

I wish all of my colleagues safe travel back to their districts, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of questions for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Can the gentleman tell us the day in which campaign finance will be brought to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the campaign finance reform will be considered on Tuesday, and I might add we expect that to be a fairly lengthy debate and we would expect Members or advise Members to expect a late evening on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman expect a late evening other than Tuesday next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. We can tell the gentleman we will conclude business by 6:00 or so on Wednesday evening. The Hispanic Caucus has a very important dinner, and the schedule will accommodate to that dinner.

We expect that Thursday evening might possibly run a little late, but we certainly would hold to our 2:00 departure time on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague.

Finally, let me just ask my colleague that in August, before the recess, about 18 colleagues on the gentleman's side of the aisle signed a letter to the leadership asking that the minimum wage bill be brought up this fall before we adjourn for the year, and I am just wondering if the gentleman, who I know has a real fondness for the minimum wage bill, would enlighten us on when and if that will happen.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Yes, we are aware of this interest on the part of the Members on both sides of the aisle. We have key Members of the House working on that. I can only say to the gentleman he might expect something later in the year, but I have nothing more definite to say on that.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and have a good weekend.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHINA SHOULD NO LONGER RELY
ON TECHNICAL BARRIERS TO
BLOCK AMERICAN PRODUCTS

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, 5 months ago, the American agriculture sector celebrated the signing of groundbreaking market access agreements with China. In April 1999, Chinese Premier Zhou Rongji signed three bilateral agreements with the United States designed to open agricultural markets. These agreements concluded decades of discussions on sanitary and phytosyntax trade barriers which had locked American farmers out of Chinese markets.

Upon signature, China agreed to immediately begin implementing these agreements, permitting access to China's vast markets.

The larger issue of Chinese WTO accession was not resolved in April, but the side agreements were considered a significant victory for American farmers.

China has long relied on technical barriers to block American products. For more than 20 years, wheat from the Pacific Northwest has been banned because of unfounded concerns about TCK smut, a wheat fungus. The rest of the world recognizes that TCK poses no threat to human health and does not affect the quality of the product, yet China has maintained its ban for all of these years.

Meat producers have largely been shut out of the market because China has only allowed imports from five approved U.S. plants and all citrus growers have been locked out because of

concerns about Mediterranean fruit flies in certain regions.

In signing the three agreements, China agreed to accept USDA certification for meat safety for U.S. exports of pork, beef and poultry; eliminate the current comprehensive ban on citrus fruits and eliminate restrictions on the import of Pacific Northwest wheat. All future SPS disputes will be settled scientifically.

The potential consequences of the agreement were tremendous and touched most agriculture districts in the United States. But unfortunately, the disagreements remain only a distant unrealized potential. Three weeks ago, a member of my staff traveled to China to discuss implementation of these agreements. The Director General of American Affairs within the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Corporation indicated that China did not intend, did not intend, to implement the agreements until discussions were concluded on WTO accession.

Such a decision would be in direct contravention of the April agreement, which held that implementation would begin immediately. Agricultural producers should not be held hostage to WTO negotiations, and I expect China to uphold its bilateral commitments.

We as a Congress, we as a country, we as people who care about our agricultural sector, should expect China to uphold its bilateral commitments. This should serve as a test case if Congress discusses permanent normal trade relations with China later this year as a part of a WTO agreement. If China delays action on agricultural agreements that have previously been signed, it raises serious questions about the sincerity of other commitments to implement market access agreements.

The April draft WTO agreement would have resolved a wide range of other outstanding market access issues: trading rights, distribution, quotas, reliance on state trading companies and export subsidies. The U.S. Trade Representative did a great job in moving China toward a tariff based system, with extremely low tariff rates, but if China is unwilling to act on the Sanitary Phytosanitary Agreement, it seems likely that we may see continued reluctance on other aspects of any WTO agreement.

So I am sending a letter to President Zemin and President Clinton urging immediate implementation of the bilateral agricultural agreements, and I urge any Member of this body who represents producers of wheat, pork, poultry, beef or citrus, to join in the signing of this letter. With low prices already hurting our farm leaders across the country, we should not stand by and let them continue to be locked out of one of the largest markets in the world.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 13, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

China should implement the side agreements; and it should do so immediately, and I would just say to my colleagues, this is an indication, I think, of disrespect for the agricultural sector in our country, which needs exports. We are fighting desperately to get our products into other countries; and now that we have reached this agreement, it seems to me that China should follow through on what they previously agreed to in April of this year.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for his message, for watching this issue so closely. It is important to the agricultural sector; and I think, as the gentleman points out, it is a real test of whether we can depend upon the People's Republic of China to implement their promises on trade. So I thank the gentleman for his diligence on this issue.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his comments and his commitment to agriculture and his interest and his expertise in trade issues.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE AT OUR NATION'S WEAPONS LABORATORIES

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, prior to the district work period, I came to the floor to discuss an issue on the minds of many Americans as well as myself, the issue of Chinese espionage at our Nation's weapons laboratories. Over the last month, I spent time with the constituents of the third district of North Carolina, which I am proud to represent, and they gave me further confirmation that the American people are outraged over the loss of our sensitive national security information. But what my constituents expressed even greater concern with, as I am sure many across this country have, is the potential for continued loss of our sensitive nuclear technology.

