goal for the next century, then not only will humankind be better off throughout the world, but the economy of the United States, the enterprise of the United States, the leadership of the United States will continue in wondrous ways for the benefit of our people, because when we talk about an attempt, a bold attempt, to eradicate disease from the face of the Earth, are we not talking about trade between countries on matters that would lead to new products in health care, new medicines, new ways of treating disease? Would we not have our hospitals and our medical colleges and our universities honed in on the great goal that we are going to be articulating?

This is so important to me personally and, I believe, to our country, to focus our energies, our innate initiatives that have served us so well over the years, into this goal of humanitarian capacity in such a way that it benefits every strata of our society; not just the health care community, but everyone in the community who, in one way or another, will have to come into contact with the health care system and with those things that benefit humanity.

I have had discussions about this with individuals at the National Institutes of Health, with people in the medical universities, with newsmen and media people who have more than a passing interest in this kind of issue, and have found a warm reception in every one of those projections.

□ 1930

So I would invite my colleagues to join with me in this bill. We would create this commission, we all would have input as to the ways and means that they would adopt for achieving this national goal, and then when our time is completed in the Congress of the United States, we will have laid the groundwork for a 21st century replete with American accomplishment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundegran, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin Compact.

H.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa River Basin Compact.

H.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 738. An act to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes.

NAFTA IS NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, for those who have been following the debate over fast track, I would just like to review a few facts. First of all, fast track is legislation which provides for expedited congressional consideration. It is called fast track because it is a way to force through Congress an up-or-down vote on a major trade package. Those who are interested in the history of this should remember that fast-track authority was first granted by the Congress in 1974. It gave the President the ability to move along trade agreements.

In 1994, fast track expired, after the approval of NAFTA and the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, also known as GATT.

What is happening now is that the President is asking for renewed fast-track authority and wants to expand NAFTA and the free trade zone to Chile and the other South American countries, and he wants trade agreements with even more countries as well, using the fast-track legislation.

We must keep in mind that fast track does not provide for any amendments, so that this Congress has no ability to change the terms of the fast-track agreement and, therefore, to have an impact on American trade policy. The reason why so many of us in Congress are concerned about this issue is this: I would like to look at the effect that NAFTA has had, because we are really talking about expanding NAFTA here, at northeastern Ohio.

Now, I am from the State of Ohio, I am in the 10th Congressional District in Ohio, and I represent an area that includes the city of Cleveland and surrounding suburbs. My constituents include auto workers, steel workers, and their families. They are very dependent on the auto industry and the steel industry for jobs. These are people who have fought for this country, who believe in this country, who have given much to this country, who helped to build this country through building the major industries with their labor. Americans secured its freedom through our strategic industrial base of steel, automotive and aerospace, and the people in Cleveland have been an important part of that.

But when a report came out a few months ago on NAFTA, it was learned once and for all how the people of Cleveland and how communities like ours across the United States have been adversely affected by NAFTA. We found out that U.S. exports to Mexico have been inconsequential, a little over $1 billion in the 3 years covered by the study, that Mexico was not the consumer market that everyone said it would be. We were promised that there was going to be expanded trade with Mexico.

Well, the fact of the matter is, workers in Mexico who are making 90 cents an hour cannot buy cars made in the United States that cost $16,000. The truth is that Mexico has become increasingly an export platform for vehicles sold in the United States. U.S. auto imports from Mexico are more than 10 times the value of U.S. exports to Mexico. And most importantly, the U.S. auto trade deficit has grown since NAFTA by about 400 percent to $14.6 billion, from $3.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the business of politics is a very complex business, as those of us who have been in politics for a while understand, and even those who have the best of intentions often are not able to get to their goals that they have stated in promises in order to achieve support for their proposals.

There were many promises made to secure support for NAFTA years ago, a few short years ago, and those promises moved votes in this House. Those promises caused people to have hope that somehow NAFTA that we are voting on in the next 2 days, an agreement that would expand NAFTA, that NAFTA would benefit the constituencies which we represent. People were promised that NAFTA would create 200,000 new U.S. jobs. All of us remember that promise.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the United States has lost more than 430,000 jobs due to NAFTA. For example, Kodak will cut 14,000 jobs and shift production to Mexico. The U.S. people were promised that the United States would inspect imported food for pesticides. Well, we know, the truth is that inspections of illegal pesticides on imported food have actually decreased, and we have seen the consequences with the great strawberry scare of a few months ago where school children in a few States were adversely affected by the pesticides which were put on strawberries.

Mr. Speaker, NAFTA has not produced benefits for the American people. It has increased the trade deficit; it puts downward pressure on wages, and I am hopeful that within 4 hours NAFTA will be soundly defeated through us defeating fast track and coming back with a plan to make our trade agreements in this country fairer to the American workers and to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDER IN MEMORY OF JOHN STURDIVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sorrow over the passing of John Sturdivant. His death is a great loss not only

to the American Federation of Government Employees, but to civil servants across the country. John Sturdivant demonstrated dedication and courage throughout his entire life, as he battled against Government downsizing, excessive privatization, restrictions on political activity by Government employees and, ultimately, leukemia. Through all of these challenges, he remained a devoted champion of workers everywhere, and his efforts will be long remembered and sorely missed.

