

As the Representative of the 14th District in Illinois, my district currently covers portions of eight countries, including four of the top 25 corn-producing countries, and three of the top 50 soybean-producing counties in the nation. The State of Illinois is the second-largest producing state of both corn and soybeans in the country. Forty percent of this production currently goes to exports, valued at approximately \$2.7 billion per year.

U.S. agriculture ranks among the top U.S. industries in export sales. In fact, the industry generated a \$12 billion trade surplus in 2001, helping mitigate the growing merchandise trade deficit. It is important to realize that 34 percent of all corn acres and 75 percent of all soybean acres are genetically modified.

And what exactly are we talking about when we say "genetically modified?" The EU would have you believe this is a new and special type of food, questionable for human consumption. In fact, since the dawn of time, farmers have been modifying plants to improve yields and create new varieties resistant to pests and diseases. Why would we want to snuff out human ingenuity that benefits farmers and consumers alike?

The European Union has had an indefensible moratorium on genetically-modified products in place for five years with no end in sight. This is a non-tariff barrier based simply on prejudice and misinformation, not sound science. In fact, their own scientists agree that genetically modified foods are safe. Still, regardless of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, bans on genetically modified products continue to persist and multiply—the worldwide impact has been staggering.

The current EU moratorium on genetically-modified products has translated into an annual loss of over \$300 million in corn exports for U.S. farmers. More disturbing is the recent trend in Africa, where several nations have rejected U.S. food aid because the shipments contained biotech corn. This based solely on the fear that EU countries will not accept their food exports if genetically modified seeds spread to domestic crops.

These actions by our trading partners have consequences. U.S. farmers are already beginning to plant more non-biotech seeds. This trend will increase farmers' cost of production as well as increase the damage from harmful insects. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently approved a corn technology that will allow the commercialization of the first corn designed to control rootworm—a pest that costs U.S. farmers approximately \$1 billion in lost revenue per year. It is absurd to think that farmers would not be able to take advantage of this technology.

Clearly, the long-term impact of these policies could be disastrous for U.S. farmers in terms of competitiveness and the ability to provide food for the world's population. Addressing world hunger is particularly critical when approximately 800 million people are malnourished in the developing world, and another 100 million go hungry each day. Biotechnology is the answer to this pressing problem. Farmers can produce better yields through drought-tolerant varieties, which are rich in nutrients and more resistant to insects and weeds, while those in need reap the benefits.

As you can see, halting or even slowing down the development of this technology could have dire consequences for countries

where populations are growing rapidly and all arable land is already under cultivation. Official WTO action will send a clear and convincing message to the world that prohibitive policies on biotechnology which are not based on sound science are illegal.

Hopefully, the WTO will act quickly to resolve the Administration's case on behalf of American farmers. There's no doubt that the U.S. and American agriculture go into this battle with the facts on our side. We simply cannot allow the free trade of our agriculture products to be restricted by this unfair and unjust moratorium. After all, the price of inaction is one we can no longer afford to pay.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure not because I wish to either support or oppose genetically-modified products. Clearly the production and consumption of these products is a matter for producers and consumers to decide for themselves.

I oppose this bill because at its core it is government intervention—both in our own markets and in the affairs of foreign independent nations. Whether European governments decide to purchase American products should not be a matter for the U.S. Congress to decide. It is a matter for European governments and the citizens of European Union member countries. While it may be true that the European Union acts irrationally in blocking the import of genetically-modified products, the matter is one for European citizens to decide.

Also, this legislation praises U.S. efforts to use the World Trade Organization to force open European markets to genetically-modified products. The WTO is an unelected world bureaucracy seeking to undermine the sovereignty of nations and peoples. It has nothing to do with free trade and everything to do with government- and bureaucrat-managed trade. Just as it is unacceptable when the WTO demands—at the behest of foreign governments—that the United States government raise taxes and otherwise alter the practices of American private enterprise, it is likewise unacceptable when the WTO makes such demands to others on behalf of the United States. This is not free trade.

Genetically-modified agriculture products may well be the wave of the future. They may provide food for the world's populations and contribute to the eradication of disease. That is something we certainly hope for and for which we will all applaud should it prove to be the case. But, again, this legislation is not about that. That is why I must oppose this bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of this measure.

I am a proponent of genetically modified (GM) food, and firmly believe that its continued implementation and use provides a number of important benefits for the American farmer and worldwide consumers. Furthermore, I believe we are legally correct and justified in asking the World Trade Organization (WTO) to impose penalties on the EU for maintaining a moratorium on import permits for genetically modified crops in violation of its rules.

However, I fear that our government's efforts will have the unintended consequence of wreaking havoc on the current WTO trade discussions. As we all know, the U.S. farmer would benefit much more if, in the current Doha

Round of the WTO, the EU nations agreed to slash the generous agriculture subsidy assistance they provide their farmers.

According to a recent Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization that seeks to help governments tackle the economic, social, and governance challenges of a globalized economy, in 2002, the EU provided \$112.6 billion in agricultural subsidies to their farmers. This amount totals approximately 1.3 percent of the EU GDP. Compare this staggering number with that of the United States, which generously provided in 2002 \$90.3 billion (0.9 percent of our GDP) to farmers in the form of agricultural subsidies, and you can easily see why reform of domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization is much needed.

In addition to fighting this important fight on GM foods today, the Administration and Congress need to hold the Europeans' feet to the fire on reforming their domestic agriculture policy and making their country more open to imported goods. The Doha Round was devised to accomplish these two objectives.

Moreover, the U.S.'s policy on GM foods must not just single out Europe. In an article, which appeared in yesterday's *The Wall Street Journal*, many U.S. soybean traders are accusing the Chinese of impeding soybean imports due to the failure of various inspection permits. The article continues by stating, "China last week announced it will extend to April 20, 2004, strict regulations on crops containing genetically modified organisms that had been set to expire September 20th."

Thus, the question that needs to be asked—Is China moving toward closing its borders in perpetuity on import permits for genetically modified crops? Will the U.S. government file a similar petition against the Chinese government? If so, when? If not, why not? After all, under commitments China made when it became a member of the WTO in December 2001, it must open its market to agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do likewise—but I suggest more substantive work be done to reform domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization policies that currently stand in the way of sustainability and prosperity of our farmers.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252. This important resolution expresses the House of Representatives' supports for American efforts within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's unfair trade practices regarding agriculture biotechnology. These trade practices are protectionist and discriminatory, and have been in place the past five years.

In 2001, the United States and other industrialized countries produced almost 109 million acres of genetically modified foods. These foods are modified, safely, to reduce the application of pesticides, reduce soil erosion and