

about particularly narcotics abuse but including alcohol and tobacco abuse, and one of the things that I have become concerned with is a bill that we are dealing with later this week regarding narcotics. I am afraid and I am sorry to announce this, but apparently our war against drugs is over. That is the good news. Unfortunately, if this bill we are working on later this week on international issues survives the legislative process, the drug producers and the drug shippers will have won instead of our Nation, because we are now going to give up the current drug certification process.

Many Americans will wonder what I am talking about. Section 490 of H.R. 1486 ends, repeat, kills off provisions in current law which require the President to certify to Congress if a country produces illegal drugs or ships them to kill U.S. children. In place of the current law, the bill the House is considering replaces drug certification with a pile of loopholes and exceptions that are virtually certain to mean no country, including Mexico, will ever be decertified for U.S. foreign aid.

Here is what section 490 does. It allows the President to, and I quote, "to the extent considered necessary by the President," end quote, to hold back foreign aid or instruct the U.S. representative at the World Bank to vote against loans to countries if a series of conditions suggested in the legislation are violated.

Just to be sure that the law is absolutely weak, the legislation allows the President to ignore even the new and timid standards if acting against a pro-drug country, including Mexico, will, and I quote again, "affect other United States national interests."

When I read this provision in the bill, I thought to myself, what a nice gift this will be for President Clinton's weak-on-drugs choice to be U.S. Ambassador to Mexico to take with him. We are looking at appointing an ambassador to Mexico who believes in so-called medicinal use of marijuana. There is no medicinal use of marijuana.

There is a medicinal use of THC, which is found in other drugs. It is a back-door effort to legalize drugs. If the policy of the Congress is not to stand up when we send an ambassador to Mexico who is supporting back-door legalization and we take out the drug certification process, what message is this to the kids? We are telling them on one hand, do not drink, do not do drugs. On the other hand, what we are saying is, if trade is more important and all of us, and I know in Florida it is important, in Indiana it is increasingly important. Nobody is saying that trade is not important, nobody is saying we do not have huge immigration questions to deal with. At the same time, we cannot be so concerned about risking some trade or irritation as we work through this that we back off our focus on the drug war.

So I hope to have more to say on this later this week. But I wanted to take

this opportunity to come down and say that sometimes we only talk about marijuana and cocaine, and we forget that alcohol is the No. 1 problem among teens. But we also need to understand as a Nation that these things are closely interrelated, and abusers of one are abusers of another. We need to send a clear, concise, consistent message across the board that we stand against this abuse. It is critical for our country, for the future of our young people. It is important in our international policy. We cannot send our children the message that money is more important to us than our lives and safety and their own character development which gets impaired when you use any kind of narcotics, whether it is alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, heroin.

I know in Florida we have had an outburst of the heroin problem, too. We need to look at all these things. I commend the gentleman again tonight for his efforts on drunk driving and all those teens and parents who have been involved in SADD and MADD and those who have been particularly affected by this. Nothing is more tragic than to talk with somebody, as we have had in all of our districts and all over the country, somebody who has lost a life—lost a mother, a father, or lost one of their cherished children because somebody could not handle the alcohol and somebody was not responsible and because of that, somebody else is dead.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts and thank him for yielding me time tonight.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for reminding us that these drugs, if you will, and alcohol are certainly very interrelated. And our wars, in terms of trying to protect our young people, must include both drugs as well as alcohol and other ills that are really out there, so many of them.

I thank the gentleman for his great work on this subject.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, several of my colleagues and I came to the floor to discuss the increasingly growing problem of juvenile crime in our Nation. All too many of the stories and statistics that I heard my colleagues discuss stemmed from alcohol abuse.

Alcohol abuse among our Nation's youth has indeed become a very serious problem. According to a recent Washington Post-ABC News survey of teens and parents, alcohol abuse was identified as the biggest drug problem facing young people today. I have also seen several studies and reports that reveal that possibly more than half of the country's population that is over the age of 12 is currently using alcohol.

Let me just repeat that: more than 50 percent of the Nation's teenagers use alcohol. We are talking about 8th, 9th, and 10th graders.

Among other things, this is the same age when many young people are first learning to drive. Simply stated, the two do not mix. We cannot begin to tackle the problems of drunk driving without at the same time addressing underage drinking.

For the past few years, I have stood on the steps of the Somerset County Courthouse in a candlelight vigil as the names of victims of drunk driving are read. I pray that next year fewer names are read off.

We are all probably aware of the tremendous peer pressure that so many young people face today. But this week, students from across the country gathered in Washington for the National Youth Summit To Prevent Underage Drinking. These students discussed ideas and made recommendations to curb this problem.

The idea of students and elected officials working together to tackle this problem has been very successful in Somerset County, NJ. While serving as a Somerset County freeholder, I helped form the Somerset County Youth Council in which I asked local school principals to recommend young people to come together and form a council to advise the local elected officials about the pressures facing our youth and strategies for addressing those needs.

This youth council became involved in a wide variety of youth related efforts such as substance abuse prevention ideas, self-esteem building projects, peer leadership programs, and community service and civic projects.

I am also proud to say that I have been involved for a number of years in the 4-H program, and have always felt that this program goes a long way in directing our Nation's youth in positive directions.

I applaud the efforts of the students that came to Washington this week. I wish them well as they return home to share their efforts and recommendations with their classmates and friends. I also want to call upon the Nation's elected officials, leaders, teachers, and parents to encourage these efforts and provide a positive model for these youngsters.

Maybe, if we all put our shoulders to the same wheel, we can work to create a brighter future for America.

NAFTA UPDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be the first speaker this evening in a special order devoted to the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA. Tonight we are going to talk about, since the agreement was signed and passed over the objections of many, many of us here in the House, passed in January 1994, what have been the repercussions in our country and what have been the repercussions in the other two nations on the continent, Canada and Mexico, that are participating in this agreement with us?

This past week we saw our President travel to Mexico and to other nations of Latin America to promote additional nations being added to the NAFTA accord. And the question many of us have in the Congress today is, based on the results of the existing NAFTA, the flaws inherent in that agreement, why would anyone want to

expand NAFTA rather than fixing the agreement we have now?

Since NAFTA's passage, the United States has not exported more than it has imported from either Mexico or Canada. In fact, we have now racked up trade deficits annually with Mexico totaling \$16 to \$18 billion a year, and with Canada \$20 billion a year. If each billion dollars translates into lost jobs in this country and we have racked up on average \$40 billion in trade deficit every year since NAFTA's passage, how can the overall agreement be working to the advantage of our Nation and its workers?

□ 1945

If we think about it, with our economy on the rebound and holding its own, without NAFTA we would be growing even faster. Because, in fact, NAFTA acts not as a net positive but as a net negative in terms of job creation and wealth creation in the United States of America.

Tonight we want to talk a little bit about what is happening inside this agreement and the people across our country who are literally the casualties of NAFTA that are never talked about in the press, that are not heard from, but they number in the thousands in our country, and in Mexico they number in the millions.

But if we look at who the President talked to last week in Mexico, the audiences were self-selected. He was cordoned off. People were bussed into events. They were told when to cheer, even told when to wave flags.

