agricultural base. There is a difference between Wall Street's paper money and productive wealth.

If the United States does not take the initiative to modernize our trade policies at this historical moment at the dawn of the 21st century, I ask, what country will? Who will carry the burden to root our trade agreements in our fundamental national values, beginning with individual dignity and justice for all.

The ongoing fast-track debate has served to illuminate the deficiencies of oldstyle trade agreements. It cannot pass on its merits. The frantic wheeling and dealing by the White House and the Republican leadership that characterized the last 100 hours of the debate shows the opponents of fast track have already won a great moral and intellectual victory. So in a historic and troubling last-minute search for votes, every conceivable lure has been used to dangle in front of undecided members—Christmas tree provisions in appropriation bills, threats to take away Members' chairmanships, tax breaks for southern towns, bridges, roads through national forests, financial help in upcoming primary and general elections, trade preferences for sub-Saharan African nations, tobacco subsidy guarantees, wheat ad wine deals—you name it; it's on the table.

It my 15 years in Congress, this type of tawdry, unyielding pressure convinces me just how powerful the forces resisting change are. It also tells me how strong are the oaks in this Chamber who have stood against the wind. We have scored a real victory for the American people and light a roman candle for the dignity of working people everywhere.

DOES THE PRESIDENT NEED FAST TRACK?

This and preceding administrations have negotiated over 220 trade agreements without fast-track authority. The Uruguay round of the GATT proceeded for several years without fast track. The Clinton administration is currently negotiating a multilateral agreement on investment without fast-track authority. The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement was negotiated without fast track. The President has constitutional authority to negotiate with other sovereign nations. The only reason the President needs fast track is so he doesn't have to seriously consult or negotiate with Congress.

Think about it. Without fast track, U.S. trade negotiators will be in a stronger position vis-á-vis our trading partners if they have to sell the deal to Congress. The suggestion that our trading partners won't deal with us without fast track is ludicrous. If President Clinton can say, ''I want to do this, but Congress is insisting on inclusion of these provisions . . .'' doesn't that strengthen his hand?

Congress certainly is capable of dealing with extremely complex legislation. Each year, we pass 13 highly complex appropriation measures, thousands of pages in length. Each year, we adopt a defense authorization bill thousands of pages in length. And hasn't Congress dealt with budget and tax measures thousands of pages in length, controlling hundreds of billions of dollars in spending and taxes?

MAKING IT THERE AND SELLING IT HERE

The United States represents about 4 percent of the world's population and enjoys about 22 percent of the world's products. To maintain our standard-of-living, it is argued, we have to sell to the other 96 percent of the world's population. But of the world's 6 billion potential consumers, 80 percent are only window shoppers, low-wage workers or subsistence farmers. Under the fast track agreements, we don't sell a net positive balance of consumer goods to other countries; we send capital and capital goods out of our country where goods are assembled by low-wage workers often employed for ''hunger wages,'' and then re-exported back to the United States and sold here at high prices—U-turn goods. Mexico is the prime example. NAFTA assured that Mexico would become one of the primary low-wage export platforms to the United States market, presently surpassed only by China. Nearly 3,000 plants have located just south of the border and they are called ''in-bond'' plants. I agree; labor is held in bondage. Since NAFTA, the Mexican domestic market has shrunk but its export market, primarily to the United States, has expanded dramatically. This process keeps putting severe downward pressure on United States living standards. If Europe and Japan maintain positive trade balances with Mexico, why is it only the United States that keeps digging a hole of debt with Mexico deeper and deeper? And with China? And with Canada?

HEALTH, SAFETY AND DRUGS

What does a fast-tracked trade policy mean for the quality of American life? Danger. Since 1990, food-borne outbreaks in the United States from imported food have included: shigellosis from imported green onions; salmonella from imported cantaloupe and imported alfalfa seeds; cyclospora from imported raspberries; and cholera from imported coconut milk. In Michigan earlier this year, more than 200 cases of hepatitis A were associated with frozen strawberries imported from Mexico and illegally labeled as United States grown. Strawberries imported from Mexico were found to have an 18.4 percent violation rate for illegal levels of pesticides in 1993. A 47-count indictment was brought against a California firm for fraudulently labeling Mexican grown strawberries as United States grown. On May 29 the Centers for Disease Control reported that imported raspberries were the cause of a 1996 outbreak of hepatitis.

Yet inspection of produce for pesticides on imported food has been reduced. The absolute number of imported food sample inspections decreased from 6,463 in 1993, to 5,448 in 1994, and to 5,032 in 1995—a decrease of 28 percent over that period. Inspection of imported Mexican produce declined from 1,820 samples in 1993 to 1723 samples in 1995 even though imports doubled. The food provisions of NAFTA constrain food safety and agricultural disease and pest inspections. NAFTA specifically forbids imported food from being inspected at the border more thoroughly than the same domestic commodity.

