order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, October 22, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, October 21, 1997, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR TODAY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled ''Extensions of Remarks.''

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO APPOINT CONFEREES ON S. 1139, SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1139) to reauthorize the programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I have the same connection with the request, that I have been meeting with my friends on the minority side, and I believe we have cleared up the communication problems.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair has not been advised that any matter is resolved.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SISISKY. Reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I will just reiterate that it has been cleared, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under these particular circumstances, the Chair will not entertain the gentleman's request at this point. The Chair has been advised that the minority leader is constrained to the request.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. THOMAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it my understanding that the Chair has ruled that notwithstanding that the ranking minority member has agreed that the procedure is appropriate and proper, the Democratic leadership wishes to override those people who are otherwise in positions of responsibility to mindlessly object to everything? Is that my understanding?

Mr. WISE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Being aware of the pending situation, the Chair is honoring the position communicated by the minority leader.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, so the minority leader——

Mr. WISE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The Chair's response to Members on this side who request unanimous-consent requests, notwithstanding the appropriate minority member agreeing that it is appropriate, cannot be honored because the minority leader says it is not to be honored?

Is that the way the rule works, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can tell the gentleman from California only that, at this point, the Chair has not recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

THE PRESIDENT SUPPORTS THE IRS, THE REPUBLICANS SUPPORT THE TAXPAYERS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the President has announced that he is supporting the IRS, and we are announcing here in Congress that the Republicans are supporting the taxpayers. We are on their side. In a nutshell, that is about what it comes down to.

Of course, that is not the news to anyone who has followed politics in this country since the 1960s. Conservatives are the only friends the taxpayers have had since the 1960's. Taxpayers have known ever since the death of John F. Kennedy that liberal Democrats have a soft spot for the IRS and their heavy-handed ways.

It seems that the tradition continues. After having exposed the IRS abuses before a congressional committee, conservatives in Congress propose a bipartisan plan to fix the IRS and bring real accountability to that agency for the first time in a long time.

But the White House does not agree. The White House thinks that the creation of a politically appointed panel that has absolutely no power will really shake things up at the IRS. Hello?

Mr. Speaker, if the White House thinks the IRS is going to change the way it does business as a result of this panel, things are even worse there than I thought. Then again, maybe it is just reflective of their attitude to support the leadership of the IRS over the taxpayers.

WELCOME TO TYLER ADAM GORSUCH

(Mr. CRAPO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome a new Member to the Crapo organization, Tyler Adam Gorsuch, the adopted son of my administrative assistant Jane Gorsuch and her husband, George. Jane has been with me since I was first sworn into Congress in 1993, and Tyler is their first child.

Tyler arrived in the United States from Seoul, South Korea, on September 4, and now he is 7 months old, happy, and healthy. Tyler is already busy supporting our majority party. He has indicated as only a child can his total support for the family friendly practices in our office, and he is also politically active, as he has volunteered to assist me in my next election. He came to visit my office last week and provided the day's entertainment to my staff. During his second visit to our office he provided invaluable advice to me on the political outlook for my home State of Idaho.

As a father of five children, I understand firsthand the joys of parenthood. My wife Susan and I enjoy watching our children grow through each stage of development, and I know that Jane and George will love and enjoy Tyler just as much.

Congratulations to Jane and George, and best of luck to them as they embark on the most fantastic journey of their lives, parenthood.

BUREAUCRATIC MALAISE AT THE IRS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last year, what did 8 out of 10 taxpayers hear when they called the IRS heartline seeking help to tax questions? Nothing, zip, nada. That is right, 8 out of 10 taxpayers could not even get a hello.

What could possibly explain this pathetic bureaucratic malaise? Is the IRS understaffed? No, one hundred and six thousand employees should be adequate, even if all they did was just pick up the phone and say hello.

□ 1815

Is the problem underfunding? No; $7.3 billion in an annual budget; clearly, that is not the problem. The problem lies with the IRS's lack of accountability.

For years the IRS has bullied, harassed, terrorized the citizens of this country while answering to no one, not even answering the phone. Now, with allegations of taxpayer abuse coming to light, layer of Washington bureaucrats after layer shifted the blame for the sorry state of affairs at the IRS until the President has finally been forced to address the issue. How did he respond? He said, quote: ''I believe the IRS is functioning better today than it was 5 years ago.''

Come on, Mr. Speaker. It is time for the President to get real, get serious, and join the Republican Congress and fix the IRS.

CFC-CONTAINING INHALERS SHOULD NOT BE BANNED

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call again the Members' attention to a concern I have that the EPA and FDA will ban measured-dose inhalers containing CFC that are vitally needed by asthmatics to treat them when they are suffering from a lack of air to their lungs.

