

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker quoted Cato and their philosophy. The Cato Institute wants to slash the military budget of our country in half. They want to legalize marijuana. So much for the Cato Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following to emphasize Republican accomplishments on education, dealing with illegal drugs in our schools:

Illegal drug use is behind most of the violence in this country. Over 50% of all men arrested for homicide test positive for illicit drugs at the time of arrest and illegal drugs are a factor in half of all family violence, most of it directed against women and children.

Illegal drugs are also the single most serious problem facing America's educational system. It has always bewildered me how President Clinton can claim to be the education President when drug use by school age children has doubled since he was elected President.

There is an obvious connection between the increase in illegal drug use which has occurred since President Clinton first took office and the educational problems facing our nation.

Illegal drug use has doubled since this President took office and according to the most recent reports drug use is still on the rise among eighth graders.

A person who uses illegal drugs is five times more likely to drop out of school than a non-drug user. Scientific studies show that illegal drugs—including marijuana—rob students of their motivation and self-esteem, leaving them unable to concentrate and indifferent to learning.

A recent study of 11th graders in our major cities showed that over half of the heavy drug users dropped out—twice the rate of those who are drug-free.

During the Reagan/Bush years drug use dropped, from 24 million users in 1979 to 11 million users in 1992. These hard fought gains were wasted by President Clinton.

There is not a parent in America who sends their children off to school without worrying that they will become exposed to illegal drugs. And it is not just teenagers anymore. Parents now need to be very concerned about 7th and 8th grade children getting involved with illegal drugs.

Toady in America one third of all high school kids smoke marijuana.

Today, more than half of all high school seniors have admitted to using illegal drugs. Since President Clinton was first elected. The trends of casual drug use for high school students have increased for virtually every illegal drug, including heroin, crack, cocaine, LSD and marijuana. This rise in teenage drug use also correlates closely with rising violence in our schools.

A recent study has also shown that students with the lowest grades were four times more likely to have used marijuana in the past month than those with the highest grade point average.

Since 1992, marijuana use has jumped 150% among 12 and 13 year old students and

200% among high school students. Nearly 1.5 million more middle school and high schools students use illegal drugs than when President Clinton was first elected.

I repeat, you cannot claim to be a President who cares about the education of our youth and not care about the illegal drug problem in this country. And President Clinton has demonstrated by his words—or lack of words—and by his deeds that he is not serious about winning the war on drugs. And our school systems have the casualties to prove it.

I urge support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the American people, at least the massive numbers who tuned into C-SPAN this morning, have been lucky enough to see the vision of the real Democratic Party. Fifteen out-of-touch liberal extremists and one pretending to be a conservative.

The Democratic vision is of a do-everything, big government, micromanaging, high taxes, big spending, deficit-creating, liberal, bureaucratic, getting-into-every-aspect-of-family-life Congress.

The Republicans propose a limited Federal Government that cuts taxes, balances the budget, strengthens national defense, empowers local and State governments to solve local problems, and make sure government works.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the American people have rejected the liberal do-everything-badly vision of government. They support a Congress that is focused on doing some things well and helping families and communities solve local problems.

We are trying to get things done here by passing this rule. I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can get things done and do the work that this Congress wants to do.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following statement from the Committee on Rules which explains the previous question vote:

THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

House Rule XVII ("Previous Question") provides in part that: "There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of the Members voting, if a quorum is present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked or ordered."

In the case of a special rule or order of business resolution reported from the House Rules Committee, providing for the consideration of a specified legislative measure, the previous question is moved following the one hour of debate allowed for under House Rules.

The vote on the previous question is simply a procedural vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution that sets the ground rules for debate

and amendment on the legislation it would make in order. Therefore, the vote on the previous question has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4761, URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS COMPLIANCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 588 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 588

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4761) to require the United States Trade Representative to take certain actions in response to the failure of the European Union to comply with the rulings of the World Trade Organization. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), as we continue our fun Saturday morning together, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded will be for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 4761, the Uruguay Round Agreements Compliance Act of 1998, without amendment or any intervention of any point of order.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, reducing trade barriers and expanding international commerce

have been the key to the dynamic growth of American jobs, wealth, and trade over the past 7 years. One of the pillars of that massive economic expansion has been the worldwide rules-based trading system.

The rules-based trading system is a very simple concept. It basically means that countries sit down and negotiate fair trading rules and then they live by them. Countries agree to follow the rules.

Now, to support free and fair trade is not to ignore human nature. Everyone knows that some people try to get an edge. In the international trading system, the same is true. Some countries always try to get an edge. They will not follow the rules. And what happens? People get hurt.

Mr. Speaker, the expansion of free trade has been one of the most important global developments of the past half century. However, it became increasingly clear in the 1980s, especially here in the United States, that we needed a better system to enforce international trade rules. Countries were cheating and Americans were being hurt. The result was the arduously negotiated Uruguay Round agreement.

The Uruguay Round was enacted by a strong bipartisan vote of the 103rd Congress when Democrats were in the majority. The agreement was negotiated by two Republican Presidents, signed by a Democratic President, and supported by 65 percent of congressional Democrats and 68 percent of congressional Republicans. One of the core features of that bipartisan agreement was that it would permit countries to enforce trade rules.

Today's bill is very important, but not because bananas or beef exports are critical to this country, although both industries provide good jobs to working families. The bill is important because we are approaching a critical crossroads of the World Trade Organization created by the Uruguay Round agreements.

Since the inception of the World Trade Organization in 1995, many cases have tested the rules-based trading system.

□ 1120

The United States has challenged unfair trade barriers in other countries, and we have had some of our own trade policies challenged. Not surprising, we have won some cases and we have lost some cases.

When a country loses a case because they are violating the rules, that country can choose how to respond. We here in this House of Representatives insisted that the WTO not have any sovereignty over our laws, so the WTO cannot force this country or any other country to do anything. Governments, not the WTO, decide what they will do. They can either eliminate the trade barrier that is ruled in violation of the trade agreement, or they can accept the fact that the countries that are ag-

grieved by the trade barrier can impose equivalent trade sanctions on the offending country.

Mr. Speaker, that is the rules-based system we signed up with. That is the rules-based system nearly all of our trading partners, including the European Union, signed up with. Those are the rules.

We are approaching a crossroads because in two major agricultural cases, one involving an unfair European banana cartel and another involving unfair restrictions on American beef exports, the European Union is threatening to undermine the rules-based trading system. They are threatening to trash the Uruguay Round and the WTO. They have lost two major cases fair and square, but they are refusing to eliminate their trade barriers and they are refusing to accept that we can retaliate in kind. This is a major problem. Mr. Speaker, if they ignore the rules, the system does not work.

