oceans. Yet we found out that we are missing a golden opportunity, because while the Navy was leading that effort dollar-wise, much of that data that is not sensitive was not being transmitted to NOAA or to NASA or to the Fish and Wildlife Service or to other Federal agencies that have similar responsibilities in understanding the ocean ecosystem and understanding why fishing stocks are declining around the world and understanding why coral reefs are being hampered and hurt or understand why we are having extensive pollution of the waters of the world.

So with that in mind, last year Congressman PATRICK KENNEDY and I introduced the Oceans Partnership Act that for the first time would bring together all nine Federal agencies working with the Department of Defense and the Navy. Senator LOTT worked the bill on the Senate side, and the bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, that bill is now law. The President signed that into law when he signed into law the Defense Authorization Act, and this year we now have a new oceans partnership arrangement. All nine Federal agencies are together under a steering committee chaired by the Secretary of the Navy so that now in this country, through our Federal Government, not only is the military doing what it needs to do to understand the oceans, but wherever and whenever possible they are sharing that technology and data with the environmental movement and with our environmental agencies so that we maximize the return on the taxpayers' dollars.

The bottom line is we get more benefit for that. The taxpayers get more out of their dollar. It is not just for the military, for the hard cold facts of what it needs to understand to go to war or to prepare for war, but it also provides us with the resources to better understand and deal with the environment.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, in this city on May 19 and 20 and 21 I am

pleased to announce that we will be hosting the world's largest ever conference on the oceans entitled "Oceans and Security." This 3-day conference is being co-hosted by ACOPS, the Advisory Council on Protecting the Seas of which I am the U.S. vice president, COERI which is the Council of Oceanographic and Educational Research Institutions, which represents every major oceanographic and marine science institution in America from Scripps to Woods Hole, and GLOBE which is an organization entitled Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment where legislators from the Japanese Diet, the Russian Duma, the U.S. Congress and the European Parliament come together at least twice a year on common environmental agendas. These three groups are all coming to Washington, and on those 3 days in the House Office Building, the Longworth Building, and in the Senate Office Building and on this Hill, we will have 300 delegates representing 45 nations who are coming here to focus for 3 days on how we can cooperate on oceans and security.

Now when we talk about security, we are not just talking about military security. We are talking about food security, we are talking about environmental security, we are talking about research and defense and economic security.

So for those 3 days we will have high-level delegations from China, from Russia, from the South American countries, Central American countries, European countries, the Middle East, Canada and Mexico, all coming together to focus on how we can cooperate, how our militaries can cooperate and how we, as nations, can cooperate to protect the oceans. In the end it will be a better investment of the American taxpayers' dollars to further assist us in understanding what we can do collectively with the world community to protect the oceans of the world and provide the security in the four areas that I have mentioned tonight.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Vice President GORE will give the speech on Tuesday evening of the conference right here in Statuary Hall, and on Monday evening at what promises to be one of the most historical events in this city, Woods Hole Laboratory is bringing the newest oceanographic research ship, paid for by U.S. tax dollars through the Navy, to Washington where it will be unveiled in Alexandria. The ship will be tied up here for 3 days, we will be erecting tents, and on those 3 days, especially on Monday evening, we will unveil the Atlantis. We will take Members of Congress and the foreign delegates on board the ship, we will have on board the deep-diving submersible Alvin, we will showcase the technologies that we are working on to better understand and protect the world's oceans.

The bottom line of these 3 days, Mr. Speaker, is that you and Senator LOTT who will both be keynote speakers of

the conference, Vice President GORE representing both parties, about 40 Members of Congress representing both parties, and representatives of 45 nations will come together to talk about how we can cooperate on understanding the oceans of the world, and, Mr. Speaker, the facilitator is the Department of Defense; again, Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose being to provide our security, but showing that we in fact can benefit in a number of areas from that investment that we are making in terms of the military.