But the real people of Mexico, the peasants who have been uprooted from their subsistence farms, the 28,000 businesses in that country that have gone belly up, the people whose wages have been cut by 70 percent, the President really did not hold state level meetings with them. Yet they live on this continent, too. And it is really tragic.

But in a way I am beginning to see a pattern here, because the President and the supporters of NAFTA will not meet with the casualties in our country either. And tonight I want to tell my friends about one casualty, but there are thousands. In fact, the Federal Government's Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for dislocated workers has already certified over 125,000 Americans who have managed to even find that this program exists. There are thousands and thousands more across our country who do not even know if they lose their job because the production has moved to Mexico or Canada, we will try to help them.

But I want to tell my colleagues about one of their stories, because it is very troubling to me that American citizens who have been hard-working, who have paid their taxes and then get hurt because of an action of their government, become nonentities. They become faceless people.

They remind me of the Vietnam war, when people were being killed in the

countryside and the body bags came home and they tried to hide them in the hangars at the various bases around our Nation until it began to be reported on the evening news. Well, my friends there are NAFTA casualties and nobody wants to talk about it. But we are going to talk about it tonight.

One of the casualties is a woman that I have had the pleasure of only talking with on the telephone and corresponding with in the mail, and I want to use her as my example and I want to tell my colleagues her story because it is repeated from coast to coast. Her name is Wanda Napier. She is a resident of the State of Missouri. She lives in Marshfield, and I want to read into the RECORD a letter that she recently wrote me.

She wrote me after she became frustrated, and I will read those letters tonight, too, in writing to the President of our country, to her Senators, to her representatives at the State level in Missouri, to her Governor, to the Department of Labor. And to see the answers that this woman got from the Government officials of her State and our Nation is truly an embarrassment.

Here is what she writes me:

Dear Marcie: I am writing concerning the closure of my apparel plant in Seymour, MO. I called you with my concerns in January on the North American Free-Trade Agreement and its cost of American jobs like mine. This trade agreement has made it easier and more profitable for companies such as the Lee Apparel Co. to take American jobs to other countries like Mexico. It is my understanding that representatives want to extend that agreement to cover other countries as well. But let me tell you my story.

The Lee Apparel Co., a subsidiary of Vanity Fair Corp., was one of the two main employers in Seymour, MO. The employees were hard working people who had helped the Lee Co. through many hard times. In 1988, we accepted the Lee COMPETE plan which gave us an immediate cut in pay and tightened our incentive rates and made it harder to make a decent living. We took this cut to help make the jobs in Seymour more secure.

But we found out 8 years later on September 26, 1996, that our hard work and willingness to help the Lee Co. would be thrown back into our faces by the Lee Co. sending our jobs to Mexico and Costa Rica. By sending our jobs to Mexico, the Vanity Fair Corp., through low wages and corporate greed, have not even allowed the Mexican people to make a living.

With one stroke the Vanity Fair Corp., has weakened the American economy and depressed the Mexican people. I know that the people who worked in the Seymour, MO, plant deserve better. Many of the employees had devoted 5, 10, 20, even 25 or more years to the Lee Co., and this was their reward. We certainly were not making extremely high wages. The average for the last quarter we worked was only \$7.84 per hour.

A total of almost 2,000 American jobs have been lost just since December of 1995—she says 2,000 jobs just in this one company, in the Lee Apparel Co.—including the closing of the St. Joseph, MO, plant; Fayetteville, TN; Seymour, MO; Dalton, GA; Bayou La Batre, AL; and the downsizing of jobs in the Winston-Salem, NC, plant. The other plants now working are in danger of losing their jobs to foreign countries and live in constant threat of plant closure. When will it stop?

I believe that the Government representatives of this country have allowed this to happen by passing the trade agreements such as NAFTA and GATT. Even though most will tell me that these trade agreements will be better in the long run, it does not help the 2,000 American workers who lost their jobs this year from the Lee Apparel Co., who need to support and feed their families.

I believe that when we combine the unconcern of the Government representatives of this country with the greed and coldness of the American corporations such as the Vanity Fair Corp., we will continue to have lost jobs and an increase of American work given to foreign governments.

The tax dollars generated in the city of Seymour, in Webster County, in the State of Missouri, and the United States, will be lost and services to those communities decreased due to lack of funds because of this closure. The same will be true in other communities that contained Lee apparel plants that were closed and the ones that will be closed in the future due to American work being sent out of the United States.

In a news bulletin dated October 18, 1995, the Vanity Fair Corp. stated, "Clearly, though, Vanity Fair remains committed to a strong domestic manufacturing capability that provides quick response to our retail partners, flexibility to changing product trends and support to the local communities in which we operate."

She says, I guess somewhere along the line the Vanity Fair Corp. forgot the American community and the American people to whom they sell their product.

Through the closing of these domestic plants, many American communities will suffer. Not only the employees of the closed Lee Apparel plants but also the businesses who rely on the money generated through wages spent. They will suffer too. That is some commitment on behalf of the Vanity Fair Corp.

We were told that if your plant must be closed, this is the best way because of the provision for job training provided by the NAFTA agreement. But in the case of Missouri, this is not proving to be the case. The employees of Seymour are having to fight to get the training entitlement under this plan. Many are having to fight many battles with the Employment Security Office that approves this training to get the

high-technology training that is supposed to lessen the chance of our future jobs being given to foreign governments. Not only have we lost our jobs, but we now must fight our own Government to get good training.

I don't know, but doesn't it seem like there should be a better way of doing things? When will the American Government start requiring accountability for these trade agreements? When will the American people that they represent start requiring accountability for the bills passed by our Government?

I hope you will read this letter to your fellow Representatives on the floor of Congress. Somewhere the system has gone against the American people and we need help. Thank you for your time and concern, I appreciate all you have contributed to the American worker.

Now I want to put Wanda's letter in the RECORD:

JANUARY 12, 1997.

Congresswoman MARCIE KAPTUR,
State of Ohio, Rayburn Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: I am writing concerning the closure of my apparel plant in Seymour, Missouri. I called your radio program on 1-12-97 with my concerns on the North American Free Trade Agreement and its cost of American jobs like mine. This Trade agreement has made it easier and more profitable for companies such as the Lee Apparel Company to take American jobs to other countries like Mexico. It is my understanding that representatives want to extend that agreement to cover other countries as well. This is my story:

The Lee Apparel Company, a subsidiary of the Vanity Fair Corporation, was one of the two main employers in Seymour, Missouri. The employees were hard working people who had helped the Lee Company through many hard times. In 1988, we accepted the Lee COMPETE plan which gave us an immediate cut in pay and tightened our incentive rates and made it harder to make a decent living. We took this cut to help make the jobs in Seymour more secure.

We found out on September 26, 1996 that our hard work and willingness to help the Lee Company would be thrown back into our faces by the Lee Company sending our jobs to Mexico and Costa Rica. By sending our jobs to Mexico, the Vanity Fair Corporation, through low wages and corporate greed have not even allowed the Mexican people to make a living. With one stroke, the Vanity Fair Corporation has weakened the American economy and depressed the Mexican people. I know that the people who worked in the Seymour, Missouri plant deserve better. Many of the employees had devoted 5, 10, 20, and even 25 or more years to the Lee Company and this was their reward. We certainly were not making extremely high wages. The average for the last quarter we worked was only \$7.84 per hour.