It is purely chance that dictates the first of these major cases involving bananas. That case, which was brought to the WTO by the Clinton administration, was resolved in our favor, and the Europeans have until January 2 of 1999 to comply with the decision. If they do not, we are regrettably, and I do mean regrettably, heading down the road to a potential trade retaliation, a trade war. This bill simply says that the United States Congress, which approved the rules of the WTO, is committed to making sure that those rules are enforced.

I sincerely hope that the European Union recognizes the self-destructive folly of their unfair trading regimes. I sincerely hope that they recognize the clear and unquestionable benefits of the rules-based trading system. I sincerely hope that they comply with the WTO decisions on their banana cartel and their restrictions on beef imports. But if they will not, I am quite certain that the Congress is committed to supporting the trade rules.

Mr. Speaker, it takes little more than a quick scan of the daily newspapers to see that the international economy is an uncertain place. Danger is afoot and we as a people have much to lose if things go badly. While nobody has all the answers, I certainly believe that supporting and enforcing a good and fair rules-based trading system like the WTO is one of the answers to the questions we face today. We cannot afford to have the system fall apart.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. To open this type of bill to amendment would open the tariff code to all kinds of destructive propositions in the name of retaliation. That is the road to a Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, and that would be bad for American families and the world.

Instead, the bill simply establishes a completely WTO-consistent schedule for the administration, through the United States Trade Representative, to protect U.S. rights in these landmark cases. I urge my colleagues on both

sides of the aisle to support a free and fair trading system. Support this rule and the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very dear friend from California for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, why on earth are we doing this bill today? Why on earth are we doing the World Trade Organization's business when we have not even finished our own business? This Congress has more than its share of unfinished business. For the first time in history, Congress has not produced a budget, but we are going to act as quickly as we can because the United States Trade Representative has not produced a letter as quickly as we wanted.

Mr. Speaker, I am not Chiquita banana, but I am here to say we should not be debating this bill today. I do not know why we are debating this bill dealing with the World Trade Organization's treatment of bananas which this country does not even grow. Where is the bill to reform managed care? Where is the bill to protect Social Security recipients? Where is the bill to reduce class sizes? This Congress has no business enforcing the World Trade Organization's decisions. They have their own enforcement process.

We certainly should not be getting involved in trade issues over commodities that we do not even produce here in the United States. This is ridiculous. With all the unfinished business that we have just talked about, and we are here on martial law to finish our business, now we are going to force the World Trade Organization's decisions.

I think when Congress gets into the business of micromanaging trade agreements, we head towards a very, very slippery slope, bananas or not.

I want to urge my Republican colleagues to forget about this bill and get down to much more pressing issues that are facing this country. Pass a bill to protect the Social Security surplus instead of raiding it for tax breaks. Pass a bill to reduce class sizes and repair schools. Pass a bill to make managed care plans lift their limits on health care services and allow their doctors to make decisions based on how much it will improve people's health and not how much it will cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my friend and say, basically, under the guidelines the United States Congress established as we embarked on entry into the World Trade Organization, we made it clear that only this Congress can enforce these laws. We are the ones who are here today protecting the rights of workers

in two very important industries in this country, and that is exactly what we should be doing. It is a priority, and it must be addressed now as Congress gets ready to complete its work in the coming days and weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Terrace Park, Ohio, (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished vice chairman of the committee for yielding me this time, and I want to support the fair rule that the Committee on Rules has come up with today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to back up for a minute, if I could, and focus on why we are here today and why this is, I think, such a critical vote for the future of the international trading system and for our economy.

This is about whether the World Trade Organization, the WTO that was talked about previously, which is the international organization charged with resolving trade disputes between nations, will work as we have promised it would. If Members will recall, this is the highly touted WTO agreement that this Congress approved just 4 years ago, calling it, among other things, "A vital tool for eliminating the remaining trade barriers facing U.S. farmers and ranchers," which is at stake here.

I voted for the WTO, and I sold it to my constituents on the basis it would resolve these disputes, as did most Members of this House on both sides of the aisle. A majority on both sides of the aisle stood up here and said we are finally going to get to the point, finally, where we are resolving these trade disputes and forcing our trading partners, almost all of whom are more protectionist than us, to comply with international dispute resolution panels.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our competitors in Europe have threatened to turn this highly touted WTO into a paper tiger, and in doing so they have threatened the world economy. After several years of litigation, the European Union has lost two important WTO disputes, one involving bananas, the other involving beef hormones.

When the U.S. has lost, incidentally, we have complied. When the Japanese have lost, they have complied. But the EU has consistently refused to abandon their protectionist regimes and come into compliance with these international rulings, and has engaged in a calculated and deliberate foot-dragging strategy for years.

In fact, it is even worse than that. They have proposed new regimes that all objective observers have agreed are even more inconsistent with international trading rules and, thus, the WTO. Indeed, our own able U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky, has said that the EU's proposed solution is, "Even more WTO-inconsistent than their original WTO-inconsistent regime."

□ 1130

Remember, we are here because that more inconsistent regime with regard

to the banana case goes into effect on January 1; with regard to beef hormones, it is in May.

With so much hazy economic news in the headlines these days, Mr. Speaker, the last thing the world economy needs is a provocative and destabilizing protectionist strategy by the European Union that threatens to undermine the WTO, the only things that stands between orderly international trade and the economic disaster of protectionism worldwide, the law of the jungle.

U.S. farmers, companies and workers, who depend on international trade, are counting on us to ensure that the world marketplace has a level playing field for U.S. products and for U.S. services.

As the gentleman from California noted earlier, the WTO system can only work if there is a threat of punishment for violations, because of the sovereignty clauses.

These two first cases will set the precedent. Unfortunately, they are the first two cases. We have no choice in that. They are going to set the precedent to determine whether the United States will have the tools and will have the willpower to be able to respond when other nations willfully exclude American products from their marketplaces. That is where we are.

The legislation is very simple. It is a clear, straightforward bill, carefully crafted to be consistent with section 301 of the U.S. trade laws, and designed to get the European Union to do the right thing and follow international law.

It simply requires the U.S. Trade Representative to take the very actions authorized by international agreement, if the EU does not come into full compliance with the WTO, by the authorized specified deadlines.

In fact, these are the very actions that the U.S. Trade Representative has indicated she wants to take anyway, but she can't guarantee to this Congress.

By voting for this measure, we can send a clear message to our international competitors. We will not stand idly by while they exclude our products and violate the international trading rules they have agreed to. We will not sit on our hands while they hurt U.S. jobs, U.S. businesses, U.S. farmers. We will not jeopardize the health of the world economy and the world trading system by their attempts to undermine the multilateral trading system under the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, whether we are free traders, whether we are fair traders, whether we are self-proclaimed protectionists, we must be for enforcing international trade agreements we have signed. We have to be.