Now in each of these cases, Mr. Speaker, in the antiterrorism cooperation that we will showcase tomorrow on the Hill and later in May in the environmental context that we will showcase at the oceans conference, this Congress is taking the lead in showing that, yes, we want to find ways to better spend our DOD money. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to have a course that takes us in a direction of cutting back so dramatically the defense resources for this Nation as we have seen over the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, let me shift for a moment and talk about that spending. I mentioned terrorism is one of our top priorities, and it is. Members on both sides of the aisle feel very strongly that we have to do more to protect our cities and our towns from the threat of a terrorist attack, and we are going to show some of that technology and that cooperation tomorrow. But, Mr. Speaker, one of the second biggest threats that many of us feel that we face is from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and especially the proliferation of missiles.

Mr. Speaker, if there has been one area where this Congress has disagreed more fundamentally with the President than any other area, it has been the area of missile defense. Over the past 2 years, Mr. Speaker, I have seen unprecedented votes in this body in disagreement with this President on missile defense spending. In fact, 2 years ago we plused up in our defense bill \$1 billion over what the President requested in our missile defense accounts. We did the same thing last year. In the 11 years that I have been here, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a defense bill, and I do not think we have ever had one in recent history where 301 Members of Congress voted in the affirmative, not just Republicans, but most of our Democrat colleagues, to support a defense bill that made a statement to this administration, and that statement was a very simple one. It was:

Mr. President, you are not focusing enough on the threat that is there and emerging in terms of missile proliferation, and you need to understand that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an important point that I want to focus on because this President has been driving the debate nationwide that says that we do not need to focus on defense, the world is so much more safer today, There is no longer a threat to the security of the American people. While I do

not want to go to the other extreme, Mr. Speaker, and create some kind of a Cold War mentality, because I think that is equally wrong, the President is doing this country a terrible disservice. One hundred forty-five times the President has made speeches where he has included the following phrase. In fact, three of those speeches were right up at the podium right in front of where you stand, Mr. Speaker. In three State of the Union speeches, our President has made this statement. Looking at the American people through national television, he said:

You can sleep well tonight because for the first time in the last 50 years there are no Russian missiles pointed at your children.

Mr. Speaker, as the Commander in Chief, the President knows he cannot prove that. We have had testimony in our House committees. In fact, the chief of Russian targeting for Russia has testified on national TV that they will not allow us to have access to their targeting processes, just as we will not allow the Russians to have access to ours. But on 145 occasions, three times from the well of this Chamber, the Commander in Chief of this country has said you can sleep well, there are no missiles pointed at our children. Yet, Mr. Speaker, he cannot verify that. He cannot prove it. And, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, if he could prove it, which he cannot, and which his generals including General Shalikashvili have said on the record he cannot prove; if he could prove it, all of our experts on the record have said that you can retarget a long-range ICBM in less than 10 seconds.

□ 2115

But do you see, Mr. Speaker, the point is not so much that particular issue, but when the President makes that speech 145 times, 3 times in front of a national audience, on college campuses, in front of national groups, he uses the bully pulpit to create the perception that there is no longer a threat to the American people or allies. And that is so deadly wrong, Mr. Speaker, because it drives the American people into believing that we have a false sense of security. And once again, I do not want to recreate the cold war, but I want the President to be honest in his assessment of what the threat is worldwide. And that is not an honest assessment, Mr. Speaker, at least not according to the key generals who run the Pentagon.

When the President makes that speech, he drives all of our constituents into believing that we are doing a disservice when we want to stabilize defense spending, that we are doing the American taxpayers a disservice when we want to protect programs that provide those jobs my colleagues talked about that were lost over the past 5 years. We do not want to dramatically increase defense spending; we want to stabilize it.

Mr. Speaker, there is currently a major struggle going on between this

Congress and both Members of the Democrat and Republican Parties and this President over how fast and how quickly we should deploy missile defense systems. Now this administration has come out publicly, Mr. Speaker, and they said they are for theater missile defenses.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, their new projections are that we will not have a new system in place until at the earliest 2004. Let me recount the importance of this for my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. In 1991, we had the largest loss of life that this country has experienced in recent years in one military incident, when our young, brave soldiers were killed in that desert in Saudi Arabia by that low-quality Scud missile. They were killed because we had no system that could warn them or take out that one Scud missile.