A total of almost 2000 American jobs have been lost just since December of 1995 in the Lee Apparel Company, including the closing of the St. Joseph, Missouri; Fayetteville, TN.; Seymour, Missouri; Dalton, GA.; Bayou La Batre, AL.; and the down-sizing of jobs in the Winston-Salem, N.C. plant. The other plants now working are in danger of losing their jobs to foreign countries and live in constant threat of plant closure. When will it stop?

I believe that the government representatives of this country have allowed this to

happen by passing the trade agreements such as NAFTA and GATT. Even though most will tell me that these trade agreements will be better in the long run, it does not help the 2000 American workers who lost their jobs this year from the Lee Apparel Company support and feed their families. I believe that when we combine the unconcern of the government representatives of this country with the greed and coldness of American corporations such as the Vanity Fair Corporation, we will continue to have lost jobs and an increase of American work given to foreign governments. The tax dollars generated in the city of Seymour, Webster County, the State of Missouri, and the United States will be lost and services to the communities decreased due to lack of funds because of this closure. The same will be true in the other communities that contained Lee Apparel plants that were closed and the ones that will be closed in the future due to American work being sent out of the United States.

In a news bulletin dated October 18, 1995, the Vanity Fair Corporation stated, "Clearly, though, VF remains committed to a strong domestic manufacturing capability that provides quick response to our retail partners, flexibility to changing product trends and support to the local communities in which we operate." I guess somewhere along the line, the VF Corporation forgot the American community and the American people to whom they sell their product. Through the closing of these domestic plants, many American communities will suffer. Not only the employees of the closed Lee Apparel plants, but also the businesses who rely on the money generated through wages spent will suffer. That is some commitment on the behalf of the Vanity Fair Corporation!

We were told that if your plant must be closed, this is the best way because of the provision for job training provided by the NAFTA agreement. In the case of Missouri, this is not proving to be the case. The employees of Seymour are having to fight to get the training entitlement under this plan. Many are having to fight many battles with the Employment Security office that approves this training to get the high-tech training that is supposed to lessen the chance of our future jobs being given to foreign governments. Not only have we lost our jobs, but now we must fight our own government to get good training.

I don't know, but doesn't it seem like there should be a better way of doing things? When will the American government start requiring accountability for these trade agreements? When will the American people that they represent start requiring accountability for the bills passed by our government?

I hope you will read this letter to your fellow representatives on the floor. Somewhere the system has gone against the American people and we need help! Thank you for your time and concern. I appreciate all you have contributed to the American worker.

Sincerely yours,

WANDA J. NAPIER.

But what is very interesting is she sent a similar letter to the President of the United States. I am going to read his answer and put that in the RECORD this evening as well, because it is an answer that goes to the hundreds of thousands of people in our country who have lost their jobs to NAFTA as well as to the people in Mexico who are getting the short end of the stick.

This is what he said to Wanda, the President of the United States, in a letter dated January of this year.

DEAR WANDA: Thank you for sharing your views about the North American Free Trade

Agreement. America's continued prosperity depends, as never before, on our ability to tap growing markets around the world.

NAFTA represents a great opportunity to create new, high-wage jobs here in America and to improve our ability to compete with Asia and Europe. And, as a result of this agreement, the Mexican and Canadian markets are beginning to open for the first time on a fair and equal basis to U.S. goods and services. More than 2 million American jobs are supported by exports to Canada and Mexico, and that number is growing in large part due to the NAFTA market-opening provisions.

Congress passed NAFTA in a historic demonstration of bipartisan support, and our country has chosen to compete, not retreat, and to reassert our leadership in the global economy. I hope you will continue to stay involved as we work to move our country forward.

Sincerely, Bill Clinton, President of the United States.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 14, 1997.

Ms. WANDA J. NAPIER,
Marshfield, MO.

DEAR WANDA: Thank you for sharing your views about the North American Free Trade Agreement. America's continued prosperity depends, as never before, on our ability to tap growing markets around the world.

NAFTA represents a great opportunity to create new, high-wage jobs here in America and to improve our ability to compete with Asia and Europe. And, as a result of this agreement, the Mexican and Canadian markets are beginning to open for the first time on a fair and equal basis to U.S. goods and services. More than two million American jobs are supported by exports to Canada and Mexico, and that number is growing in large part due to the NAFTA market-opening provisions.

Congress passed NAFTA in a historic demonstration of bipartisan support, and our country has chosen to compete—not retreat—and to reassert our leadership in the global economy. I hope you will continue to stay involved as we work to move our country forward.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Now, Wanda also wrote her Senators, and I am going to read the answer that she got, and we wonder why the American people stop voting, because nobody is listening. And here is what one of the Senators said, and I will place this in the RECORD:

Dear Ms. Napier: Thank you very much for sharing your thoughts. I am always happy to hear from Missourians and am interested to know your thoughts on this issue.

Again, thank you for taking the time to inform me of your views. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 16, 1996.

Ms. WANDA J. NAPIER,
Route 4, Box 3810, Marshfield, MO

DEAR MS. NAPIER: Thank you very much for sharing your thoughts on supporting the NAFTA Accountability Act. I am always happy to hear from Missourians and am interested to know your thoughts on this issue.

Again, thank you for taking the time to inform me of your views. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
U.S. Senator.

Then she wrote a senator in her home State, and I will not read the entire letter here this evening, but I will read a portion of it and place the entire letter of reply in the RECORD. The gentleman, who is a senator in Jefferson City, says to Wanda:

The question was posed as to how we were allowing this to happen. I do not know that anyone was allowing this to happen. Competition in the sewing industry has been very intense for several years, and now that we have a Mexican labor market so open to us, there is even greater pressure from competition.

MISSOURI SENATE,
Jefferson City, October 16, 1996.

Ms. WANDA NAPIER,
Marshfield, MO.

DEAR MS. NAPIER: I have received four letters which were identical so, therefore, I am taking the liberty of sending each of you the same letter.

I am very sorry that the Lee Company found it necessary to close the Seymour plant and I know it will be a burden and hardship on 350 individuals as well as their families. The economic impact on the county is also obvious.

The Department of Economic Development has assured me that they will do all they can do to see that a new employer is able to move into the Seymour community at the earliest date possible.

The question was posed as to how we were allowing this to happen. I don't know that anyone was allowing this to happen. Competition in the sewing industry has been very intense for several years and now that we have a Mexican labor market so open to us there is even greater pressure from competition.

I doubt that any one of us wants to live in a state or nation that would nationalize businesses (take the companies over).

You may wish to correspond directly with Congressman Skelton and Senators Bond and Ashcroft. Their addresses are enclosed.

Be assured of my interest and willingness to help in any way I can. I do believe that there will be job opportunities for the work force in the Seymour area. The availability of the plant facilities and trained work force has to be a real asset for the city of Seymour to offer a prospective company.