Vote yes today for American workers, American farmers and American businesses.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the strongest possible opposi-

tion to this politically motivated sneak attack on the small Caribbean banana farmers on behalf of the massive Chiquita Banana Corporation and its CEO Carl Lindner.

The Republican leadership, led by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) in the House, are trying to move this punitive attack on the small banana farmers from the former island colonies in the Caribbean.

This bill would force punitive, harsh measures on thousands of small farmers and their families throughout the Windward Islands of the eastern Caribbean. The small island nations of the Caribbean, which depend on the banana trade for their economic survival, are at great risk if this bill passes.

Let me just tell you what the real deal is. First of all, we have to ask ourselves, why at the eleventh hour do we get this sneak attack, with all of these Members tied to Carl Lindner lined up on the floor talking about unfair trade practices? I will tell the Members why.

Chiquita Bananas and Mr. Lindner lost \$356.9 million and now they have got their representatives running to this floor to help him make more money. He is worth \$13 billion. That is not enough.

I tell my colleagues what he is trying to do. He is trying to get rid of the competition that comes from these small Caribbean islands.

Yes, there was a relationship between the European Union and the former colonies. It was a relationship that allowed them to sell their bananas on the European Union market, because they had been colonies depending on that relationship.

Now, with them having their independence, this is what they do to earn a living. These are small family farms. I have gone down through all of these countries, countries like Dominica depend on this banana. It is 70 percent of its economy.

We took them to the WTO. It was my friend, Mickey Kantor, who was working for Carl Lindner. Mickey Kantor was with this administration, and I do not back up from Democrats or Republicans on this one. Mr. Lindner has bought his way through this House and through this administration. Mickey Kantor took the message from Carl Lindner. We went to the WTO, even though we do not grow any bananas here. This is not about American workers.

Mr. Lindner's farms are all down through Central and South America, with slave labor, unfair practices. These people are at risk in these farms because they are at risk from the pesticides, with no help, limbs falling off. They make less than minimum wages, but Mr. Lindner wants to keep those farms going, wants to make more money, so he comes in here and gets all of you to act on his behalf, including Mickey Kantor, and the WTO made a decision.

The WTO ruled against these small farms, but they recognized it was wrong, so now the United States and the WTO and these small-farm islands are involved in negotiations and working so that they can help these little countries diversify their economies so they will not starve to death.

The drug dealers are just waiting to pounce on these little countries because they know, without the banana, they have nothing else.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. No, I will not yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I will not yield because this is a shame, and I want the press to get this scandal about to happen. I want them to know what you are doing. As a matter of fact, this is the kind of legislating the American public hates, sneak attacks for billionaires who use their power to come to the floor of this Congress and get something like this at the last minute.

Get out of the WTO's business. Let them work this out in the way that they are doing. Stop being lackeys for Carl Lindner. It is outrageous that you would do this today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was just asking my very good friend from Los Angeles to yield. The reason being that when we as a Congress in a bipartisan way tried to really throw a life raft to those struggling nations in the eastern Caribbean by passing the Caribbean-based initiative, it is my understanding that my friend from Los Angeles voted actually against that initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Bakersfield, California (Mr. THOMAS), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, I began meeting with European parliamentarians in a joint meeting between Members of Congress and the European parliament. It was over the discussion of the Europeans' failure to open their markets to agricultural products from the United States and, frankly, from other countries around the world.

They had what they called a common agricultural policy, but it was really a social policy. They wanted to make sure they subsidized their agriculture products to keep their people down on the farm.

□ 1140

Over those 20 years, the European Parliament and the European Union has grown and the United States has continued to grow, but there has been virtually no movement in opening European markets. The gentlewoman from California's desire to focus the debate on bananas frankly misses the mark completely. I would have wished

it would have been the raisin issue that would have been the first issue in front of WTO. We could have used that. It could have been the pasta issue. It could have been the canned peaches issue. It is in fact the beef hormone issue, along with bananas. The argument that this is being done for some individual for some nefarious reason really misses the mark of world economics.

The entire world got behind the United States when we said the old trading order would not work. Agricultural products were not even part of the agreement in the old world structure. Under the WTO, the commitment was agriculture would be covered and when you won a case, you could get it resolved.

The Europeans have no intention of changing. The, I am sure, well-intentioned although totally naive assumption that this is over one individual or one product fails to understand the real issue. We have an international agreement. The Europeans are once again failing to live up to it and, will do everything they can not to live up to it. It is our responsibility to get them to do so, not just for us but for the rest of the trading world. If this administration will not go forward with appropriate steps in a timely fashion, it is incumbent upon the Congress to move. This is the vehicle.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this trading system that we have developed recently, is it not wonderful? Is it not just, if you will excuse the expression, peaches? Is it not just the top banana? Is it not just a great system we have now?

All you have to do is pick the paper up every morning, turn on the news every evening, to understand that it is falling apart. It is a disaster. In case my friends have not noticed, in Asia people have no money to buy the products we are trying to sell them. They have no money in Russia to do the same thing. They have no money in Brazil, they have no money in Canada, and now we are going to pick on farmers, family farmers in the Caribbean who are trying to make a living for themselves and say, "The WTO knows what's best for you."

The WTO, that secret organization that meets in secret, we cannot find out when they meet. We just went through a week in this town where the leaders of the economic community in the world came here from the IMF and the World Bank in their limousines and their stretch limousines to try to get this mess in order.

But they will not get it in order because they miss the central point, and the central point is, when people do not have money or the wherewithal to buy the products, the system will break down and will fail. And that is what is happening in Asia, it is what is happening in Russia, it is what is happening

in Latin America, and we are right behind them.

So the question is on this bill not just a few farmers in the Caribbean, and God knows we ought to be looking out for them, because when we look out for their interests we look out after the interests of our own workers here and our own farmers. It is really a broader debate here. It is about if we are going to continue with a system of unfettered markets.

I know there are people who worship at the altar of unfettered markets. But unfettered markets means that people like Mr. Lindner and the big corporate multinationals will dictate policy in every aspect of this world economy, to the detriment of working men and women and working men and women farmers. That is what this is about. That is what this bill is all about.

We say, well, why are you here on the floor talking about these poor farmers in the Caribbean? Because it is the farmers in Florida who have suffered under this same type of discrimination. We used to sell tomatoes in Florida. That whole crop is disappearing because of WTO, NAFTA-related ideas.

What do you mean by that? I will tell you what I mean by that. They send the tomatoes from Mexico into the United States. Those tomatoes are picked by kids who are 10 and 11 years of age, who do not go to school. They are sprayed by pesticides that are illegal here and are dangerous here. We have determined that.

Because of those standards on labor and environmental standards, they have put our farmers out of business in the tomato industry in Florida and on the Eastern Shore in Maryland. If you talk to the farmers in the Central Valley in California, they will tell you that because of these policies that we have, their products being shipped into Mexico are down between 50 and 85 percent, vegetables, fruit, olives, almonds.