The EPA and FDA clearly are on the wrong side of this issue. There are over 70 types of inhalers today used by asthmatics at a time of critical need. We commend the EPA for attempting to ban CFC in all of our products as they have in hair spray, underarm deodorant, car refrigeration, air conditioning systems, and other things. But the amount of CFC sent into the air by inhalers used by asthmatics is minimal and marginal.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. C. Everett Koop joins us in an attempt to block the EPA and FDA from embarking on this rule that will have devastating consequences to those who suffer from asthma. Thirty million Americans suffer from asthma. Thirty million Americans need this vital medication. Thirty million Americans asked the EPA and FDA to relax this idea and not institute a ban and allow medical science to prove that when we do have adequate medication available, we will then take those products containing CFC off the market.

NAFTA DOES NOT KEEP ITS PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THUNE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, they are your typical working family, husband, wife, two kids. Both parents work in an auto plant, but they are still having trouble making ends meet.

They dream of moving into a little nicer home and providing an education for their children, but it is hard to get ahead when they only make $40 a week apiece, barely enough to put food on the table and keep their kids in clothes.

Rafael and Felicia Espinoza work for a large multinational corporation in a maquiladora plant in Reynosa, Mexico, across the border from McAllen, Texas. They make 90 cents an hour. For them, as for thousands of American workers with whom they compete for jobs, NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, is a series of broken promises.

I sat with Rafael and Felicia last Thursday afternoon in their ramshackle home in one of the hundreds of colonias that have sprung up around Reynosa in Mexico. They have no electricity, no running water. They have a propane tank to fuel their cooking stove, and they have hooked up a cheap little television to a car battery.

They told me their roof leaked. They said they suffer in the winter because the house is poorly constructed. As we talked, their children, happy as most children are when they have loving parents, ran barefoot on the dirt floor. Rafael is a proud man, but he worries about the future because a kilogram of chicken costs up to 30 pesos, about 10 percent of his weekly wage.

NAFTA has failed Rafael and Felicia in part because the Mexican Government refuses to enforce its labor laws. Companies under Mexican law are required to distribute 10 percent of their profits to their workers. Needless to say the Espinosas and their coworkers have yet to see a peso of these profits. The American company claims that it has no profits from its Mexican operations, which they say operates as a cost center, not a profit center.

The NAFTA side agreement on labor has been no help to the Espinoza family. Indeed, they have seen other workers lose their jobs by trying to form an independent union to replace the company controlled syndicate, leaders of which have been known to inform on the reformers.

They are undaunted. ''I am going to continue going forward,'' Rafael said in Spanish, all the while looking straight at me. ''There is no law that says it is a crime to have a real union. Even if they fire us, we will continue fighting until we have a union that will wake up and defend our rights under the law.

''The company says it is losing money, but we know it is not. We need the maquiladoras because of our terrible necessity to be working, but they are taking advantage of us for their own interests. We know the company does not want bad publicity, so why is there such injustice? I am not afraid,'' he continued, ''on going forward for myself and my family for my children. We will not quit.''

A neighbor, Rita Gonzalez, earns about a dollar an hour. Out of her $40 weekly paycheck, her employer deducts $9 for a very small stove which she proudly showed off in her tiny home, one-quarter of her paycheck for the next 52 weeks for an appliance that would not cost $200 in the United States.

While the Gonzalez family was lucky enough to have electricity, they have no running water and no indoor plumbing. Her brother-in-law, who is 25, suffered nerve damage to his face. They think it is because he worked around massive doses of lead at this American company doing business in Mexico, this American company, of course, which does not use lead in its operations in the United States.

The NAFTA agreement has failed utterly to keep its promises to Rafael and Felicia and Rita and thousands of Mexican workers. They have no effective representation in their workplace. NAFTA has failed to keep its promises to thousands of working American families. They cannot be expected to compete for a dollar an hour. And it has failed to keep its promise of a cleaner environment. The border is a disaster area of polluted water and chemical poisons.

A trip to the border exposes almost immediately NAFTA's broken promises. And those promises should be kept before we rush headlong into another trade agreement that punishes workers on both sides of the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain further 1 minutes at this point.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 158 colleagues joined me in a bill that I introduced called the Paycheck Protection Act. This legislation was introduced to address a problem that occurs throughout the country and is a shame when we begin to think about it. It is a problem that not many people know about, except those individuals who are hard-working wage earners throughout the country who happen to belong to labor unions.

Mr. Speaker, what labor unions are able to do in America today is skim off a portion of workers' union dues and put that cash toward political purposes to support candidates which the wage earner may, in fact, not support, and they do this without securing the consent of the worker who earns the cash in the first place.