I know it is a difficult time but by working together there will be a brighter day.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. RUSSELL.

At least he was honest. At least he was honest, and what he is really saying is that here in the United States what we are doing is, we are in a race to the bottom. Lowering our standards continually, wages not rising, benefits being cut, whether it is in health, whether it is in retirement, workplace standards deteriorating because we do not have proper rules of engagement with nations that are not at our level and standard of living.

Now, she also wrote the Secretary of Labor of the United States of America. I am going to place that response in the RECORD, as well, because essentially what they say to her is that the President and the Secretary of Labor have been raising the issue of corporate responsibility, and they are telling her that while change is inevitable, profit should not be the only factor considered when companies reorganize, merge, or downsize.

And, in fact, the Secretary of Labor informs her that the President of the United States recently hosted the White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship, gee, would that not make her feel good, to continue the national discussion, discussion of how the corporate sector can ensure growth and profitability while not denying people the opportunity to make the most of their lives.

They go on to say that more than 300 business leaders came to the White House, including a sizable number of those businesses that are leaders in one or more of the five critical aspects of corporate responsibility. And listen to what the White House thinks are the elements of corporate responsibility: family-friendly work practices, health care and retirement, safe and secure workplaces, education and training, and employer-employee partnerships.

But where is jobs in America? Where is the issue of holding these corporations responsible for productive, high-wage jobs in the United States of America? Not even discussed.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, OFFICE
OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
POLICY,

Washington, DC, October 28, 1996.

Ms. WANDA NAPIER,
Marshfield, MO.

DEAR MS. NAPIER: Thank you for writing. The Secretary of Labor has asked me to respond on his behalf.

The President and the Secretary are committed to doing all they can to assist workers, such as those at the Lee Company plants cited in your letters, who have lost or are in danger of losing their positions as a result of downsizing. The Administration is fighting to ensure that adequate funding is provided for training programs for dislocated workers, to help them land on their feet.

The President and the Secretary are also raising the issue of corporate responsibility. While change is inevitable, profits should not be the only factor considered when companies reorganize, merge, or downsize. Corporate decisions and actions must accommodate the interests of employees as well.

The President recently hosted the White House Conference on Corporate Citizenship to continue the national discussion of how the corporate sector can ensure growth and profitability while not denying people the opportunity to make the most of their lives. More than 300 business leaders attended the Conference, including a sizable number of those businesses that are leaders in one or more of five critical aspects of corporate responsibility: family-friendly work practices, health care and retirement, safe and secure workplaces, education and training, and employer-employee partnerships.

Thank you for sharing your thoughts and concerns on these important economic issues with the Administration.

Sincerely,

EMIL PARKER,

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy.

It was interesting, she wrote her Governor. I will not read the answer from the Governor of Missouri, but basically it is a letter saying, I want to hear the concerns of citizens and be of assistance, but because your problem of losing your job falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, he is bucking the letter to the Department of Industrial

Relations, which basically tells her that they have a listing of computerized building and site information that they make available to potential companies that want to locate in Missouri.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City, November 26, 1996.

Ms. WANDA NAPIER,
Marshfield, MO.

DEAR MS. NAPIER: Thank you for your letter. I want to hear the concerns of citizens and to be of assistance when possible.

Because the matter addressed in your letter falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, I have forwarded your letter to the department director's office for review and response. You should receive a reply in the near future. If you do not, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

MEL CARNAHAN.

□ 2000

I can tell my colleagues I spoke to Wanda on Sunday again. She has no job. Her fellow employees, if they have been able to scrape anything together in that part of the country, are earning half of what they used to earn, and they only earned about \$7.85 an hour anyway.

This is what one citizen has tried to do to get anybody to listen to her story. This is someone who could be completely down and out, but she refuses to back down because she wants an answer. So what is she doing? She has rewritten the President of the United States another letter. She said, "Mr. President, I do not think you read my letter because the answer I got could not have been to the letter that was addressed to you."

She wrote that letter a few months ago and she finally got an answer dated May 5, again from the White House, exactly the same letter, word for word, except for the date, that she received in the first place. I am going to place that letter in the RECORD as well at this point.

The White House,

Washington, May 5, 1997.

Mrs. WANDA J. NAPIER,
Marshfield, MO.

DEAR WANDA: Thank you for sharing your views about the North American Free Trade Agreement. America's continued prosperity depends, as never before, on our ability to tap growing markets around the world.

NAFTA represents a great opportunity to create new, high-wage jobs here in America and to improve our ability to compete with Asia and Europe. And, as a result of this agreement, the Mexican and Canadian markets are beginning to open for the first time on a fair and equal basis to U.S. goods and services. More than two million American jobs are supported by exports to Canada and Mexico, and that number is growing in large part due to the NAFTA market-opening provisions.

Congress passed NAFTA in a historic demonstration of bipartisan support, and our country has chosen to compete—not retreat—and to reassert our leadership in the global economy. I hope you will continue to stay involved as we work to move our country forward.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

She has been e-mailing the White House. This is a woman who will not give up. I give her so much credit. She has been e-mailing the White House almost every other day. It is interesting when she writes the e-mail to explain her problem, whoever is down in that office in the e-mail office, here is what they answer her:

Thank you for writing to President Clinton via electronic mail. Since June 19, 1993, the White House has received over 1 million e-mail messages from people across the country and around the world. We are excited about the progress of online communication as a tool to bring government and the people closer together. Your continued interest and participation are very important to that goal. Sincerely, Stephen Horn, Director, Presidential E-mail, the Office of Correspondence.

If you were Wanda sitting out there in Missouri, how would you feel? I promised her that I am going to keep repeating her story until she gets a decent answer from the highest officeholder in this land who is elected, not appointed, and who is the promoter, the chief promoter of this agreement, along with the Speaker of this institution. It seems to me that Wanda and the 125,000 citizens of this country who have completely lost their jobs, in California, in Missouri, in Florida, in Michigan, in Tennessee, in Kentucky, in Alabama, in Texas due to NAFTA, do they not have a right to more consideration than this?

Today in Ohio we had major news. In the Warren, OH area, 8,500 workers at a major General Motors plant have gone on strike. What are they striking about? Let me read from the AP wire service. They walked off the job at General Motors Corp. where they make electric wiring for 20 automakers worldwide. The walkout began at 12 o'clock today, the deadline set by their union representatives to reach a contract agreement on local pension and pay issues with Delphi-Packard systems. Talks broke off on the issue of job security. Specifically, the union's contention is that the company in recent years has shifted thousands of jobs to Mexico, which it has. It employs over 37,000 people in Mexico today. General Motors is the largest employer in the nation of Mexico after the Government of Mexico.

The company wanted to reserve the right to move any work out of Ohio to Mexico at any time and that they did not have to meet with us about it, and that's when the bargaining committee said we can't live with that.

The concern is for our members working here to be able to retire from here.