This is a great system we have here. When are we going to wake up? When are we going to start protecting the people who need the money to buy the products? Because without any money, the system collapses, and we are watching it collapse today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Apparently my good friend has missed the past 7 years of dynamic economic growth which has taken place because of exports and imports to this country which have dramatically improved our standard of living. They are going down this road towards very, very intense class warfare once again. But let us look at the class warfare that they have embarked upon.

They are trying to penalize the people of Central America, in countries like Honduras where the per capita buying power is \$2,000, or Guatemala where the per capita buying power is \$3,460; actually against those who are in very, very sad shape in Jamaica, their per capita buying power is \$3,260, and in Belize it is \$2,960. So the fact of

the matter is the people of Central America, who support us in this decision, believe that we are doing the right thing, are supportive of the WTO, they are being hurt and they are worse off than the ones we are supposedly helping.

All we are saying is that we need to have at least a modicum of fairness. I think that as we have heard now from the distinguished minority whip, it is important to look at the words of the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), who just this week in a letter said, "We have no reason to believe that the EU will comply with the WTO rulings on the banana case before the December 31, 1998 deadline set by the WTO. Failure to do so by the EU would set a terrible precedent for the WTO's ability to open global markets, particularly in the agriculture sectors."

We are talking about beef, we are talking about bananas in this case, but it could be anything. I look at my friend from South Boston. I remember when he had a big opening of a Gillette plant. Back before we enacted the gift ban, he even sent a razor around to a few of us. Tell me, what is going to happen when the goal of exporting razors, when they are impacted negatively?

These are two instances that are very, very key and important, and they are I think going to be addressed effectively by someone who is a rancher and understands the needs of ranchers, the gentleman who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means who is from Stillwater, OK (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is quite an interesting debate. I was seated on this side of the aisle for 14 years. I made a lot of friends on the Democratic side. I am now on the majority side, the Republican side.

I have been interested in this debate. It is part of the things that affect me as I try to serve my constituency, because I serve a great deal of cattle people, and this debate seems like it doesn't even appear on this side of the aisle to be concerned about the United States cattle people. They are going through the lowest prices they have seen in years, the droughts. It seems like there is no concern about that.

I think the men and women on our side of the aisle have a concern. We cannot ignore the fact that we are in a global, competitive economy. I do not think anyone out there will deny that fact. We are not going to go back to an isolated country. Let me say if we are going to be a leader in the world, in the world economy, and I want to, I want our country to use the initiatives, the free enterprise system, and be that leader out there in the economy, because we owe it to our children and we

owe it to our grandchildren not to shirk our duty, but let us go out and lead.

I come to the floor to express my strong support for H.R. 4761 because today we have a blatant abuse and we have a sham, and yes, the sneak attacks we have heard, but it is being conducted by the European Union. Those are where we have got problems. Let me share with my colleagues why.

Since 1989, nearly 10 years ago, the European Union has imposed a ban on beef treated with growth-producing hormones. Since 98 percent of all of our beef produced in the United States uses growth hormones, even though all our scientists say we have got the greatest quality beef in the world, even the European Union says we have the greatest quality of beef, we cannot sell our beef to the European Union because they have blocked us with that little clause.

□ 1150

Now both the WTO, the dispute settlement panel and the payment bodies have ruled that the EU is in violation of its WTO obligations and have ordered the EU to drop its ban by May 1999 through the appeal process, but now they are changing courses. They are going to just change and say we are not going to buy it for that, we will do something different. If we do not put some teeth in the WTO, then we are just flaunting the situation and we are not carrying out and providing the needs of our American farmers and ranchers and working people. We have got to make sure they live up to it.

Many of my colleagues may ask why this matter should be of concern to them. In a parochial sense, yes, it is important to many of us because the toll demand has taken on our cattlemen and ranchers is causing them to go bankrupt.

In a larger sense though the beef case is important because it will test whether or not the WTO framework can endure.

The United States helped create the WTO because it offered the first real opportunity to force other Nations to drop their unfair restrictions and open their markets to U.S. products.

The key difference between the new WTO and the old GATT framework is that under the WTO parties in disputes agree that the WTO findings will be binding. If the EU refuses to abide by WTO's ruling and fails to change its misguided policies, it will forever undermine the legitimacy of WTO. It will fail. If the EU refuses to comply, why should any other Nation be forced, why should the United States be forced to alter its policies and abide by WTO rulings?

We are talking about a major significant policy that is going to affect the future of this country, our economic position in the world and the future for our children and our grandchildren. I ask for my colleagues' support for H.R. 4761.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote no on this rule out of protest, protest of America's trade policies.

It started in 1909 when we moved off on a sophisticated cerebral process of continuing to reduce and eliminate tariffs, and it sounded so progressive.

Let my colleagues label me what they want, Mr. Speaker. We replace tariffs in America with the income tax, my colleagues, the 16th amendment, and if we want to debate tariffs, let us debate the income tax which has, in my opinion, destroyed the potential of economic gain on a perpetual basis.

The top Republican in our history, Teddy Roosevelt, once said:

We must always equal, equal, the advantages of foreign industry versus American industry.

We have not done that.

Now we have a World Trade Organization. I voted against NAFTA, GATT and the WTO. The WTO is another international organization we have to go to to remedy our problems. Beam me up.

Check out Venezuelan oil disputes. They voted with Venezuela, just like the United Nations. How much more money do we give them? They vote against Uncle Sam almost every time.

We may be talking about bananas today and beef hormone; what about steel? They are dumping steel in America at record levels, and Congress cannot act. We have to wait for someone in the steel industry to spend their money to take a shot with the WTO. This is sad.

Why manufacture in America, my colleagues? With this trade policy?

Here is exactly the way it is, America:

If someone manufactures in America, they have got IRS and Social Security, Workman's Comp and Unemployment Comp, OSHA, EPA, banking regulations, security regulation, pension law, health insurance, local tax, State tax, local law, State law and a \$20-an-hour average manufacturing cost. If someone moves to Mexico, there is no IRS, no Social Security, no OSHA, no EPA, no pensions, no health insurance, no minimum wage, and they hire people at 50 cents an hour.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues do not think it is happening, they now have a \$16 billion surplus. When we passed NAFTA, we had a \$2 billion surplus.

We are screwed up here.

Now I want to talk about steel because we are about to give \$18 billion to an International Monetary Fund that will bail out Brazil, that is dumping steel in the United States of America, and the rational is: give Brazil money so they could buy our products.

How dumb are we?

We do not have to be protectionists, but, by God, we need a reciprocal trade

agreement. When a country is screwing us, we should not have to go to some international group and ask them to help us. That is our job here.