When those 28 kids were killed, many of them from my home State of Pennsylvania, Congress was in a state of shock. Congress said, why do we not have a system in place? So the Congress, in a bipartisan move, passed the Missile Defense Act of 1991. Now that act was, rather simply, Mr. Speaker, it said two things: First of all, that the Defense Department shall deploy a highly effective theater missile defense system as soon as possible to protect our troops.

The second part of that act said that by the year 1996, America should deploy a national missile defense system. Well, Mr. Speaker, 1996 came and went. We are now in 1997. We are still fighting that battle even though it was the law of the land.

Let me tell you what the most recent projections are. The administration is now telling us that they will be lucky to field our first highly effective theater missile defense system in the year 2004. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is, if the administration is right, and they are now hedging on that date, that it will have taken us 13 years from the date those kids were killed in Saudi Arabia until we have a system deployed that can prevent a future killing of our kids from a low-quality Scud missile.

Now the missile defense organization, the Pentagon tells us they probably cannot even make 2004, that is probably too optimistic. Now is the threat greater today than it was in 1991? Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is our intelligence community that told us a few years ago not to worry, there were no emerging threats coming forward that we have to worry about, we will handle the Scud missiles that are used, we will take them out, even though we did not take out all the Iraqi launchers both during and after the invasion of Kuwait and our response to that invasion.

But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, about some very troubling events that have occurred over the past several weeks. First of all, the media has been reporting that Iran has now deployed a version of a Russian rocket called a

Katyusha rocket that has a range of around 800 to 900 kilometers, which means it could hit Israel and many of our key allies in that part of the world. That was a development that many of us were not expecting, according to what our intelligence committee told us.

Even more troubling, Mr. Speaker, are the press accounts that are coming out from Japanese sources and some United States sources that tell us that the newest missile coming out of North Korea, the No Dong missile, that we were told would not be deployed probably until the turn of the century, is now in fact either deployed or ready to be deployed by North Korea after just one test.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That means every one of our 70-some-thousand kids, when I say kids I mean our troops, that are currently stationed in South Korea and Japan and in Okinawa are within the range of that missile that we know can go as far as 1,300 kilometers.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that we now have a risk either today or very shortly that we cannot defend against because we have not taken the aggressive steps that this Congress mandated to deploy a theater missile defense system quickly, and we are going to have to wait until, at the earliest, 2004 to have that highly effective system in place.

Mr. Speaker, that is the heart of the debate over defense spending in this Congress between this Congress and this administration. Now we are also concerned, Mr. Speaker, because the administration does not want to work with us on a national missile defense system. They told us last year they were pursuing a three-plus-three system, 3 years of development and 3 years to deploy a system that would protect America's mainland.

The American people and my constituents back home cannot believe and cannot imagine that America, with all of its might, has no system today that can defend our country against an accidental launch of a long-range ICBM coming from Russia or China or any other rogue nation. You said that is not true currently, we have to have that capability. And I say no.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, I will tell you pointblank, we have no system or capability today to take out any incoming missile. Now the administration would say we do not need it, we have treaties. The ABM Treaty, Mr. Speaker, only applies to the United States and to Russia. Even though the administration is trying to expand it to include other former Russian states, it does not apply to them. So it does not apply to North Korea, to China, it does not apply to the rogue nations that are trying to get missiles that said they would use them if they had them against us; it only applies to us and Russia.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot rely on the ABM Treaty. We need a

physical capability to defend our country. Do we need a massive system that the media has trivialized in the past that would protect our entire country. We are not talking about that. We are talking about a very limited system that could protect us perhaps against five incoming missiles, that is all.