Their story, their strike is connected to Wanda. It is over the same issue: fair treatment of workers across this continent. It is very interesting that when Mexico got in trouble last year and they had to be bailed out with the peso bailout, the investors on Wall Street and the investors on the Mexico City stock exchange had such important seats at the table that our own Government became the insurance

company for Mexico and our taxpayer dollars, through the U.S. Treasury, were used to prop Mexico up. But when the American people lose their jobs to another nation, or they are threatened with losing their shirts, they have no seat at the table. There is no place under NAFTA where the workers of our country, and, for that matter, the workers of Mexico and the farmers of both nations, where they get a break, where they get anybody to pay attention to their story. Do my colleagues think the Secretary of the Treasury even would sit down with Wanda? I would love to see that. The President of the United States will not even answer her repeated letters and repeated e-mails.

So here tonight we give voice to her, we give voice to the 8,500 General Motors workers in Warren, OH, who are standing firm. Their fight is a fight for every working family in America, because they are saying, we do not want our jobs outsourced. We do not want to have our wages reduced and our benefits cut and our health benefits plan gutted because we have to go in competition with a nation that will not even permit its own citizens to have their wages rise with rising productivity.

Let me mention that this Warren-based company of General Motors has 17 manufacturing plants and an engineering center in the Warren-Youngstown region in northeast Ohio, and they make wiring harnesses. Half their production goes into GM vehicles. As with Wanda's company, Vanity Fair, which had branches all over the United States, Delphi Packard has factories in Alabama, Arizona, California, and Mississippi. The workers who are standing the ground in Ohio tonight are standing in firm solidarity with workers across this Nation and, in fact, across this continent.

The striking workers have set up picket lines in Ohio. Production was stopped and no new talks were scheduled. One of the company spokesmen said today, "One real key point for us is that Delphi Packard has worked long and hard to build a diverse customer base, a lot of non-GM customers. The difficulty of winning and growing non-GM business is so challenging that when you interrupt that supply line, the risk is you can damage that relationship."

Union members have complained about retirement incentives for older workers and wages and benefits for newer employees who make up 55 percent of the most senior hourly workers.

What they are really fighting about are standard of living questions, living wage questions, questions of whether their contract, given their work, deserves a fair day's pay. With whom are they competing? People who do not have the ability to raise their standard of living in a nation like Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place this story about what is happening in Ohio in the RECORD this evening at this point.

8,500 DELPHI WORKERS STRIKE IN WARREN, CITE MEXICO THREAT

WARREN, OH (AP).—A key auto industry supplier was struck today by 8,500 hourly workers who walked off the job at a General Motors Corp. subsidiary that makes electric wiring for 20 automakers worldwide.

The walkout began at 12:01 a.m., the deadline set by the International Union of Electronic Workers to reach a contract agreement on local pension and pay issues with Delphi Packard Electric Systems.

Talks broke off over the issue of job security, specifically the union's contention that the company in recent years has shifted thousands of jobs to Mexico, Mike Kowach, Local 717 vice president, said today.

"The company wanted to reserve the right to move any work out of Ohio to Mexico at any time and that they did not have to meet with us about it, and that's when the bargaining committee said we can't live with that."

"The concern is for our members working here to be able to retire from here," Kowach said.

A message seeking the company's response on that issue was not immediately returned.

Most pay and benefit issues were settled earlier in a national agreement between GM and the union. The contract governing local issues expired in September.

The Warren-based company has 17 manufacturing plants and an engineering center in the Warren-Youngstown region in northeast Ohio, and makes wiring harnesses. Half of its production goes into GM vehicles.

Delphi Packard also has factories in Alabama, Arizona, California and Mississippi that are not involved in the strike.

Both sides have been negotiating on local issues since mid-1996.

The striking workers set up picket lines, but other employees reported to their jobs, leading to some minor confrontations at the plant gates, according to police and the union.

Production was stopped and no new talks were scheduled, Delphi Packard spokesman Jim Kobus said today.

"One real key point for us is that Delphi Packard has worked long and hard to build a diverse customer base, a lot of non-GM customers. The difficulty of winning and growing non-GM business is so challenging that when you interrupt that supply line, the risk is you can damage that relationship," Kobus said.

He said it was too early to comment on when automakers might feel the effects of the walkout.

Union members have complained about retirement incentives for older workers and wages and benefits for newer employees who make 55 percent of the most senior hourly workers.

Mr. Speaker, I see that we have been joined by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], our very esteemed leader. I very much appreciate the opportunity to be able to tell the story of Wanda Napier this evening. I hope at some point we can bring her to Washington and let her tell her own story. I also appreciate being able to talk about the very brave workers in Ohio who run the risk of losing their jobs because they are standing firm at a time when they feel like pawns in a very powerful system of production globally. We just want them to know that we stand with them and our hearts are with them tonight.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for taking the time and for her leadership on this issue and for caring so

much for those who have been in many ways brutalized by a system that has run amuck in our country today and for putting a human face on this issue tonight by telling a story of a person who has gone through the difficulties and the sorrows and the change. Putting a human face on these issues is so important. We can talk numbers and we can talk statistics, but these are real people with real lives, who have families, who have hopes, who have dreams. We are watching these policies snatch away those hopes and those dreams. We have got to fight it. The gentlewoman has been at the forefront of doing that for years.

My friend from Ohio talked about what is happening in outsourcing in Warren, OH. Of course, my colleagues know that recently the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. was on strike. I do not know if the gentlewoman alluded to that. I was not here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I did not allude to it.

Mr. BONIOR. There were 12,500 people that went on strike to demand decent wages and benefits and to limit outsourcing, which is a serious problem. Let me say that one of the major issues of that strike was the announcement by Goodyear that it was transferring production from Akron, OH to Santiago, Chile, resulting in 150 job losses. This issue is going to continue on and on unless we seriously address the wages and worker rights in our trade agreements. That is what we are here for today. We are talking about something that the administration wants to bring to the House floor. It is called fast track. It is a way to do trade negotiations without including the Congress in the formulation of that agreement. Agreements are made, they are brought to the Congress, and it is an up-or-down yes vote on the whole agreement and we do not have a say in it. That one might be OK from our perspective if we knew that in the core agreements, there would be negotiations dealing with the environmental issues, with labor issues, the trade issue, the whole question of wages and pensions and benefits and human rights. But they are not part of these discussions, and that is why we are so concerned about them.

I would like to talk about one other thing tonight, if I could, because it is an article that appeared, and I know that we have discussed it on the floor today, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and myself, and I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] here who has an article I am going to talk about that appeared in the New York Times, I believe it was last week, it was on the front page of the business section, it says "Borderline Working Class." This piece deals with the whole question of what has happened to the workers in Texas, in El Paso and all the border towns along that area.

One would have expected that there would have been a boom from listening to all the proponents of NAFTA, that this would have changed the direction

of the Texas economy for the better and there would be just great trade between El Paso and these other border towns and Mexico.

