

began drafting legislation to end this abusive practice. While crafting this measure, I contacted the Humane Society of the United States for their input. As a result of these efforts, I introduced H.R. 1622, the Dog and Cat Protection Act.

An estimated 2,000,000 dogs and cats are slaughtered and sold annually as part of the international fur trade. Many of these animals are raised in deplorable conditions. Unfortunately, there are no federal laws to prohibit the importation, manufacture, transport or sale of any product made with dog and cat fur. The only provision in law to regulate the importation of products made with cat and dog fur is the Fur Products Labeling Act (FPLA). The FPLA and its regulations simply require that any product with a value of more than \$150 contain a label informing a consumer that it contains animal fur. Any product worth less than \$150 is exempted from the labeling requirement.

My legislation would impose a ban on all products entering the United States made with cat and dog fur. In order to prevent a foreign importer from establishing operations in the United States, H.R. 1622 would also prevent the sale, manufacture, transport, or advertisement of any product made domestically with cat and dog fur.

Furthermore, H.R. 1622 would give additional authority to the Customs Service to inspect products entering the United States to ensure they do not contain cat and dog fur. Violators of the ban would be subject to both civil and criminal penalties. Furthermore, persons found to be in violation of the ban would face the prospect of being permanently prohibited from selling any fur product in the United States.

The Dog and Cat Protection Act also amends the Fur Products Labeling Act to require all fur products entering the United States—regardless of their value—to contain a label showing their true content. This means those persons who try to mislabel products in order to get around the ban contained in my legislation would face additional penalties under the Fur Products Labeling Act. The additional labeling requirements will also help the Customs Service in their enforcement efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put an end to the inhumane treatment of dogs and cats once and for all. I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors of H.R. 1622.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND DUTIES ON IMPORTED RAW MATERIAL

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1999

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which supports important regional and national interests.

My home, the 7th Congressional District of Washington, is also the home of the K2 Corp., the last remaining major U.S. manufacturer of skis and one of three major makers of snowboards in the United States. K2 conducts all significant manufacturing operations for skis

and snowboards at its Vashon Island, Washington facility. In fact, all K2 snowboards and virtually all K2 and Olin-brand skis sold throughout the world are individually crafted by technicians on Vashon Island. Moreover, K2 sources almost all of the components for its skis and snowboards in the U.S. stimulating the U.S. economy through its purchases of raw materials from U.S. suppliers, especially in the Pacific Northwest region of the country. However, for a key ski and snowboard component—polyethylene base materials—K2 has been unable to find a supplier of these products in the U.S. that can meet its needs. Therefore, K2 has been forced to import this product, which is subject to U.S. customs duties upon importation. This legislation provides for a temporary suspension of customs duty on the raw material which is vital to the U.S. production of skis and snowboards and which are unavailable from domestic producers.

K2 is working hard to remain viable in the highly competitive international market for skis and snowboards. In fact, K2 has endured as a U.S. ski manufacturer in the face of fierce price competition, while several other major ski companies no longer manufacture skis in the U.S. This temporary duty suspension legislation would support jobs in the region, as well as K2's ability to continue developing innovative, fine quality products. Equally important, a temporary duty suspension would help K2 preserve and increase its competitiveness in the global marketplace.

K2 is the only major exporter of skis made in the U.S. In addition, K2 is one of three principal exporters of U.S. made snowboards. Thus, K2's exports of U.S. manufactured skis and snowboards represent a substantial percentage of U.S. skis and snowboards sold worldwide. If K2 is unable to remain competitive in global and domestic markets, skis manufactured in the U.S. may disappear from the global marketplace. The temporary duty suspension proposed by this legislation would help prevent the shutdown of the only remaining U.S. producer of skis.

OPPOSING NATIONAL TEACHER CERTIFICATION OR NATIONAL TEACHER TESTING

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation to forbid the use of federal funds to develop or implement a national system of teacher certification or a national teacher test. My bill also forbids the Department of Education from denying funds to any state or local education agency because that state or local educational agency has refused to adopt a federally-approved method of teacher certification or testing. This legislation in no way interferes with a state's ability to use federal funds to support their chosen method of teacher certification or testing.

Having failed to implement a national curriculum through the front door with national student testing (thanks to the efforts of members of the Education Committee under the

leadership of Chairman GOODLING), the administration is now trying to implement a national curriculum through the backdoor with national teacher testing and certification. National teacher certification will allow the federal government to determine what would-be teachers need to know in order to practice their chosen profession. Teacher education will revolve around preparing teachers to pass the national test or to receive a national certificate. New teachers will then base their lesson plans on what they needed to know in order to receive their Education Department-approved teaching certificate. Therefore, I call on those of my colleagues who oppose a national curriculum to join me in opposing national teacher testing and certification with the same vigor with which you opposed national student testing.

Many educators are already voicing opposition to national teacher certification and testing. The Coalition of Independent Education Associations (CIEA), which represents the majority of the over 300,000 teachers who are members of independent educators associations, has passed a resolution opposing the nationalization of teacher certification and testing; I have attached a copy of this resolution for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As more and more teachers realize the impact of this proposal, I expect opposition from the education community to grow. Teachers want to be treated as professionals, not as minions of the federal government.

Legislation has already been introduced in the Texas State Legislature prohibiting the use of any national certification or national examination to determine if someone is qualified to teach in Texas. While I applaud this legislation, I wonder if Texas would change its policies if the Department of Education threatened to deny Texas federal funds if Texas failed to adopt the Department's chosen method of teacher certification and testing. It is up to Congress to see that the Department of Education does not bully the states into adopting the method of teacher certification and testing favored by DC-based bureaucrats.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to join me in opposing national teacher certification or national teacher testing. Training and certification of classroom teachers is the job of state governments, local school districts, educators, and parents; this vital function should not be usurped by federal bureaucrats and/or politicians. Please stand up for America's teachers and students by signing on as a cosponsor of my legislation to ensure taxpayer dollars do not support national teacher certification or national teacher testing.

COALITION OF INDEPENDENT EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS—STATEMENT ON NATIONAL TEACHER LICENSURE, FEBRUARY 26, 1999

The licensure of teachers should remain the responsibility of each state's Board of Education and any attempt to authorize the federal government to govern this process should be opposed.

Secretary of Education Richard Riley's proposal (February 16, 1999) to empower a teacher panel to grant licenses for teaching would remove the separate state's authority to protect the welfare of the general public.

Teaching is a public enterprise and not a private profession.

Such high stakes licensure decisions must be controlled by a body that is responsible to