I am voting no on the rule out of stone-cold protest to an economic policy that is taking us down an inexorable path to another depression.

Now, no one has said this on the floor, and they could call me what they want, but I am going to make this prediction:

If we do not deal with illegal trade, if we do not deal with reciprocal trade agreements that are fair to give Uncle Sam a fighting chance in this global economy, my colleagues, we are down an inexorable path for failure and bankruptcy as a Nation. We are subsidizing the world, and the world is denying us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not demean the efforts of my friend from Ohio. He has done a great job here, and bananas and beef hormones, I am sure, need attention. But, my colleagues, we do not build skyscrapers, we do not build homes, we do not build industry with just bananas. Steel is a big part of it, too. Steel is a big part of it, too.

Later today there will be a move to try and help our steel industry. I am going to ask for my colleague's support. And with that I will vote no on the rule out of protest.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just for an example, Mr. Speaker, as we are debating this very important bill, a copy of the bill is not present here at the desk. Again, we are dealing in never-never land.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will give a copy of the bill to my friend. We had it in the Committee on Rules last night.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know I have seen it, but I said it is not at the desk for other people who want to know what the bill is all about.

Mr. DREIER. There it is right there.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that this day should go down in congressional history as a congressional sneak attack day.

□ 1200

First, we have the marshal law, and that is a sneak attack against America. This is a law which will allow Speaker NEWT GINGRICH to make the laws for America, thereby denying a school modernization bill, denying the protection and reservation of Social

Security, and denying the Patients' Bill of Rights.

We have a sneak attack against some of our very best neighbors, some of the individuals and nations that we are trying to do trade with, who buy our consumer goods, who create job opportunities in America, our Caribbean nations, and our Caribbean neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the CBI. I voted for the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I did not vote for the fast track when it was politicized and it was determined that Americans would lose jobs. But I did vote for us to be friendly to our Caribbean neighbors because they represent an economic market for us.

We have a bill that was not even on the Floor, that Members have not even read, that frankly is a sneak attack against our Caribbean neighbors like Jamaica and countries where they are struggling to maintain an economy, where their economy is dependent upon bananas, on plantations, yes, with depressed salaries and compensation, but all that they have, where they are trying to bolster up their economy, where they have a trading relationship with the European nations. And now America in a sneak attack wants to break those relationships so, therefore, we will not have the kind of economic stability in our Caribbean nations.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE from Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time to yield. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, what a disgrace. It frankly is a disgrace that we come to the floor of the House and violate the sacred relationships with those who are on our border who are seeking, Mr. Speaker, to maintain their economic base.

This is a sneak attack against our trade representatives, because there are many of us who believe that they need to do a better job in working with the relationship that the Caribbean nations have with the European countries which give them their economic base. If we want to break that relationship, Mr. Speaker, then what is America doing to help bolster up the economy of the Caribbean nations?

We are already at a fragile international monetary crisis. The Asian nations are trembling. Do we now want to have those on our very border trembling and then collapse? Is this what we want to do with this sneak attack trade bill, break the very economic backs of these countries whose only sole income is the marketing and producing of bananas?

Are we so small, Mr. Speaker, this giant of a nation, that we cannot share the international economy so that small countries, barely surviving, can provide some kind of safety net for their own citizens?

This is a great day in America's history. The big and ominous America crushing down on small countries,

breaking their economic system, throwing people who are making pennies out into the streets because we are jealous, if you will, of the relationship they have with the Europeans.

I would be willing to find some solution to this problem, Mr. Speaker, if we could sit around the trade table fairly with the Caribbean nations, with America, with our European friends, maybe with the banana folk that we are trying to build up over here. I do not think that our banana industry is on the collapse. They are doing quite well. I like bananas.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we need to get out of the business of a sneak attack and crashing down on our neighbors. I think we need to defeat this rule and defeat this agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was asking my friend the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to yield just to make a couple of quick points. First of all, I would say that the countries of Central America, where the per capita buying power is in fact lower than it is in the countries to which the gentlewoman is referring, are simply working for fairness.

The people of Honduras, with a \$2,000 per capita buying power, versus those in Belize and Jamaica who have roughly \$3,000 per capita buying power, are the ones we are talking about who are seeking fairness. They support us in this effort.

I think it is also very, very important to note this is not a sneak attack. We have been, for 7 years, trying to resolve this, and we have finally got to the point where action needs to be taken before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from West Chester, Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised today that the Members are not really at all interested in moving forward on this bill. Whether we are from a protectionist background or whether we believe in free and fair and open trade, everyone ought to be for this bill because what this bill says, very simply, is we are going to force the other countries in the world to live by an agreement that we all signed.

The Congress of the United States signed onto the GATT agreement. We signed onto the World Trade Organization. What we are saying today is we want the rest of the world to live up to the agreements that they signed onto with us.

We can talk about bananas. This fight has been going on for a long time. It is an issue that will probably continue. But the World Trade Organization needs to make a decision and needs to follow through on it.

But I have found it rather interesting that Members that have come down here to support the interests of Caribbean farmers, small family farmers, let

us not forget the other issue in this bill. The other issue here is for cattle producers in America who over the last several years have dealt with the lowest prices they have had.

Why do they have low prices? Because we are unable to export our beef to some countries and some nations and areas of the world, including the European Union. The European Union has oversubsidized their farmers for years and flooded the markets and depressed prices for our farmers. We have heard earlier the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), and I am sure we will hear from several of our other colleagues about what the European Union is doing in terms of blocking our ability to export beef grown by U.S. farmers, U.S. family farmers, to the European Union.

What this bill does today is force the WTO to do what they should be doing, and that is to enforce GATT and to enforce an agreement that we all agreed to. This is about keeping your word. We want to keep our word in this deal, and we want to keep our word to U.S. farm producers and cattlemen who deserve this effort today.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am really disappointed that we are bringing this bill to the floor at this particular time. I am going to oppose the rule. I am going to oppose the bill as well.

I want to bring a little light on this. First of all, this bill never went through the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means that had jurisdiction over this issue, and it had not come through the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill was introduced on the 9th of this month, and it was brought to the floor so quickly. We wonder why this was all happening, particularly in view of the fact the USTR, the U.S. Government cannot even act at this time.

It has not even been 15 months since the WTO had made its ruling. Under the WTO ruling, which the United States has agreed to, 15 months must transpire so the Europeans can become in compliance, and that date is January 7. If we were talking about this on the 3rd or 4th or 5th of January, I would say that is very timely. We should be making these statements and taking these actions. But the fact of the matter is we are bringing it up in the waning days of the session.

The administration has told Members informally they are going to take action, but they cannot take formal action yet because it is not January 2, 1999.