I want to draw the attention of my colleagues this evening to what I call a casualty of NAFTA. It might surprise my colleagues to know that El Paso, TX, right along the border with Mexico, is a casualty of NAFTA. In last Thursday's New York Times, in the business section, there were a couple of stories. We would expect the city of El Paso, as I said, to be a winner under NAFTA. At least that is what the proponents said. But as the article in the New York Times shows, the exact opposite has taken place. The article first describes a situation of Sun Apparel, where workers stitch clothes for Polo, Fila, and Sassoon. Some of the women who work at Sun Apparel in El Paso made slightly more than \$4.75 an hour, which is the minimum wage. Even after 15 years of work, these women are making \$4.75 an hour. But last month, Sun Apparel eliminated 300 jobs at the plant and shifted work to Mexico. Those workers, and 320 more who lost their job last year, were certified by the Labor Department as having lost their jobs through NAFTA. In Mexico, garment workers are usually paid \$1 an hour. So the minimum wage does not even protect you anymore.

Mr. Speaker, El Paso is where the rest of America is starting to catch up to, becoming fully integrated with the Mexican economy. Workers in El Paso must accept the minimum wage because the wages are so much lower just across the border. El Paso has lost more jobs to Mexican trade as certified by the Labor Department than anywhere else. Of the 5,600 workers who have been certified, only a fraction took advantage of the retraining program for NAFTA job loss victims. According to this Times article, and this is significant, that program left these workers with no skills or no jobs. The Federal Government has spent \$18 million on retraining people in El Paso under this program, without any real results, and will be spending another \$4.5 million more to retrain workers yet again. In fact, the mayor of El Paso, who was once a champion of NAFTA, is now a critic of the agreement. El Paso's unemployment rate is soaring. It is up to 11 percent. Juarez, just across the border from El Paso, has 177,000 maquiladora jobs by the end of last year. It has gained 77,000 of those jobs in the last 2 years alone. NAFTA has driven thousands of jobs out of El Paso and depressed the wages of its workers.

□ 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, that is some level of a sucking sound south, is it not?

Mr. BONIOR. It is certainly one of the largest Hoover vacuum cleaners that I have ever heard.

Ms. KAPTUR. And by the way, they are moving jobs, if the gentleman will

yield, out of Canton, OH, to Mexico as well.

Mr. BONIOR. Canton, Ohio, and I can name some places in Michigan, and of course our friend, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER] was up here the other day talking about the two plants in her district that have moved entirely out.

But you know it is not just the jobs. It is that downward pressure on wages. And I want to emphasize that tonight because we talk about jobs, but it is that constant pressure of the American worker that the employer comes to the bargaining table with them and says: "Listen, if you do not take a freeze in your wages or a cut in your wages or a cut in your health benefits, your pension benefits, we are out of here. We are going south."

And as the chart that is next to the gentlewoman from Ohio illustrates, there was a study done by the Labor Department recently that was suppressed that showed that 62 percent of United States employers threatened to close plants rather than negotiate with or recognize a union implying or explicitly threatening to move jobs to Mexico; 62 percent.

They said to these folks, "You know, we can just go south, and we will go south," and that is driving down wages.

Now for those people who actually do lose their job, and we have had anywhere between a quarter of a million and 600,000; we do not know the exact figure, but it is high; and we know we have got a trade deficit with Mexico now. We had a surplus of about \$2 billion before NAFTA; it is about \$16 billion deficit now, and that translates into about 600,000 jobs if you use the proponents' formula. We know that of those people who have lost their jobs a good many of them, probably most of them, have gotten other jobs.

Mr. SANDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I will. When I make my point, I will yield to my friend from Vermont. The problem is the jobs that they have got, they have gotten at about two-thirds the wage level which they were making before the original job is lost. And of course that just puts incredible pressure on them to reach a sustainable living wage for their families. So they get another job, they are sort of working two jobs, and when they are working two jobs or three jobs, they are not home for their kids' soccer game, they are not home for PTA meetings or school nights out, and then the whole family structure suffers.

So it is more than just jobs and wages. It is the whole social fabric of our society today.

And I yield to my friend from Vermont if the gentlewoman from Ohio will yield.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH], who are leading the fight against NAFTA.

The gentleman from Michigan makes an important point about wages, and let me ask my friends this question:

Every day that we pick up the newspaper we hear about the booming American economy. Do we not? In fact there was an article in the paper about how we have to clamp down on the boom, it is just off the wall it is so fantastic. But if you read page 62 in the little print about the boom when they talk about the wages that middle-class workers are getting in the midst of this boom, what do you find? My goodness. The real wages for American workers are continuing to decline.

Yes, the CEO's of major corporations saw a 54-percent increase in their compensation. Yes, the stock market is hitting off the wall. Yes, the rich are getting richer. But what about the average worker?

Mr. Speaker, the front pages of corporate America's newspapers do not talk about it, but for the average American worker, despite all of the so-called boom, the real wages are going down, people continue to work longer hours for low wages, and one of the reasons why is precisely what the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] are talking about. If our workers are forced to compete against desperate people in Mexico or in China who are trying to get by on starvation wages, if we merge these economies what is the ultimate result?

Mr. Speaker, it does not take an Einstein to figure it out. If there is a employer over here who is going to pay somebody 50 cents an hour, why are they going to pay you \$15 or \$20 an hour?

I would submit for the RECORD a remarkable article. Many of you must have seen it. It was April 27, 1997, the Associated Press, and what they talk about is Nike in Vietnam. Now Nike has a habit of going to wherever in the world wages are at rock bottom. Mexico is much too high wage for Nike. They are now in Vietnam. They have determined that wages in Vietnam are the lowest in the world.

Let me quote this:

In demonstrations on Friday workers burnt cars and ransacked the factory's office saying the company, Nike, was not paying them a \$2.50 cents a day minimum wage.

That is our competition. That is what, much of what, the global economy is about.

American workers, you really want to compete? Are you ready to go below \$2.50 an hour? Nike might come back to America and hire you if you are ready to go for \$2 a day. Ready to do that?

And that is, I think, the point that we are trying to make, and that is how it ties into the most important issue which is the declining wages.

Mr. BONIOR. And I think the Nike Corp., and correct me if I am wrong,

you have the article in front of you; they are paying the workers in Vietnam 30 cents an hour.

Mr. SANDERS. That is about right.

Mr. BONIOR. Thirty cents an hour.

Now I mean the Disney Corp. engages in the same situation. I mean they had a guy who they fired as their president, Michael Ovitz. They paid him \$90 million, severance package; he got \$90 million to be fired, and the guy who fired him got \$776 million over a 10-year period in the contract.

Now having said that, they make their clothes not in Texas, not in North Carolina, not in Illinois. They have those sweat shirts and those hats all stitched down in Haiti where they pay people 28 cents an hour.

I was watching the evening news, I forgot what network had it on this weekend, but they did a story about the Caribbean basin, I suspect a follow-up or during the President's visit down there. They are losing jobs to Mexico, the Caribbean basin countries. The Caribbean basin countries are losing all types of jobs to Mexico because they are getting a better deal in Mexico because of the NAFTA agreement and the low wages and the guaranteed investment.

