

down. The Government Shutdown Prevention Act allows appropriators to finish their work as funding levels automatically continue at the rate of the previous year: an "instant replay" that allows the Government to operate until a budget agreement is reached. An "instant replay" that allows senior citizens to get their social security checks on time, allows veterans to receive their benefits, and keeps federal workers on the job during budget negotiations. I'd say Congress ought to take a page out of the NFL play book and pass H.R. 142, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act.

#### MY COMMITMENT TO REPEALING THE JONES ACT

#### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 18, 1999*

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, American agricultural producers today do not have access to domestic deep-sea transportation options available to their foreign competitors. There are no bulk carriers operating on either coast of the United States, in the Great Lakes, nor out to Guam, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or Hawaii. This places Colorado producers at a competitive disadvantage because foreign producers are able to ship their products to American markets at competitive international rates whereas U.S. producers are not.

Colorado agricultural producers also need access to deep-sea transportation options because other modes of transportation are often expensive, unpredictable, or unavailable. The rail car shortage we experienced in 1997 could have been averted if just 2% of domestic agricultural production could have traveled by ocean-going vessel. With continued record harvests anticipated across our state, the bottlenecks and congestion on rail lines could easily happen again. This raises rail rates to artificially high levels at a time when commodity prices are already depressed. This in turn raises the costs of production, lowers income, and makes it more difficult for Colorado's producers to compete against subsidized foreign products.

The reason there are no domestic bulkers available to agriculture shippers is because of an outdated maritime law, known as the Jones Act, which as passed in 1920 in an effort to strengthen the U.S. commercial shipping fleet. This law mandates any goods transported between two U.S. ports must travel on a vessel built, owned, manned, and flagged in the United States—no exceptions. The domestic fleet has languished under the Jones Act because it is prohibitively expensive to build new ocean-going vessels in U.S. shipyards.

Only two bulkers have been built in U.S. shipyards in the last 35 years, which has left our country with the oldest fleet in the industrialized world. To contract for a new ship would cost an American operator over three times the international non-subsidized rate, almost assuring no new bulkers are built in the United States.

At a time when we should be fighting ever harder to open foreign markets, reduce unnecessary costs and regulatory burdens, and promote sales of American products, we should not be imposing artificial costs and burdens on Colorado's hardworking agriculture producers.

I will continue my work in Congress to repeal the Jones Act and assure a more efficient and cost-effective system for transporting agricultural goods to market.

#### TRIBUTE TO THOMAS FERNANDEZ

#### HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 18, 1999*

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention an award won by Thomas Fernandez, a 12-year-old resident of our great community, Albuquerque, NM. Thomas Fernandez is the 1999 BMX Grand National Champion for his age group.

Thomas began competing when he was 4½ years old. He has more than 200 trophies displayed at his family's home in Barrio de Duranes. This is the second time Thomas has taken this prestigious national title. The first time was in 1992 at the age of 6.

Please join me in recognizing this achievement of Thomas Fernandez and wish him continued success.

#### OPPOSING COMMUNISM

#### HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 18, 1999*

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following remarks given by Paul Harvey in a radio broadcast on March 16, 1999 to my colleagues.

[Excerpt from Paul Harvey News, March 16, 1999]

When Communism was threatening to take over the world there were Americans with divided allegiance. Communists had infiltrated some high places into the United States. A lean young traitor was able to walk out of the Supreme Court building with two character references in his briefcase.

In Hollywood individuals suspected of communist sympathies were blacklisted. Some were denied employment for years. Less well known is the Hollywood blacklist of ANTI communists and this one still exists.

March 21, next Sunday; in Los Angeles, California at the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion there will be a ceremony of support for the actors and actresses who have been blacklisted because they dared oppose communism. Adolph Menjou, Elia Kazan, and recognition for his red-white and blue colleagues: Writer Jack Moffitt, Richard Macaulay, Morris Ryskind, Fred Niblo, Junior. Albert Mannheimer who dared fight communists within the Screen Actors Guild.

Most of these who opposed communism never worked in Hollywood again. They represent the "other blacklist." And it is not limited to Hollywood.

All media include some whose patriotism is diluted and to whom anybody consistently on the right is anathema. They hated Reagan and still do.

Such is the "new discrimination" a new organization has taken root to protect the civil rights of the American right. The American Civil Rights Union chaired by Robert Carlson and with a board comprised of Bob Bork, Linda Chavez, Ed Meese, Joe Perkins, Ken Tomlinson.

In my professional experience there is less—left-right—polarization in our nation

than ever in this century. But what it is is insidious, entrenched, tenacious. Until the day when there will be need for an ACLU or an ACRU . . . it is constructive that we now have both.

#### AFL-CIO MAKES GOOD SENSE ON TRADE

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 18, 1999*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues on which many of us are now working is to forge policies which allow us to get the benefits of the global mobility of capital while dealing with the negative impacts that accompany that movement of money throughout the world in the absences of sensible, humane public policies.