Moreover, under NAFTA we have not just opened our southern border to unsafe food. We have thrown the door open for the importation of the illegal drugs that degrade and destroy our communities. Key provisions for cross-border trucking have been relaxed resulting in Mexico becoming the primary route for the importation of drugs into the United States. The vast majority of trucks entering the United States from Mexico enter without inspection.

During the closing moments of the NAFTA debate in 1993 when it was clear that our position was on the short end of the votes, we promised the American people during that singularly compelling moment here in the House that our fight would continue in the tomorrows to come—a fight against the narrow visions of the elites and Wall Street who would abandon those who work in our factories, on our farms, and on Main Street. We have continued valiantly in our efforts, and we can be proud as we vote here today. For it is in our hearts, that reside the truest principles of democracy, prosperity, and respect for ordinary people of extraordinary spirit. Our victory gives hope to those in our world who struggle for democracy, for labor rights, for human health and safety in the workplace, and for the right to speak out as we have spoken out today.

When the vote on GATT occurred, we said when that vote was over, it would not be over. Its consequences would be felt for years to come. As a result of the elections of 1994 and 1996, we have been joined by many new Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who fought to be our new partners and in that fight to forge a new American responsible trade policy. These colleagues did not share our experience as we battled NAFTA in 1993 and GATT in 1994. But they have heard the will of the American people as they campaigned for the seats they now hold, and they have made the difference.

Out of these many battles in a long struggle has come a deep awareness on the part of the American people that trade and jobs are inextricably linked and that people matter more than profits. On the floor of this House, we not hear the voices of those who bear the pain of NAFTA, the indignities of GATT. We must now proceed to constructively fashion a trade policy that moves America and the world into an era of trade-linked advancement for people or ordinary means.

I said in 1993 and again in 1994 during the GATT debate—also scheduled after midnight during a lame duck session of Congress—that working people would remember those votes. I say again America's working families will remember this vote as well. Let history show it was here, together, in the people's House where the journey began to enshrine in trade laws the highest ideals of a free people. Let us inspire a world where the majority long for a better way of life along the path that leads, not back to the 19th century, but forward to the 21st.

HONORING JOSEPH SULTAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and achievements of Joseph Sultan.

Joe Sultan is a Brooklyn native who graduated from Abraham Lincoln High School in 1972. He attended the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Art & Science where he received his bachelor of architecture degree in 1976.

After graduation, he worked for such prestigious architectural firms as Davis Brody Associates, Giorgio Cavaglieri and Warren Gran & Associates.

In 1983, Joe established his own firm. Sultan Associates and in 1991 merged with Warren Gran & Associates to form Gran Sultan

Associates. Together Joe and Warren Gran have completed numerous schools for the New York City School Construction Authority, four SRO's for mentally ill adults and many other commercial, residential, and institutional projects.

Joe is currently designing the home for the Long Island Children Museum and Crosby Commons, a 67-apartment assisted living residence for United Methodist Homes of Connecticut. He has taught construction technology at New York University as a visiting lecturer and his work has been featured in the national media. He and Warren have been named local heroes by Time magazine for their work in supportive housing.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Joseph Sultan for all of his years of faithful service to his country and to the 10th Congressional District of Brooklyn, NY.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE RICHARD T. FORD

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Judge Richard T. Ford upon his retirement on the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. Judge Ford's years of dedicated public and civic service have been instrumental throughout his career. His commitment to justice serves as a model for all Americans and should be held with the highest respect.

Richard T. Ford will retire early in 1998 as U.S. Bankruptcy Court judge. His retirement comes following his long-standing service in the community and in the courts. Upholding the values for improved practice and ethical standards, Judge Ford has been graced with an exceptional career as a lawyer and a counselor.

Judge Ford is a native to Fresno. He attended local public schools including Fresno State University. He has served his country in various capacities including time in the U.S. Army. Following his service in the Army, Judge Ford attended the Hastings College of Law.

After his legal education, Judge Ford return to Fresno area to work for the Fresno County District Attorney's Office. After his work for the district attorney, he practiced bankruptcy and insolvency law. He has served as a bankruptcy trustee and has administered thousands of bankruptcy cases over the years. Judge Ford began his service as a bankruptcy court judge on January 1, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I pay tribute to Richard T. Ford upon his retirement as a U.S. Bankruptcy Court judge. Judge Ford is a thoughtful, impartial, insightful, and thoroughly prepared judge. Litigants and counsel are treated with respect in his courtroom and are given full opportunity to be heard. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Judge Richard T. Ford the best of luck with the future.