Two years ago we pulled provisions in the defense bill to require that kind of system to be deployed by the year 2003, and the administration would not buy that. And today we are now looking at a situation we probably will not have a national missile defense capability until perhaps 2005. That is totally unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Why do I say it is unacceptable? Am I fearful that the Russians are going to attack us? No, I am not. I worked with Russia perhaps as much as any Member of this body, and you know that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I will be taking a delegation of our colleagues, bipartisan delegation to Moscow in May of this year for the second time I have been there this year. It will be my 9th or 10th trip. I share the new initiative with the Russian *duma*. My counterpart is the deputy speaker Mr. Shokhin. I want Russia to succeed.

I am not concerned about Russia attacking us. But Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Russia is an unstable country today. Many of their military has not been paid for months. In fact, they are trying to sell off their hardware and technology. The evidence of the further reliance on their strategic weapons is such that, because their conventional military is suffering and because the Russians are fearful, they rely much more on their offensive strategic weapons than ever before in their history.

Now what does that mean? That means a higher potential for risk of an accidental launch. Is there evidence of that? Just 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, in January, the Russians have been notified by the Norwegians that Norway was going to launch a weather rocket to do some weather monitoring. The Russians were told in advance this was going to take place. The Russians, however, are so paranoid because of their conventional force breakdown; and, so, relying on their strategic force that when this weather rocket went off from Norway, the Russian defensive alert system put the entire country on an alert that would have caused within 60 seconds an offensive response.

They admitted on the record in Moscow media and media all over the world, Boris Yeltsin admitted that it was one of the first times in recent years that the black box carried around by the President of Russia himself was activated in response to a weather rocket that they had notified the Russians they were going to launch in advance.

That meant Russia was within 60 seconds of activating that response that all of us fear would have happened one day. Would it have been deliberate? No. But those are the kinds of concerns that we have in this country.

Now there is also an attempt to sell a mobile version of Russia's most sophisticated rocket, called the SS-25, that can be hauled in the back of a trailer. They have over 400 of these launchers in Russia. How long is it going to take before one of those launchers gets in the hands of a Third World nation and then we have a threat that is not covered by the ABM Treaty that we have to be prepared to respond to?

Those are the issues that we face, Mr. Speaker, and those are the issues that dominate our defense debate this year. Over the next several weeks, we will be moving into markup of the 1998 defense authorization bill. We are being very up front with the administration, Mr. Speaker; we do not want business as usual.

Over the past 6 years, this administration has decimated the defense of our country, it has caused the loss of over a million jobs. We, in the Congress, have tried to make up for that. Each of the past 2 years, Democrats and Republicans alike joined together and plussed up \$10 billion 1 year and \$5 billion in the other year to put money back into programs that our service chiefs said they could not live without. That is going to be the same battle this year, Mr. Speaker.

It is not about parochial issues of weapon systems in Members' districts because 98 percent of the funds that we put in the defense addition last year and years before were items requested by other chiefs. In fact, General Shalikashvili briefed Secretary Perry last year, said to the Secretary, we need \$60 billion just to buy replacement equipment for the military. We never saw that briefing in Congress.

When Secretary Perry came in and briefed us in the House and the Senate, when he had Shalikashvili sitting next to him, unable to tell what he was really thinking or said, Secretary Perry said, we could live with \$40 or \$45 billion.

What does that mean? That means 1 billion people have been cast out of their positions in this country all over America. But more important, it meant, Mr. Speaker, that we are jeopardizing the lives of our young soldiers.

What do I mean by that, Mr. Speaker? I can tell you, as we slip programs out, as this administration does day after day after day, we drive up the cost of those programs and we make it so that they will not be into full production for 5, 10, or 15 years down the road. That is the battle we are facing this year.

The administration wants to keep all these major programs alive. They want to build three new tactical aviation programs. They want to build the F-22, the joint strike fighter, the F18F. They want to build a new attack submarine. They want to build another aircraft carrier. They want to build the arsenal ship. They want to build the Comanche, the V-22. They want to build the battlefield master program of the 21st

century. And they want to do all of this with a budget that is impossible to meet the needs of the military today.