This NAFTA is broken. I mean, they want us to move ahead with the fast track that will include other countries based on what we have under NAFTA, and it is like your house being on fire and your basement being flooded. You do not add another addition while that is all happening. You fix it first before you go on. And before we move ahead on fast track it seems to me, and to us, I think, is that we have got to correct a very inequitable, unfair situation in which the gentlewoman from Ohio has depicted in human terms very well this evening, and I thank her for it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if I might just reclaim a moment here before recognizing our wonderful colleague from Ohio? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has been a champion. I remember during the NAFTA debate he said this is our way of life, we are fighting for our way of life, this is who we are. We are not talking about something that is out there; it is about the struggle that we have had to create a middle class and allow people to sustain themselves and to experience the best that American life has to offer, and the country owes the gentleman a debt of gratitude, not just our region, but the whole country, and I thank the gentleman for sticking with us on this. I just wanted to mention that when you were saying that probably the biggest threat in these trade agreements when they are not well-balanced and people, many people, are not at the table, creates this downward pressure on our living standards, on our wages.

This is an excellent poster that we have blown up here that came from a company in Illinois, and they told their workers that the workers' jobs might go south for more than just the winter, and it says on the bottom this was

posted on the company bulletin board. This is an automotive plant. It says, "There are Mexicans willing to do your job for \$3 to \$4 an hour. The free trade treaty allows this."

And that is not just a subtle message to the work force, but it is that the downward pressure is heavy duty, and that is why workers at plants like the Delphi plant in Warren, OH, have said, all right, you want to draw a line in the sand, we are drawing the line for America.

So I think this is proof in the pudding of exactly what you are talking about, and I wanted to thank the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for coming down here this evening and being with us. It seems like we were here before, we were here before and we tried to tell this story. Now we have 3 years of experience to measure, and we intend to measure, and we have new Members like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] who has hit the ground running here, who comes from having been mayor of Cleveland and comes from a place that has experienced the industrial and agricultural transformation over the last several decades, has lots to say on this, and we welcome you this evening.

Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you very much, and I am certainly glad to join the delegation of which you are a leader in this effort to call to the attention of the American people so many of the inequities which exist in our trade agreement known as NAFTA, and it is certainly a pleasure to be in the Congress of the United States with such leaders as you and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] who are outstanding spokespersons on this issue to let the American people know what is going on because people who follow government always want information so that they can make intelligent decisions about whether or not they support policies.

And when I saw the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] produce that poster, which I have a copy of as well, with the UAW: Your jobs may go south for more than just the winter; this was distributed in an attempt to frustrate what we in this country recognize as the basic right of working people to associate and organize. And when an organizing drive was occurring in Macomb, IL, at this company, it was NTN Bauer, these leaflets began appearing throughout the plant. There are Mexicans willing to do your job for \$3 to \$4 an hour; free trade treaty allows that.

So what NAFTA has produced is a different type of behavior on the part of those who are running the companies where workers are now threatened, and they are threatened in an insidious way because, if we in this country do not always have the ability to exercise our most basic rights as citizens, which we recognize as the right of association guaranteed in the first amendment and derived from that the

right to organize, the right to be able to affiliate, the right to be able to extend into areas like collective bargaining; if we have a trade agreement that effectively can lead others to trash those basic rights, then we have a trade agreement which abrogates some of the rights which the people of this country gained when this country was founded over 200 years ago.

Now what then can be the remedy? Well, there certainly is a remedy, and that is the Fast Track Accountability Act which specifically provides that workers' rights must be protected, that we would adopt and enforce laws to extend internationally recognized workers' rights in any country involved, and those rights would include, and we would codify this, this would be in the law, the rights of freedom of association, the right to organize, which Congressman SANDERS talked about in one of our last discussions, the right to organize and bargain collectively, the prohibition of force or compulsory labor, establishment of a minimum wage for the employment of children and acceptable working conditions with respect to minimum wage and hours of work and occupational safety and health.

Some will say, well, we have some of that in existing NAFTA. We have very weak side agreements which are not really enforceable, and there is no punishment if someone does not abide by and respect the rights of workers. The same is true of environmental standards. NAFTA is causing a leveling down of environmental standards.

We know also from other trade agreements the World Trade Organization can in fact impose, in effect abrogating our Constitution, can attack our sovereignty by saying that our environmental standards, which help to assure the quality of life in this country, in effect are an impermissible trade barrier and therefore the United States must either pay a fine or other action will be taken against the country. This attacks our sovereignty as a nation.

□ 2030

So we need in a fast track agreement guarantees not only to protect workers, not only to protect labor, but to protect the environment as well, which would mitigate global climate change, which would cause a reduction in the production of ozone depleting substances, which would ban international dumping of highly radioactive waste and all of these things which we need to put in the law. That is the only way that fast track should ever be considered. Those must be in the law, and once it gets into law, if there is a violation, then we could treat it as an actionable unfair trade practice, subject to potential sanctions such as withdrawal of free trade privileges.

Now, we are not helpless in this country. We have the ability to retake, to regain control of our destiny. We have an ability to reclaim our sovereignty so that the World Trade Orga-

nization is not in effect nullifying the laws made by this Congress. But the only way we can do that is that as long as NAFTA exists, and I certainly am not an advocate for that, but as long as it does exist, the only way we can move forward is through having labor and environmental standards, high standards which must be at the core of any agreement.

Mr. Speaker, that is something I offer for my colleagues' consideration, because I think that is something that would enable the public, which watches these events so carefully, to have a little bit more confidence in these kinds of agreements. We must secure workers' rights. If we do not do that, if we are not willing to do that in international trade agreements, we will sacrifice the rights of workers here at home, and that will lead to a deterioration of our democratic society.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on that point, because that is really a key point here. When we talk about these agreements, we talk about them in terms of trade, we talk about them in terms of tariff, and I tried to broaden it with my colleagues here this evening to talk about the environment and labor rights and human rights.

The gentleman mentioned something just now that goes deeper than even that, it goes to the depths of what we are about as a country, it goes to the heart of our system, it goes to democracy. The gentleman used the word democracy. That is what this is about.

The proponents of this fairlyland globalized trade scheme that we are now engaged in want to take us back to the 19th century, before people had these basic rights. I am talking about worker rights now, the right to organize, to assemble, to freely associate, to form unions, to collectively bargain, the right to strike, the right to have certain labor standards and job protections and safety standards.

That just did not happen, that happened because a lot of people struggled for 100 years to make it happen. They marched, they were beaten, they lost their jobs, they were killed, they were assassinated in order for us to have these rights, to be able to come together and bargain for our work.

As a result of those sacrifices, the wealthiest and most prosperous Nation in the world and the largest middle class in the history of the Earth, of this world, was developed. And now, we are, through our trade agreements, creating a situation in which there is a rush to the bottom rung to roll back all of these rights.

The woman who works at Sun Apparel making \$4.75 an hour lost her job, making the minimum wage. The minimum wage does not even help her anymore, because we have made a marriage with Mexico on the economy and it is across the border. Now she has to compete at a lower level, she has to compete without job security, she has to compete without environmental

safeguards there along the border and along the river.

So it is more than just jobs and tariffs and downward pressures on wages, it is about being able to come together as people and organize and to assemble and to bargain for your sweat.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think the proof basically is in the pudding; is it not? Now, if the trade policies and our current economic policies are working well, then the proof is there. Then we will have an expanding middle class; right? Then the new jobs that are being created will pay people decent wages; is that not correct? Then we will have a society where the gap between the rich and the poor grows narrower.