RELIEVE THE TAX BURDEN

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some thoughts about taxes. The tax burden on Americans is out of control and not being eased fast enough. As we debate the best way to give Americans much needed tax relief I urge my colleagues to consider the comments of a constituent of mine, Brandi Graham, of Fort Collins, CO.

In 1914 the United States was preparing to enter into the most mammoth war the world had ever seen. She was strapped for the necessary cash to fund the unprecedented development, training, and transport of troops and weaponry across the globe. It was inarguably the greatest financial challenge the growing nation had faced.

Congress took to radical measures. Among others, it enacted a temporary federal tax on income. It was a spirited debate that produced the 16th Amendment.

The first tax rate was a flat one percent of all income earned. An amendment was offered that would have capped the all-time federal tax rate at two percent. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated. Many of the legislators wondered if allowing the federal government to tax individual income would be the slippery slope toward a government that would confiscate the earnings of its citizens. Tragically, their fears were to become realized.

In 1997, Americans worked through the month of May just to pay the tax collector. Only after June, did the Feds actually allow us to begin providing for our own families. In the hands of congressmen, the flat, one percent tax rate has become a cruel monstrosity bearing all the modern trappings of ''progressive'' taxation, loopholes, and shelters.

The tax code itself contains over 1,000 pages and requires legions of accountants to comprehend. ''Progressivity'' has caused citizens who work harder to find inexplicably that they only have less take home pay because they have achieved a higher tax bracket. Others discover that their savings are taxed at higher rates, or that they pay more to the government now simply because they decided to marry.

The scramble to escape the clutches of the income tax has approached the absurd. Billionaires exchange U.S. citizenship for tax breaks and companies move their operations to countries offering less confiscatory ways of raising national revenue. Our system is a disaster beyond repair.

So what would the authors of the 16th Amendment do if they were in Washington today? Well assuming they could recover from the shock of seeing the Frankenstein-like mutation of their quaint little income tax plan, they would almost certainly call for tax relief. They would urge the elimination of the myriad of loopholes and write-offs. But such a lesson might better persuade them that the original dissenters were right: That *any* income tax allows for government repression of its people. They might opt for the old and proven way of funding the federal government.

Today, seemingly all Americans agree that the tax code is hideous except for those who make the laws. Politicians seem to like the power confirmed by the prodigious code. They seem to enjoy the contributions from interests seeking to tweak the tax laws here and there for their selfish advantage.

But the nation's true leaders are those who understand the history of American taxation. They understand how hard Americans work to pay their government's largess. They realize that our nation once did well to rely on national sales taxes (we called them tariffs then) to fund all government operations. And our best leaders recognize today that a nation which ventured beyond a national sales tax has become perpetrator of a sick irony, embracing the very precepts against which it once rebelled, denying the fruits of real liberty with an arrogance of royalty and all the while crushing its people under the weight of oppressive taxation.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward in our quest to relieve the tax burden, let us keep these comments in mind. Taxpaying Americans desperately deserve to make their own decisions on how their hard-earned money should be spent.

A COMPACT FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE: SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR OUR GRANDCHILDREN

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, I received a letter from one of my constituents, Betty Dowdling of Marshall, MI, urging me to continue working on preserving Social Security for future generations. ''It is most certainly not fair to leave big debts for our children and grandchildren,'' she wrote. She's exactly right. The good news is that more and more people are coming around to Betty's point of view.

There has been a lot of talk in the last year about the future of Social Security. It is an issue that, in some way or another, affects every American, young and old. If you're currently working, you pay tax into Social Security—listed as FICA on your paycheck stub. And if you're retired, you probably regularly received a Social Security check.

When President Franklin Roosevelt enacted Social Security in 1935, it was meant to provide modest assistance to the Nation's most elderly—those over 65—paid for by the current work force. At that time, the system worked wonderfully. Most people never made it past the age of 61, and, as it worked out, about 42 workers contributed to the system for each retiree.

Today, Social Security is the Nation's largest budget expenditure. Thanks to advancing technology and improved health care, the average life expectancy for Americans is no longer 61, but a record 74. Instead of 42 workers paying taxes to support each retiree, there are now just three workers for each retiree. Instead of the old 1 percent payroll tax enacted in 1935, the tax is now 12.4 percent. In just the past 26 years, in fact, the payroll taxes all workers pay has been hiked 36 times—that is on average more than once a year. As the so-called baby boom generation starts to retire at the turn of the century, the ratio between workers and retirees will continue to get smaller and the propensity to increase taxes will continue to be greater. As early as 2005—less than 8 years from now—the Social Security trust fund will start spending more than it takes in. That is unless we take some action now to change the system.