John Sturdivant leaves behind him a legacy of victories and improvements that will continue to benefit the employees he represented even though he can no longer speak for them. During a period of relentless attacks on Federal workers, through Government downsizing and budget pressures, John fought to preserve jobs and spoke out for the interests of working families everywhere. He struggled against two wasteful Government shutdowns, and tirelessly advocated for improved conditions, pay raises and better retirement benefits for those he represented. John Sturdivant was instrumental in bringing about Hatch Act reforms which enable Federal employees to contribute money, attend fundraisers and volunteer for campaign work. In short, he was a great friend for workers and a great voice for change, and his passing leaves us missing a powerful and passionate ally.

SECRETARY BABBITT'S ABUSE OF POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in disbelief, in fact in total disgust. I stand here before you in an effort to seek the truth in campaign fund-raising allegations involving the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Bruce Babbitt, a serious abuse of power.

I am here to inform my colleagues of the mounting evidence that Secretary Babbitt potentially misused his administrative position to influence the outcome of a 1995 Department of Interior decision regarding an Indian gaming permit to a group of Chippewa Indians in Wisconsin, all that in exchange for political contributions to the Democratic National Committee.

Allow me to set the stage. Three groups of Wisconsin Chippewa Indians recently filed a lawsuit charging that the Clinton administration bowed to improper political pressure when the Interior Department rejected their application for a gaming permit in 1995.

So what was the reason for this otherwise unexplainable denial? Well, other tribes opposing their application donated more than $270,000 to the Democratic National Committee soon after their proposal was rejected. The rival tribes were trying to prevent competition to their lucrative gaming interests located some 20 miles from Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN.

Now, Mr. Paul Eckstein, an attorney and old friend of Mr. Babbitt, recently testified before a Senate Governmental Affairs panel on campaign fund-raising hearings that he met with Secretary Babbitt on July 14, 1995, after being told by another Interior Department official that the casino planned by 3 Wisconsin Chippewa tribes was being disapproved. Eckstein proceeded to tell the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee that Mr. Babbitt's response was that Deputy White House Chief of Staff, Harold Ickes, had directed him to issue the decision that day. In a 1996 letter to Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a Republican of Arizona, the Interior Secretary denied making the comment about Ickes. But last month, Mr. Babbitt again recanted, acknowledging that he did, in fact, make the remarks to Mr. Eckstein simply to get the lawyer out of his office.

Well, the contradiction in Secretary Babbitt's responses troubles me almost as much as the act of trading favors for campaign money. The blatant misuse of administrative power for monetary gain is a serious offense. If no other inconsistencies were uncovered beyond this, this would still warrant the appointment of an independent counsel.

At issue in this case is whether Secretary Babbitt's decision to deny the application was influenced by the promise of political contributions and whether his actions came as a result of an order from higher up in the administrative ladder.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to stand here before the House in an attempt to influence the outcome of this case, nor to comment on any more specific details of the event that precipitated this matter. However, the apparent seriousness of the allegations of this wrongdoing and underlying facts clearly dictate further investigations into this matter.

I have in my office investigative reports, many from major news publications on this subject, that confirm in precise detail the pervasive, serious and potentially unlawful conduct of Secretary Babbitt's 1995 decision.

The likelihood that government policy was made in return for a political donation in this case clearly brings into question whether criminal misconduct occurred in fund-raising efforts for the 1996 Federal election.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to inform you of major malfunctions in the campaign fund-raising machine for the 1996 election, and I am also here to inform my colleagues of my intent to pursue this matter further.

In fact, I would like to report on Friday of last week I sent a letter to the Attorney General, lauding the Justice Department's decision to open a 30-day initial review into how Secretary Babbitt handled the application for an Indian gaming permit back in 1995. But this is not enough. In this same letter I expressed my earnest sense of urgency on behalf of the American people in pushing forth with the appointment of an independent counsel to investigation this scandal.

SHADY DEALS TO JAM FAST TRACK THROUGH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House for a few minutes this evening.

I read earlier today a story on the AP wire about some of the deals that have been made between the White House and Members of Congress on the fast track legislation which we were going to consider today, but has been pushed back until Sunday, frankly because Speaker GINGRICH and the President do not have enough votes with the deals they are making to jam this bill through the Congress of the United States.

What troubled me today, and I would like to share for a moment one of those deals that was mentioned in the AP wire story. I will quote:

> A Member of Congress announced his support for a fast track trade bill Friday after the White House circulated a 7-point memo promising continued support for the tobacco price support program and immunity from health-related lawsuits for tobacco farmers.

The paper also promised reform of import duty rules that farmers say encourages imports of foreign tobacco. Lobbyists said the moves were aimed at garnering the Congressmen's support.

This deal is troubling for a whole bunch of reasons, Mr. Speaker. As the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Health and Environment on the Committee on Commerce, the subcommittee that, under the leadership before of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and other Members of Congress brought forward many of the problems with tobacco, many of the issues with tobacco executives and some of the problems, particularly with teenaged smoking, and I am particularly concerned about this deal that the President has purportedly made, according to the AP wire story, with some Members of Congress in order to get their votes for the fast track legislation.

Immediately, upon reading this story, I called the White House to ask for a copy of this 7-point memo that was about tobacco, about protecting tobacco, that would bring in the support from Members of Congress for the fast track bill.

□ 1945

The White House has still refused to send this memo. For whatever reason, they have not felt obligated to send this memo, even though next week this Subcommittee on Health and Environment and the full Committee on Commerce will be holding a hearing on tobacco.

So what troubles me, and I think what troubles people across this country, is that on a trade issue, an issue that has nothing to do with tobacco,