□ 2045

In response to their concerns, I gave my word that I would do everything as a Member of Congress to ensure the accountability of those who have jeopardized the security of our Nation and protect our security information for the future, and, Mr. Speaker, I mean it too.

In July, I had the opportunity to meet with the former director of Safeguard and Security for the Department of Energy, Colonel Ed McCallum. The Office of Safeguards and Security governs protection of the Department of

Energy's national security assets including nuclear weapons, nuclear material, highly classified information and personal clearance. It also investigates security incidents involving the loss of nuclear materials and the unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

Colonel McCallum served as director of the office for 9 years under former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary and then under current Secretary Bill Richardson. I first heard Colonel McCallum reveal his side of the nuclear spy scandal on the O'Reilly Factor on the Fox News Channel. Colonel McCallum was telling of how he and members of his staff made continued efforts, Mr. Speaker, to approach both O'Leary and Richardson to alert them to the lax security at our weapons labs and the need to take measures to prevent possible theft.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum reported that time after time he hit roadblocks in trying to bring this issue to the attention of both Secretaries. Neither O'Leary or Richardson took interest in his findings, and neither worked to tighten security. It is little surprise then to find out that security secrets were easily targeted by the Communist Chinese.

To prevent similar situations in the future my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and myself had called for a hearing to have Colonel McCallum and members of his staff brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the instances in which U.S. security was compromised. I am confident the information the colonel and his staff can provide will be critical in assisting Congress in its efforts to eliminate leakage of sensitive military secrets in the future.

Mr. Speaker, despite what the administration is willing to bet, the American people care about the loss of nuclear technology. In fact, after I had the opportunity to appear on the O'Reilly Factor to state my commitment to pursue this issue I have received a number of supportive letters from men and women across the country. One soldier in the Army wrote, and I quote:

I cannot figure out why there is so much apathy among the American people regarding this very serious threat to the security of our country.

I further quote:

There are a lot of people like myself who recognize the gravity of this situation and wish to see those responsible held fully accountable for their actions. I do not care how well the economy is doing. It won't mean a thing if China or one of its allies decides to launch a missile strike against this country.

That is from a member that served in the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, a couple wrote another letter I want to share with you. It reads, and I quote:

This is a tragic road America is heading down. We are both grateful to you and others

who are working with you to bring light, order, and some justice to what we see as a complete incompetence, lack of integrity, and dishonesty shown by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have a stack of letters just like these I have read to you tonight. The message is clear. The American people want you and I to stand up to this administration.

We are a Congress. As a Congress, we must demand that those responsible are held accountable for compromising our national security, and we must work to prevent future leaks.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered my commitment and urge my colleagues and this Congress to join me in working to protect the security of every American citizen because America is special, and we must do everything we can to protect our national security of this Nation.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues to urge this House to engage in a serious and honest debate on modest tax relief for the American people. Unfortunately, the Republican Tax Plan is nothing more than a thinly-veiled fundraising gimmick.

The Republican Tax Plan reminds me of the Shakespearean play, Hamlet. Hamlet's stepfather Claudius secretly kills Hamlet's father. Claudius later marries Hamlet's mother. Claudius attempts to get away with murder and don the ill-fitting cloak of kindness to young Hamlet. The Republican Tax Plan attempts to kill the spirit of the American people who cry out for sensible tax relief. But just as the Ghost the slain King sought to be heard, so does the spirit of the American people. We Democrats seek to honor this spirit.

The Republicans know that their risky tax plan has virtually no chance of passing. The President will certainly veto the Republican's \$800 billion risky tax scheme. If the Republican leadership has enough votes to override a veto why have they stalled for 35 days and counting to send their risky tax scheme to the President's desk?

The Republican leadership put on a road show this summer to sell their 1980's-style voodoo economics to the American people. But the American people realized that as we say in Texas, "That dog don't hunt." The GOP's risky tax plan would spend virtually all of the projected non-Social Security surpluses, would cause \$31.8 billion in cuts to Medicare within 5 years, and would cut \$56 billion out of crop insurance, education programs, child support enforcement programs, veterans education and readjustment.

Even Majority Leader DICK ARMEY admitted that the Republican tax plan is not an issue that resonates with voters. After a dismal showing with the American voters, Mr. ARMEY had this to say about the Republican's tax