why not liberate the entire American community to bring the full weight if its influence to bear upon Cuban people? Implementing an aggressive engagement policy to transmit our values to the Cuban people and to accelerate the burgeoning process of reform occurring on the island has a far better chance of ending Castro's rule than the machinations of Helms-Burton.

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES OF MEAT PRODUCTS FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION UNTIL CERTAIN UNFAIR TRADE BARRIERS ARE REMOVED

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1996

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will put American livestock producers on an equal footing with their European counterparts when it comes to illegal trade barriers. The European Union currently blocks United States beef imports simply because U.S. producers use hormones in the production of the beef. The E.U. also continues to block U.S. pork imports under their so called Third Country Meat Directive claiming that U.S. processing plants do not meet European standards.

These non-tariff trade barriers are in clear violation of the phytosanitary agreements which are part of the GATT. Scientists from around the world have determined that the use of these hormones poses no risk to human health. In 1992, through an exchange of letters, the Europeans agreed that U.S. and E.U. slaughter and processing procedures were essentially identical. The only reason for these bans is to keep U.S. meat out of European markets.

Since 1989, when the hormone ban went into effect, the Europeans have sent over $2 billion worth of meat products to the United States. During the same period. U.S. exports to the E.U. totaled only $342 million. Clearly the Europeans have little incentive to expedite the negotiations to end this unreasonable trade barrier.

The GATT agreement should be an effective tool to remove the hormone ban, but the Europeans have shown little commitment to working out these issues. On January 26 of this year, U.S. Trade Representative Kantor initiated formal action in the World Trade Organization against the E.U. on this issue. The European Parliament responded by voting to keep the ban in place. WTO action may take up to 18 months and the only beneficiaries of this delay are the Europeans.

The USDA has estimated that the loss of these markets costs our cattle producers $100 million per year and our hog producers $60 million. Clearly at a time when U.S. cattle producers are facing rising feed costs and the lowest prices in recent memory these unfair and trade barriers cannot be tolerated.

Just last week North Dakota hog farmers told me that access to the Asian markets following GATT has helped keep the price of pork stable over the last year. Clearly GATT can work to the benefit of American farmers. However, we need to send a strong message to the Europeans that further delay in opening their markets will not be tolerated.

This legislation is simple. It says that as long as the Europeans keep our meat from their markets they will not have access to U.S. markets. They are taking the resolve of their Parliament to the negotiations. The United States should be taking the resolve of Congress to those same meetings. This legislation sends the message that the U.S. Congress is serious about GATT working to open European markets. I urge my colleagues to join me in giving our trade representatives a valuable tool to meet the Europeans on equal footing.

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES OF MEAT PRODUCTS FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION UNTIL CERTAIN UNFAIR TRADE BARRIERS ARE REMOVED

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1996

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that will prohibit all meat imports from the European Union [EU] unless and until the EU lifts its ban on American beef and eliminates the nontariff trade barrier imposed by their ''Third Country Meat Directive [TCD]. The EU ban on beef from cattle treated with hormones was put in place on January 1, 1989. Scientists throughout Europe and the world have repeatedly concluded there is no scientific basis for this ban. In fact, after legal challenges by the British Government in 1987 and the European animal health industry association in 1990, the EU admitted that the ban was introduced for political and economic reasons—to curb the growth of Europe's beef supply rather than to protect public health. The EU ban has resulted in lost American beef sales of nearly $1 billion.

The TCD imposes meat inspection standards on U.S. meat exporting facilities that a wide majority of EU plants do not themselves meet. The United States has the most comprehensive and effective system of food safety management in the world. The TCD is designed and administered strictly to function as trade protection for higher cost, less competitive EU pork production.

The failure of the EU to live up to the 1992 bilateral meat agreement and re-list U.S. beef and pork plants is deeply disturbing. Prior to 1988, over 400 beef and pork plants were certified to export to the EU. Because of the TCD, only a handful of beef and pork plants are currently able to export to the EU. In 1985, the EU was the destination of over 20 percent of U.S. pork exports. Today, U.S. exports to the EU are negligible. The U.S. pork industry conservatively estimates that U.S. producers will lose $60 million in export revenues during 1996 with losses jumping to approximately $157 million per year by the year 2000 as EU tariff rate quotas on pork are phased in. Since January 1, 1989, America has allowed meat imports of $2.1 billion from the EU while U.S. meat exports to the EU totaled only $342 million. At a time when our cattle producers are struggling with the lowest cattle prices in recent memory and beef and pork producers are becoming more reliant on export markets, it is unconscionable to allow stubborn European bureaucrats to insult our cattle and hog producers with these barriers to American beef and pork.

We applaud Secretary Glickman and U.S.T.R. Kantor for initiating action against the EU hormone ban under WTO dispute settlement provisions and for their efforts to open export markets around the world for U.S. meat. However, EU Agriculture Commissioner Fischler has clearly indicated that even if the EU loses the WTO case, which might not be resolved until late 1997, the hormone ban will remain in place.

Although reasonable and prudent negotiation would clearly be preferred to address these trade disputes, our Nation's livestock producers need access to EU markets now. They are demanding a much stronger negotiating tool. My bill will provide a clear and unequivocal message to the EU that further delay will no longer be tolerated. Unless the EU eliminates these unscientific sanitary trade barriers, this legislation will prohibit the entry of all EU meat within 15 days of enactment. Please join me in providing a simple, but very effective negotiating tool to Secretary Glickman and U.S.T.R. Kantor.

BRING BART TO THE AIRPORT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1996

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation heard testimony regarding funding of mass transit projects across the country. The subcommittee heard from the united bipartisan Bay Area congressional delegation which supports funding the San Francisco Bar Area Rapid Transit [BART] extension to San Francisco International Airport. As you know, this Congress has supported this project over the years, and I am happy to report that BART is now ready to move forward on construction to provide tens of thousands of travelers quick, convenient, and reliable access to the nation's fifth busiest airport.

The BART extension to San Francisco International Airport is a longstanding regional priority with overwhelming and broad support from the public. Voters in San Mateo County have twice approved ballot measures directing local funds and taxes to be used for the airport extension and all but one of the cities impacted by the project have passed resolutions in support of this project. We have fought the hard battles at the local level. We have reached a regional consensus. We are ready to move forward on the most important and necessary transportation link in the San Francisco Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, local officials and residents in the bay area have made the tough choices in planning and providing local financing for the BART extension to SFO Airport. These decisions were made in an open and public access process at the local level and should be supported here in Washington. I would like to urge my colleagues to continue their support of the BART extension to the San Francisco International Airport.

A recent editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle summed up this issue brilliantly. I respectfully request that this editorial be placed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.