Why are we doing this? We have never taken 301 action, the House of Representatives, never in the history of this institution. Why is this Congress doing this? We did not do it on semiconductors in the early 1980s

against the Japanese. We did not do it for the movie industry. We have not done it for pharmaceuticals. We have not done it for aircraft. We have not done it for steel. We have not done it for autos and auto parts. But we are going to do it for bananas. We are going to do it for bananas.

Do my colleagues know what? I have checked. The only place in the 50 States where they produce bananas is in Hawaii. In Hawaii. We are not even going to create jobs by taking this action. Hawaii only produces a very small number. They do not even export out of their State. So all of a sudden we are taking this monumental, unprecedented action for bananas. Not one job will be created by this.

I have to believe that, again, just as we took a vote 2 weeks ago on fast track, which we all knew was going to be defeated, this Congress has destroyed trade policy. I hope every lobbyist that watches this debate understands what is happening with the Republican rule of trade policy.

□ 1210

They have destroyed the bipartisan consensus we have had, because they want to take action to help people, lobbyists, because we know, we know because bananas are not produced in the United States, it is only to help multinational corporations.

I have to tell my colleagues that again, again, the United States is going to be isolated on a little island. We only represent a small part of the trading world, we only represent a small part of the consumers of the world; and this decision and decisions like it are going to be regretted by this body.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume very briefly to say that this action does not go into effect for 15 months, and I think it is very important to note, I would say to my friend, that this is the first, these are the first two items under the WTO structure. Bananas and beef are the first issues that have been addressed by the WTO. The other issues which my friend raised were long before the World Trade Organization even existed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, just responding to my good friend from California, I have to say, why not allow the administration to take its action. The administration will take action; the gentleman knows it, I know it. But what we want to do is do a little political game here. That is why we are doing that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend that we asked the administration to do a letter and they flat out refused in response to our request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed with the comments of my colleague and friend from California.

He knows as well as I do this legislation does not go into effect until after the 15-month period. He knows as well as I do that the applications under this particular WTO consistent regime go into effect November 15. He knows as well as I do we are going out of session this week. He knows as well as I do we have to do it before we go out. He knows as well as I do that we asked for a letter from the administration, a very straightforward letter saying that they will enforce the international trading rules. He knows as well as I do that under WTO, this case is pending under WTO. We have a right to do that.

He knows as well as I do that the legislation is consistent with WTO. He knows as well as I do that all of those other products he listed, if he get through the WTO process, if they got to the point where they make a decision, it may win an appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I just have to say that I have worked with the gentleman on this for the last week. We just need to stick to the facts. We need to stick to the facts. If we stick to the facts, we will determine that it is time for this Congress to have the United States follow its international obligations.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the underlying bill. Not so much because of the substance and some of the suggestions that are going to be made, but primarily because of the process.

We have a piece of legislation that was introduced just a couple of days ago that has critical and far-ranging impacts, and also has the potential to set a precedent that will come back to haunt us on future trade negotiations.

I also oppose this legislation because I think, quite frankly, that it undermines the integrity of the WTO. We, in the case of bananas and beef hormones, as a country, have won against the European Union in the WTO. What we are doing now, instead of allowing that process to continue, allowing USTR to take the actions which they think are in the best interests of the country, we are having Congress step in and prematurely set the terms of what those negotiations and what those efforts in retaliation should be, and that is not right. That is something that is going to set a precedent that will come back to haunt us on a lot of other different commodities and different trade issues that we might, we might find disagreements on.

I think clearly this is a case where we are micromanaging the efforts of the USTR, and that is wrong. I think by having us identify these retaliatory

actions prematurely we are, in fact, limiting the leverage of the administration and limiting the leverage of USTR, and that is clearly not in our interests.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this legislation is ill-advised, and that we need to have USTR be able to run their course, taking actions which are consistent with the Uruguay Round and the WTO; and if we do so, I think we are going to be much better served.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time so that we can hear another member of the minority talk about not protecting the rights of American workers.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) controls 4½ minutes; the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) controls 4 minutes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The last statement was extraordinary. It is the Republican perception when they talk about American workers, they are talking about the CEO of a multinational company. That, to them, is the embodiment of the average American worker. When they talk about protecting American workers, they are talking also about the CEO of a giant agribusiness pharmaceutical company which produces bovine growth hormones.

They think it is great that the American people have to eat meat laced with bovine growth hormone and they will not even allow labeling of that so an American can know whether it is in the milk or in the meat, because there is a very wealthy guy running that company and they give lots of money to the Republican Party.

So we cannot even have labeling in this country, and now, what are we going to do? We are going to force the Europeans who have wisely said, we are not quite sure whether this stuff is safe, and we are not quite sure that we want our babies and our children to be ingesting beef and milk from cattle which have been laced with this experimental drug.

Now, they have passed a law to say that. We are saying, no, you cannot have those kinds of laws. Where did we go to get their law overturned? The same place where they are going to get our consumer protection laws overturned, our laws to protect American workers: the WTO, a secret tribunal which meets in secret, gives decisions in secret, produces no case, no law, no documents. They just make rulings, no conflict of interest rules at all.

Now, is this the American way? When I asked the past American Trade Representative, how can we bind ourselves to that kind of process? He said, well, you have got to understand, these

other countries in this organization, they do not believe in our system of jurisprudence, they do not believe in open courts, they do not believe in open arguments, any of that.

So, now we have set up a system where the multinationals are always going to win, and sometimes it will be U.S.-based multinational: Chiquita, Monsanto, any other times they will be European-based multinationals. But the losers will always be the consumers and the workers.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my friend, who thought it was sort of an extraordinary statement that I made, when I talked about protecting U.S. jobs and they do not have an interest in doing it, I was talking about jobs in marketing, in shipping, in accounting, and all of the other areas that are impacted by the banana industry; and as we talked about some of these other areas in ranching, look at all the people who work there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my very good friend from Delmar, California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is every individual's right whether to support trade or not to support trade. I personally feel that during GATT, during NAFTA, during fast track, I think each and every one of us had pluses and minuses in those agreements. Why? I think our worst fear is not for the trade itself, but because under either a Republican or Democrat White House, I think you have to eat pabulum to be a member of the State Department. Because when it comes to the protection of our rights as Americans and our workers as Americans, we back off every time.

Let me give my colleagues a classic example. In China over 200 years ago, when we first had ships going into the China ports, there was a sailing ship, they tossed a bucket with a line over and it actually hit a Chinese worker. It killed the young lady. Well, the Chinese stormed the ship, and the Americans repelled boarders, and they would not let the sailor, would not give him up.

Well, then they said that if we did not turn over this worker, then they would cut all trade off from the United States. Well, what happened? With that, the United States gave in. They took the sailor and they executed him.

So it seems, every time. An example with avocados in NAFTA: We begged the administration not to let Mexico import avocados, for the farmers.