What we are saying this year, Mr. Speaker, is you cannot do that. This President and this administration has got to say no to some programs. If they are not going to raise top-line defense numbers, if they are not going to cut into the vertical costs, if they are not going to help us get our allies to pay for the cost of our operations when we deploy our troops around the world, then they have got to cut some systems; they cannot keep treading water because we are holding companies' and workers' lives outside there thinking that some day down the road some new administration is going to rapidly increase defense spending.

That is where the debate is coming down this year. We are doing our part, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to show ways where we can use defense activities to help us in other areas. I said two of them tonight, in the environmental area and in the area of terrorism. But that is still not enough, Mr. Speaker.

We are in an impossible situation; and I would ask our colleagues, as we approach a debate on the defense bill, to understand that we are at a historical crossroads. If we are not going to find other ways to free up some money out of that 16 cents that we spent in this year's Federal tax dollar, then we have got to cut some programs and cause more people to lose their jobs or we have got to transfer more people out of the military because this administration will not address any one of the three areas that I talked about that would help us deal with this budget problem that we are facing this year. Cut the deployment rate or get our allies to pick up more of the cost of it. Cut the environmental costs or raise the top-line number.

□ 2130

If you do not do any of those three things, then you have no choice but to cut the troop strength, the end strength, which I know they do not want to do, or cut some big ticket programs. When you cut big ticket programs, I hope all of those AFL-CIO members out there who listened to the hour before me talk about NAFTA's impact will remember the 1 million brothers and sisters of theirs who were laid off over the past 5 years in defense plant after defense plant around this country. These were not people making 15 cents, these were people who were middle income Americans. These were UAW workers, machinist workers, IUE workers, building trades workers, all of them today who are out of a job.

The hypocrisy of this administration, Mr. Speaker, scares me. But I want to say to this administration, because Members of both parties in this Congress have been trying to tell the story of what the threat is and what we must do to meet the need that is provided to us as a threat, how we must provide the dollar commitment to our troops

to fund these priorities that are identified as being critical to our military and also look for opportunities to share technology.

Now I talked about what the impact is when we cut these programs. Well, let me give one example. The workhorse of the Marine Corps is the CH-46 helicopter. It has been the workhorse of the Marine Corps since the Vietnam War. We should have replaced the CH-46 10 years ago. We have now slipped the replacement program to a point where it is going to cost us \$5 billion extra dollars. We are going to be flying CH-46 helicopters when they are 55 years old. Now, what does that mean to a Marine?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the constituents that we serve have young sons who are flying Marine helicopters, they need to understand that those young kids flying those 46s during a combat situation have to carry 18 troops. Oh, by the way, they cannot train carrying 18 troops, they only can carry 6 to 8 because of the age of the aircraft.

Those young pilots, when they fly this CH-46 in a combat situation, have to be able to do evasive maneuvering. But Mr. Speaker, those young pilots cannot train doing evasive maneuvering because of the age of the aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, those young pilots have to be able to fly at night in combat situations. But Mr. Speaker, because of the age of the aircraft, they have to put masking tape over the instrumentation panel so they can fly during evening hours.

What does that mean? That means we have more accidents with CH-46s. That means we have more kids killed and more kids injured. So by slipping these programs out, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about CEOs of companies, we are not even talking about jobs. We are talking about threatening the lives of those people who are there to protect our country and our allies. That is the worst possible decision that we could make, to delay a program that directly affects the life of a young person serving our military.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to pay attention to the debate this year on the defense bill. I would encourage my colleagues tomorrow to come out and show their enthusiastic support for the 1.2 million men and women who serve this country as our domestic defenders, to look at some of the ways that we are involving the military in helping us deal with terrorism incidents. I would encourage our colleagues to come out on May 19, 20 and 21, the largest oceans conference ever, against showcasing our militaries taking a lead in helping to understand environmental problems.

I would also encourage our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to get real. The defense spending in this country is at a critical crossroads. We must provide the support against this administration making further cuts in our defense budget. We must provide the bipartisan support we have had over the past 2

years to stand up and say no. Not because it is right for jobs, even though it is, and not because it is right for companies, even though it is, but because it is right for the kids who serve this Nation and who put their lives on the line every day.

