

security that the United States Armed Forces have access to recruit the best people to serve in this country.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From SolomonResponse.Org]

FAIR PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS

The members of FAIR willing to be named publicly are:

1. The Faculty of Capital University Law School
 2. The Faculty of Chicago-Kent College of Law
 3. The Faculty of City University of NY (CUNY) Law School
 4. The Faculty of DePaul University College of Law
 5. The Faculty of University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law
 6. The Faculty of Fordham University School of Law
 7. The Faculty of Georgetown University Law Center
 8. George Washington University Law School
 9. Golden Gate University School of Law
 10. The Faculty of Hofstra University Law School
 11. The Faculty of the John Marshall School of Law
 12. New York Law School
 13. New York University School of Law
 14. Northeastern University School of Law
 15. The Faculty of the University of Minnesota Law School
 16. The Faculty of Pace University School of Law
 17. The Faculty of the University of Puerto Rico School of Law
 18. The Faculty of Roger Williams University Ralph R. Papitto School of Law
 19. The Faculty of the University of San Francisco School of Law
 20. The United Faculty of Stanford Law School
 21. The Faculty of Suffolk University Law School
 22. Vermont Law School
 23. The United Faculty of Washington University School of Law
 24. The Faculty of Whittier Law School
- faculties: 24 (18 public)
institutions: 12 (6 public)

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, THE NATIONAL UNIFORMITY FOR FOOD ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4167, the National Uniformity for Food Act. If passed, this bill will be a huge setback to consumer safety, public health and America's war on terror. This bill wipes out over 80 State food safety laws and puts our Nation's food safety standards squarely in the hands of the FDA.

State laws that will be overturned include warnings as to the risk of cancer, birth defects, reproductive health issues and allergic reactions associated with sulfiting agents in bulk food. That is why 37 State attorney generals, Democrats and Republicans, oppose this bill. A bipartisan Association of Food and Drug officials also have strong concerns about the legislation.

Let me quote from them. It says, this bill, H.R. 4167, "undermines our Nation's whole biosurveillance system by preempting and invalidating many of the State and local food safety laws and regulations that provide necessary authority for State and local agencies to operate food safety and security programs. The pre-9/11 concept embodied in this bill is very much out of line with the current threats that confront our food safety and security system."

The Association of Food and Drug Officials also said that H.R. 4167 will severely hamper the FDA's ability to detect and respond to acts of terrorism. Again, quoting from this report, it says our current food safety and security system will be significantly disrupted, and our inability to track suspected acts of intentional alteration will be exploited by those who seek to do our Nation harm.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to these two pictures. Which meat do you think is older, the red meat on top or the brown meat on the bottom? It is not really a trick question, but both of these packages of meat were packaged at the same time. Both have been sitting in a refrigerator side by side for 5 months. The meat on the top has been packaged with carbon monoxide which causes the meat to look fresh and red long into the future. The meat on the bottom has not been treated with carbon monoxide. It is brown and it is slimy.

Like I said, the meat on the top is 5 months old and looks as good as new, but it is not. If consumed, you could become severely ill from a food-borne pathogen like E. coli and possibly die from the red meat here on the top.

The FDA, without any independent study, has no objection to allowing meat to be packaged in carbon monoxide. The FDA merely reviewed the meat industry's carbon monoxide proposal. Review is not the same as independent research. By allowing the injection of carbon monoxide in meat and seafood packaging, the meat industry stands to gain \$1 billion per year because meat begins to turn brown. When it does, consumers reject it.

Consumers rely on color to determine freshness. Numerous studies from 1972 to 2003 cite color as the most important factors consumers use to determine what meat to buy. The whole purpose behind this carbon monoxide packaging is to extend the shelf life of meat and seafood and to deceive the consumer into thinking the product is fresh. Today, States may pass their own laws and put labels on meat that has been packaged with carbon monoxide, but those laws will be overturned if this bill, H.R. 4167, becomes law.

I will be offering an amendment which allows States to label carbon monoxide packaging of meat, so consumers will know the meat may not look as fresh as it may appear.

Is this really the standard we want for our country? Do we offer low car-

bon monoxide in meat packaging to make it look fresher, to stay on the shelf longer, and expose our country and consumers to the health and risk of eating contaminated meat and seafood? Public health and safety for food primarily have been the responsibility of States. We should not tie the hands of States who want to protect the health of their citizens. I urge my colleagues to support the Stupak carbon monoxide labeling amendment and vote "no" on H.R. 4167.

ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSE OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, under the leadership of our colleagues JIM KOLBE and JOHN CORNYN, a bipartisan, bicameral delegation attended the 45th meeting of the U.S.-Mexico Inter-Parliamentary group that was held in Mexico. The House Members, on Saturday, then went to the Mexico-Arizona border. We had the opportunity there to meet with local law enforcement officials and hospital administrators to discuss the tremendous strain that illegal immigration imposes on resources and law and order in our communities.

As an advocate of greater security at our borders, I have long supported addressing the root cause of illegal immigration, and that is a lack of economic opportunity that exists at home for the people in Mexico. We know that the majority of illegal immigrants come to this country for one very simple reason. They are seeking economic opportunity. They want to better their lives. They want to feed their families. Economic growth, job creation, and higher wages in Mexico are special components to a long-term solution to the very serious problem of illegal immigration.

By pursuing an open trade agenda that expands economic engagement in this hemisphere, we are not only shoring up our regionally based economy, and creating new opportunities for the United States workers, we are benefiting workers, the business owners and investors as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are hoping to drive the economic growth necessary to reduce the number of illegal immigrants who are trying to make that dangerous trek across the border, doing so simply because of the fact that they are wanting, as I said, to feed their families. It was therefore with great interest that I read a recent Business Week article describing the emergence of a growing middle class in our neighbor to the south.

The success of the North American Free Trade Agreement can be seen in the greater economic stability outlined in this Business Week piece. It talked