□ 1220

But yet the White House insisted that they did, against all of the Members from the States that raised avocados. And right now, California's crops are at risk.

I do not berate my friends on the other side for being concerned. We need to focus on implementing these trade agreements in the White House under Republicans as well. But in this case,

just like in the fast track, the words that I listened to from our farmers and our ranchers and many of my colleagues who represent agriculture districts is that this was the most important vote of the decade for our farmers and ranchers. For one reason or not, some chose not to vote or to vote for it.

But I think in agreements like this, we need to focus on what is good for our American workers, and then focus on the White House and the State Department to carry those through. That is my concern for any trade agreement, not that the Republicans are doing this and the Democrats are doing that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read the last statement of the administration policy on this bill: "H.R. 4761 will undermine our ability to achieve a meaningful solution for U.S. interests and weaken our hand in these trade disputes."

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by recognizing the hard work and the persistence of our Trade Representative and the Department of Agriculture in pursuing the European compliance with WTO decisions on both beef hormones and bananas. Ambassadors Barshefsky and Scher, Secretary Glickman and his team, including Paul Drazek, who has just left the Department and will be sorely missed, have tirelessly raised the beef hormone and banana issues at every opportunity and every level of the European Parliament.

Unfortunately, there is no way to make Europe play by the rules. Even this effort today will not force the Europeans to do anything to remove the barriers to free and fair trade. But it will provide them with a strong incentive to adhere to agreed-upon rules.

Listening to the debate today, I think we can see the difficulties that we have. There are those among us who honestly differ regarding what we should and should not do. I speak today not about bananas. I would just say this on bananas; I agree that we should encourage the Europeans to meet their obligation to provide aid to their former colonies. That aid, however, should not come at the expense of U.S. and Latin American trade interests.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today on behalf of beef. When we say that no one has been hurt in this country, they have been hurt. Tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost in income to cattle producers all over this country; have been lost because of the refusal of the European Union to adhere to the rules that all of us who believe in free and fair trade should adhere to. That is the problem.

By expediting the established process for retaliation against unfair trade

practices, this bill will provide the European Union with an advance list of which of their products will lose favorable tariffs. This list will likely be of great interest to Europeans whose jobs depend on exports of the products listed, just as the WTO cases on beef hormones and bananas are of interest to American ranchers and the thousands of Americans whose jobs depend on fair trade in bananas and in beef.

I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) for including consultation for the Committee on Agriculture in the formulation of the list, which I believe is very appropriate, given that both of these cases, and many of the cases coming down the pike, involved agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying this to those who speak on this floor and suggest that there is something unsafe about the American food supply. They do no good, no benefit to the producers. We have the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply at the lowest cost to our people. It does no good to suggest otherwise to the people of America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, I would like to say that I believe that support of this rule is the right thing for us to do. Why? Because an overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans a few Congresses ago voted to establish a rules-based trading system. We did so in the pursuit of reduced tariff barriers so that we could improve opportunities for our manufacturers and producers to export, and also to improve the quality of life, equally important, here in the United States by allowing imports to come in.

Free trade is, in fact, the wave of the future and it is something that we need to recognize. Under this rules-based trading system, we have unfortunately run into a problem. Seven years ago, 7 years ago, this case was filed on bananas. We also have seen, following, the hormone case in beef. We are trying to resolve that. We have tried to get a letter, and I hope very much that we still will be able to get a strong letter from the administration raising concerns with the European Union about this.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that this is potentially just the beginning. There are many other industries in this country that could be detrimentally impacted by those kinds of negative actions by others of our trading partners who are not playing fairly.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to do the fair thing for American workers. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, today marks a historic moment in U.S. economic history. Over fifty years ago, this nation embraced a multilateral, rule-based approach to our international trade policy with the creation of the GATT. Our acceptance of the role of multilateral institutions in international trade did not

occur in a vacuum. It arose out of the ashes of the great depression and World War II. For two decades we witnessed the human damage which unilateral protectionism, nationalism and economic stagnation could bring, and we vowed never to let it happen again.

During the Bretton Woods conference in 1948 the United States helped establish the framework for the creation of GATT. The objectives of the GATT system were simple: to promote trade liberalization and to guarantee stable conditions for market access on a non-discriminatory basis by creating a set of transparent rules and dispute-settlement procedures. World leaders of that time believed—as I do today—that increased economic integration through trade would strengthen world stability and provide a bulwark of democracy in the emerging Cold War.

And the system, although far from perfect, worked. Nations opened their markets and began to view other nations as trading partners, rather than antagonists. The results have been dramatic. For the past fifty years the world has experienced a degree of economic growth and stability which was unimaginable to our forefathers. In my view, this stability and prosperity are in no small part due to the growth of international commerce among nations.

Since the adoption of the GATT we have been working to perfect the multilateral trading system. A great steep forward was taken when this Congress adopted the Uruguay Round Agreements Act in 1995. With the adoption of this act, the GATT and its successor organization the World Trade Organization—moved from its inception as a forum for discussing tariff reductions for trade in goods to cover such diverse and important areas as intellectual property, services and agriculture. Most important, the GATT moved away from a slow and ineffective dispute resolution forum to one based on clear, objective criteria, enforced through a multilateral system of debate, consultation, negotiation, adjudication and consensus.

Clearly one of the most important benefits of the WTO is the enhanced dispute settlement process. Under the old system, U.S. exporters with legitimate grievances against foreign trade barriers had to wait years before cases were resolved. The system was excruciatingly slow and—in the end—largely ineffectual. In contrast, the new dispute settlement procedures provide U.S. exporters with a relatively quick and effective system for resolving trade grievances. And it has worked largely to our advantage. The United States won far more cases than any other nation and the WTO has become an effective tool in our trade arsenal to open foreign markets and level the playing field for U.S. exporters.

This brings us to where we are today. We have a rule based system that works to our advantage and a dispute settlement process that enables us to bring multilateral legitimacy to our international trade complaints. Today, when we win a case in the WTO, our position is clearly strengthened vis-a-vis our trading partners. But we must have compliance.

The United States won two significant cases against the European Union. The first ruling determined that the EU banana import licensing and quota scheme was designed to favor European importers over U.S. suppliers. The second determined that the EU ban against U.S. beef was not based upon sound science

but served as a non-tariff trade barrier to U.S. beef imports. But, rather than comply with these rulings and open their markets to U.S. products the EU is seeking to take advantage of a loop-hole in the system, a loop-hole which, if allowed to be exploited, will result in endless meeting and meaningless negotiations. It will also establish a precedent for compliance with WTO decisions which would seriously damage the effectiveness of the dispute settlement mechanism. What we are saying here today is no. We will not accept endless negotiations over true market access. When the WTO makes a ruling, we expect compliance within a reasonable period. If not, we will take actions consistent with the WTO to enforce our rights.