#### A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO KAHUKU HIGH SCHOOL'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and a distinct personal honor for me to prepare this special order of the House to inform my colleagues of a very special occasion that will take place this week on the campus of one of Hawaii's smallest public high schools. Small in number maybe, Mr. Speaker, but dynamic in terms of the quality of its academics, its ethnic social mix, and a high school marching band that has won top awards throughout the State of Hawaii for years. The band even marched at the Rose Bowl and was rated among the top high school bands in the Nation; and yes, its athletic program is also among the best in the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the high school I am referring to is none other than the pride of the North Shore on the Island of Oahu, Kahuku High School. As they say among the locals in Hawaii, "Imua Kohuku High School on your 100th birthday."

Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian word "Kahuku" has a special meaning among the ancient Hawaiians. The first four letters, "Kahu", means guardian, or royal keepers or protectors. The last two letters "ku" are in reference to an ancient Hawaiian god named Ku.

According to ancient Hawaiian tradition, the god Ku was a member of the godhead of three gods, and their names were Kane, Ku, and Lono. Those three gods were all powerful. They created the heavens and the earth and, yes, from red earth they made man in their express image, and they even breathed into his nostrils and man became a living soul.

Mr. Speaker, if one wants to give specific meaning to the word, Kahuku, after which the location and high school are named, it means one is a guardian of the god Ku. Rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because not far from Kahuku is another place called Laie, which according to Hawaiian tradition was an ancient city of refuge, a special place of sanctuary where offenders may escape to seek refuge and be reinstated by the priests who preside over the sanctuary.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share this portion of Kahuku's history because I suspect many people are not aware of its meaning and its significance as far as ancient legends are concerned.

As far as the record is known, the first classes ever held at what was unofficially known as Kahuku school began in 1893. The classes were held under shaded trees or in someone's yard. The school was first organized by a Hawaiian lady named Mrs. Hookana.

Four years later in 1897, and this time with an appropriation of only \$984 provided by the republic, or then the sovereign nation of Hawaii, a one-room schoolhouse was built. An enrollment of 36 students was noted and a Mr. Brightwell served as the first principal.

By the 1920s the school had grown and was educating children from the Campbell and Laie plantations, plus a pineapple camp known as the Hawaiian Pineapple Company. During this period the school moved to its present location.

In 1939, the high school was added and the school was renamed Kahuku High and Elementary School. The next year, the first senior class graduated 16 students and they took home the school's first yearbook, the Ke Koolau.

In the 1940's the Laie area was still almost exclusively plantation, and the area from which it drew its students had grown considerably. The list of plantations and other activities reads like who's who in the North Shore during the 1940's. Attending Kahuku during this period were the children from the Marconi Wireless Station, the Paumalu Pineapple Camp, Waialea Hawaiian settlement, and several camps of the Kahuku Sugar Mill.

The Kahuku athletes became known as the Red Raiders because they wore red uniforms donated by Iolani High School in 1950. Prior to this time the unofficial nickname was the Ramblers. Through the 1940's Kahuku had developed sufficiently and there was competing in sports events against other high schools on the North Shore and the Windward sections of the Island of Oahu, and it won its first football championship in 1947. This was the first in a long line of championships that began the development of many championship players as well.

In 1988, Kahuku High and Elementary School became the Kahuku High and Intermediate School, and the elementary level was separated.

Today, Kahuku High School has only about 1,100 high school students from grades 9 through 12. Supporting the students are its 136 faculty members, four administrators and the supportive staff of 42. The school has developed into an athletic powerhouse and students from other parts of the island travel to Kahuku just to participate in their academic, social and sports programs. This is considered a considerable achievement, given the diversity of the school's population.

From the well-to-do residents of the famous Sunset Beach and the neighboring golf course communities to the low-income housing development on the North Shore and everything in-between, there is ethnic and economic diversity at Kahuku. Unlike some areas,