But what in fact has been happening since the development of these trade policies? What we now have in the United States is the wealthiest 1 percent of the population owning 42 percent of the wealth, which is more than the bottom 90 percent. Now I think we have not been totally fair tonight, because I think we should acknowledge that these trade agreements do do some people good.

Mr. BONIOR. They do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, we have to be honest about it, yes, for the vast majority of workers, wages are going down. Yes, we have lost hundreds of thousands of jobs for our working people, but we have not been totally fair tonight; and that is we must acknowledge that some people are doing well. We have to say that, and we do have to point out that the CEO's of major American corporations last year, and I am sure everybody will be happy to hear this, especially if you are among the richest 1 percent, saw a 54 percent increase in their compensation.

So some people are doing very well. The average worker has seen a decline in his or her wages, but the richest people in America have never had it so good. So that explains to us why they pour millions and millions of dollars into their lobbyist friends and their television ads and newspaper ads telling us why we should support NAFTA and GATT.

The trade agreement is working for all of you out there who are millionaires and billionaires. In fact, over the last 15 years it is rather remarkable. While the real wages of American workers have gone down, we have seen a proliferation of millionaires.

In 1982 there were 12 billionaires in the United States, 12 billionaires. Today there are 135. So in all fairness, these trade agreements are working very well for millionaires and billionaires. But for the vast majority of our people, they are resulting in significant job loss and the pressure to lower wages.

Now, some people will say, I do not work in a factory, it does not affect me. What is my problem? It does affect you, it affects you because when UAW workers see their wages go down, then when your employer, even if you are in

a nonunion shop, has to deal with you, what he will say is, hey, I do not have to pay you \$15 an hour, I can pay you \$12, I can pay you \$8 an hour. If we have Mexican workers prepared to work for 50 cents an hour, I will start you off at \$5 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, one of the scariest aspects about the new economy is the decline in real wages of high school graduates. These are the young people who have never gone to college. What we are talking about is entry level jobs for young Americans graduating high school, for young men it is 30 percent less than what it was 15 years ago. For young women it is 17 percent less.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, that is a phenomenal figure. If the gentleman will repeat that again, because some of us are aware of it, but a lot of folks in this country do not understand that as the gentleman points out, the people at the very top, in fact, it goes down. People in the top 5 percent in America are doing very well today, but beyond that, it slips dramatically.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for young people graduating high school, their entry level jobs are now paying 30 percent less than was the case 15 years ago. For young women, it is about 17 or 18 percent less.

Furthermore, Americans at the lower end of the wage scale are now the lowest-paid workers in the industrialized world. Eighteen percent of American workers with full-time jobs are paid so little that their wages do not enable them to live above the poverty level. Welcome to the global economy.

The point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] made earlier, in many ways, what this economy is looking like is what Mexico is: a few people at the top, and millions of people struggling just to exist.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if I could just make a brief point, last night I was in Lima, OH, giving a speech to a large number of people. And afterwards three different citizens came up to me, two who were high school graduates, and one a mother of a gentleman who is 30 years old but is working in a temporary position. And that is the fastest work category in our country, fastest growing category, temporary work. She said: "Marcy, my son is worried because in two weeks he loses his temporary job."

It is not just low wages of these workers, it is the insecurity of not knowing whether there will be a job for them. The other two young men that were there were just seeking work, seeking to better themselves, having to work at jobs like Payless Shoes, which imports all of its shoes. And when you are a manager for a lot of those jobs, you qualify for food stamps.

Is this the kind of America that we want to produce, one where when you work, and in Mexico, as we were told by the people down there, they work for hunger wages. These people in Lima, OH last night had several problems in trying to locate steady, well-

paying jobs where they could secure a future for themselves and their family.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the largest employer in the country today is not General Motors, it is Manpower temporary services. The company pays no health benefits, no pensions. It is temporary work, the largest employer, and it is moving more and more in that direction.

I wanted to expand on what both of my colleagues have just said about the workers. Because it is not just happening here in America, in the United States, it is occurring, as the gentleman pointed out, in Mexico as well.

When we began the NAFTA debate, the worker in Mexico was making \$1 an hour. Now that worker, and I have seen it with my own eyes in a trip that I took down there two months ago, is making 70 cents an hour. The people at the top in Mexico, they have created an incredible burst of billionaires, a class of billionaires down there.

I have a friend who told me, and I do not know if this is true, but I am reluctant to repeat it tonight, but I have a sense that it is, because he is very conservative in his estimates and he understands these issues very well. And he is a very learned person, who told me that in Del Mar, a little town north of San Diego in California, there are 600, 600 millionaires with Mexican citizenship, 600. So the wealthy make their money, they live often across the border here, and the workers are being paid 70 cents an hour. Their value of their wages have, since NAFTA, declined 30, 40 percent. So it is workers on both sides of the border.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on one point?

As the gentleman is talking, I am thinking about when NAFTA was discussed here, and we were told President Salinas had the greatest democratic heart, with a small D, beating in this century. Can you imagine a President of the United States being so disgraced that he then is a man without a country?

That gentleman who headed Mexico now may be living in Ireland, for all we know, and his brother is in jail, and will be standing trial for drug-related charges, and we act, I mean the proponents act as if nothing happened.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, all the editorial writers in the country, they thought Mr. Salinas was a great guy. He went to Harvard and he is going to take Mexico into the next millennium and they were just as proud as punch to be affiliated and associated with him. The fact of the matter is he has not turned out very well, nor has his brother, nor has his policies. You would expect somebody to recognize this and say well, we made a mistake, but no, they cannot admit they made a mistake. My goodness, gracious, they are infallible, because they are, as the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] says, part of this whole corporate machine, this multinational transnational

machine which spews this stuff out in the press on a daily basis about the upstanding, wonderful nature of these leaders and tries to pull the wool over everyone's eyes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for a moment, I remember during the NAFTA debate, one of the frustrations that we had is that virtually every major newspaper, without exception, every major newspaper in America told us how great the NAFTA agreement would be.

Now I am wondering if anybody here tonight knows if there has been one of those newspapers yet that has apologized to their readers and has said, whoops, we were wrong. Are my colleagues aware of any newspapers that have made that statement?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of a single one, I would say to my colleague.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am not either, but just in 30 seconds here, I read the New York Times very carefully, because it is a good newspaper and I generally agree with them, not all of the time, with their editorials, and they are starting to express themselves in ways that they understand that there was something very wrong with NAFTA.

They are not going to admit that they were wrong, but they have been writing editorials recently with respect to the environment and Chile and labor standards, and so there is starting to be a slight sign, but that is about it. The rest of the business has been very silent, as the gentleman has indicated.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we just want to thank all of the membership for listening and for those who are tuned in on public broadcasting or C-SPAN, we want to thank the public for their interest in NAFTA, and more to come.

□ 2045

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1469, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1997

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-96) on the resolution (H. Res. 146) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEFNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of funeral for a family member.