That is what this historic legislation does. It sets out a clear framework for compliance, a framework which is completely consistent with our international commitments under the WTO. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill and I urge my colleagues to show their support for American exporters and to protect our rights under the multilateral system. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the rule for H.R. 4761.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 588 the closed rule which blocks all amendments to H.R. 4761, a very punitive bill which would destroy small Caribbean family farmers and their banana industry.

Why are my colleagues on the Majority side of the aisle in such a hurry to seek the destruction—in the dead of the night—of vulnerable Caribbean banana farmers especially in light of the recent devastation wrought against these islands by the recent killer hurricane Georges? This last minute sneak attack against our Caribbean friends and in favor of the Chiquita Banana Corporation must not be allowed to stand.

We must not let our tiny neighbors in the Caribbean be the victims of our fight with the European Union and the WTO. I urge my colleagues to reject this last minute “cover of darkness trick”. Say no to this unconscionable action and support our friends in the Caribbean. Vote against the rule and against H.R. 4761.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentlelady from California, in voicing my adamant opposition to this bill.

Last year, the World Trade Organization (WTO) issued an interim ruling against the European Union's (EU) banana program for the Caribbean. This ruling was in response to a U.S. claim of trade protections, on behalf of the Chiquita Banana Company, who wants to sell to European countries. The WTO ruling, if implemented, will destabilize the economic and social infrastructure of Caribbean countries. This ruling is particularly problematic given the fact that we have been unable to enact a Caribbean trade bill to assist this region with economic development.

This situation would be particularly harmful to eastern Caribbean countries, like Dominica, where banana exports account for 70 percent of the income and employment. We should not underestimate the impact this action will have on the enhancement of drug trafficking as an economic replacement for the banana industry. The WTO has demonstrated neither understanding of, nor concern for the problems of these small developing countries. I have repeatedly called on the Administration to ensure that the thousands of small Caribbean

banana farmers, and the economies of so many Caribbean nations, not be damaged in any way.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4761. It is a bill that rewards one special interest at the expense of many of our Caribbean allies and more importantly it will consign Caribbean peoples to further economic devastation beyond that experienced by the recent hurricane. This bill deserves to be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this resolution will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such roll call votes, if postponed, will be taken later.

VETERANS' BENEFITS ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1998

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 592) providing for the concurrence by the House with amendments in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4110.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 592

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 4110, with the amendment of the Senate thereto, and to have concurred in the amendment of the Senate with the following amendments:

(1) Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services provided to Persian Gulf War veterans, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing health care, compensation, education, insurance, and other benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

(2) In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References to title 38, United States code.

TITLE I—PROVISIONS RELATING TO VETERANS OF PERSIAN GULF WAR AND FUTURE CONFLICTS

Sec. 101. Agreement with National Academy of Sciences regarding evaluation of health consequences of service in Southwest Asia during the Persian Gulf War.

Sec. 102. Health care for veterans of Persian Gulf War and future conflicts.

Sec. 103. National center on war-related illnesses and post-deployment health issues.

Sec. 104. Coordination of activities.

Sec. 105. Improving effectiveness of care of Persian Gulf War veterans.

Sec. 106. Contract for independent recommendations on research and for development of curriculum on care of Persian Gulf War veterans.

Sec. 107. Extension and improvement of evaluation of health status of spouses and children of Persian Gulf War veterans.

TITLE II—EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Subtitle A—Education Matters

Sec. 201. Calculation of reporting fee based on total veteran enrollment during a calendar year.

Sec. 202. Election of advance payment of work-study allowance.

Sec. 203. Alternative to twelve semester hour equivalency requirement.

Sec. 204. Medical evidence for flight training requirements.

Sec. 205. Waiver of wage increase and minimum payment rate requirements for government job training program approval.

Sec. 206. Expansion of education outreach services.

Sec. 207. Information on minimum requirements for education benefits for members of the Armed Forces discharged early from duty for the convenience of the Government.

Subtitle B—Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act Amendments

Sec. 211. Enforcement of rights with respect to a State as an employer.

Sec. 212. Protection of extraterritorial employment and reemployment rights of members of the uniformed services.

Sec. 213. Complaints relating to reemployment of members of the uniformed services in Federal service.

TITLE III—COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND INSURANCE

Sec. 301. Medal of Honor special pension.

Sec. 302. Accelerated death benefit for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance participants.

Sec. 303. Assessment of effectiveness of insurance and survivor benefits programs for survivors of veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Sec. 304. National Service Life Insurance program.

TITLE IV—MEMORIAL AFFAIRS

Sec. 401. Commemoration of individuals whose remains are unavailable for interment.

Sec. 402. Merchant mariner burial and cemetery benefits.

Sec. 403. Redesignation of National Cemetery System and establishment of Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs.

Sec. 404. State cemetery grants program.

TITLE V—COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Subtitle A—Administrative Provisions Relating to the Court

Sec. 501. Continuation in office of judges pending confirmation for second term.

Sec. 502. Exemption of retirement fund from sequestration orders.

Sec. 503. Adjustments for survivor annuities.

Sec. 504. Reports on retirement program modifications.

Subtitle B—Renaming of Court

Sec. 511. Renaming of the Court of Veterans Appeals.

Sec. 512. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 513. Effective date.

TITLE VI—HOUSING

Sec. 601. Loan guarantee for multifamily transitional housing for homeless veterans.

Sec. 602. Veterans housing benefit program fund account consolidation.

Sec. 603. Extension of eligibility of members of Selected Reserve for veterans housing loans.

Sec. 604. Applicability of procurement law to certain contracts of department of veterans affairs.

TITLE VII—CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MATTERS

Sec. 701. Authorization of major medical facility projects.

Sec. 702. Authorization of major medical facility leases.

Sec. 703. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 704. Increase in threshold for major medical facility leases for purposes of congressional authorization.

Sec. 705. Threshold for treatment of parking facility project as a major medical facility project.

Sec. 706. Parking fees.

Sec. 707. Master plan regarding use of Department of Veterans Affairs lands at West Los Angeles Medical Center, California.

Sec. 708. Designation of Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Aspinwall, Pennsylvania.

Sec. 709. Designation of Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Gainesville, Florida.

Sec. 710. Designation of Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic, Columbus, Ohio.

TITLE VIII—HEALTH PROFESSIONALS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 801. Short title.

Sec. 802. Scholarship program for Department of Veterans Affairs employees receiving education or training in the health professions.

Sec. 803. Education debt reduction program for Veterans Health Administration health professionals.

Sec. 804. Repeal of prohibition on payment of tuition loans.

Sec. 805. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 806. Coordination with appropriations provision.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS MEDICAL CARE AND MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS

Sec. 901. Examinations and care associated with certain radiation treatment.