No organization in America has done as much to articulate the important, principles that we need to follow in this regard than the AFL-CIO, and the statement on Trade and Deindustrialization issued by the AFL-CIO's executive Council last month is an excellent presentation of this problem. A significant number of us here in the House believe that unless we are able to embody these principles in legislation, the chances of adopting further trade legislation will be substantially diminished, an support for international financial institutions will be similarly negatively affected. Because the AFL-CIO does such a good job of spelling out the approach that is economically, morally and politically called for in dealing with the international economy, I ask that the Council's statement be printed here.

#### TRADE AND DEINDUSTRIALIZATION

The financial crisis that began in Asia more than a year-and-a-half ago continues and spreads. The countries hit first struggle to recover, and new countries succumb to the contagion. Millions of workers have lost their livelihoods in the crisis countries and hunger and poverty have grown alarmingly. The United States is not immune, and many American workers are already paying a high price for global turmoil.

It is clear that the crisis is neither temporary, nor easily fixed. The cause of the crisis is systemic, and solutions must go straight to the heart of a global trade and investment regime that is fundamentally flawed. Deregulated global markets, whether for capital and currencies, or for labor and goods, are not sustainable. They produce speculative, hot money explosions and a relentless search for lower costs that devastate people, overturn national economies and threaten the global economy itself. The so-called Washington consensus on "economic reform"—trade and investment liberalization, privatization, deregulation, and extreme austerity—is a recipe for instability, social strife, environmental degradation, and growing inequality, not long-term growth, development, and broadly shared prosperity.

The combination of the global financial crisis and long-term trends in trade and investment have inflicted deep wounds in the U.S. manufacturing sector. The United States has lost 285,000 manufacturing jobs since March of 1998. Trade-related job loss will likely grow in 1999, as the trade deficit in goods is projected to climb from about \$240 billion in 1998 to close to \$300 billion this year.

This trade imbalance is accelerating industrialization in a broad array of industries—

steel, textile, apparel, auto, electronics, and aerospace. No region has escaped the ravages of the crisis. The impact is not only job loss, but also the quality and composition of jobs, and therefore the distribution of income. Despite the recent growth in wages, the typical American worker's real hourly compensation is lower today than it was almost a decade ago—even as productivity grew by 9 percent.

We must address these problems by insisting upon a set of principles that will guide our trade, investment, and development policies at home and in all of the multilateral fora. We will strenuously oppose any new trade or investment agreements that do not reflect these principles, and we will work to remedy the deep flaws in our current policies.

First, excessive volatility in international flows of goods, services, or capital must be controlled. Countries must retain the ability to regulate the flow of speculative capital in order to protect their economies from this volatility.

Second, we must not allow international trade and investment agreements to be tools which businesses use to force down wages and working conditions or weaken unions, here or abroad.

Third, we need to pay more attention to the kind of development we aim to encourage with our trade policy. Our current policies reward lower barriers to trade and investment, and encourage developing countries to dismantle domestic regulation. These policies encourage developing countries to grow by tapping rich export markets abroad, while keeping wages low at home. This focus on export-led growth shortchanges developing countries and places undue burden on our market.

As Congress considers trade initiatives this year, and as the Administration prepares to host the World Trade Organization (WTO) ministerial in November, they must adhere rigorously to these principles. This requires that:

The U.S. government must radically reorder its priorities, so that our trading partners understand that enforceable worker rights and environmental protection are essential elements in the core of any trade and investment agreements. Unilateral grants of preferential trade benefits must also meet this standard. The African Growth and Opportunity Act and the proposed extension of NAFTA benefits to the Caribbean and Central America fall far short and are unacceptable.

We should strengthen worker rights provisions in existing U.S. trade laws and enforce these provisions more aggressively and unambiguously to signal our trading partners that failure to comply will not be tolerated.

The U.S. government must enforce the agreements it is currently party to, before looking to conclude more deals. China's failure to abide by the 1992 memorandum of understanding and the 1994 market-opening agreement must not go unchallenged, and China's recent jailing of trade unionists is yet more evidence that WTO accession should be denied. Congressional approval should be required for China's accession to the WTO.

Current safeguard provisions in U.S. law are clumsy and ineffective. We must strengthen and streamline Section 201 and the NAFTA safeguards provisions, so that we can respond quickly and effectively when import surges cause injury to domestic industries. Until this can be accomplished, we should be ready to take unilateral action to protect against import surges when necessary.

Immediate steps must be taken to address the flood of under-priced imported steel coming into our market. U.S. workers must not

be the victims of international financial collapse.

Fast track—the traditional approach to trade negotiating authority—has been decisively rejected by Congress and the American people. Trade negotiations are increasingly complex, and Congress must have a stronger consultative role. Congressional certification that objectives have been met at each stage must be required before the negotiations can proceed. Both the process of negotiation and the international institutions that implement these agreements need to be more transparent and accessible to non-governmental organizations.

We need to address the problems faced by developing countries more directly, by offering deep debt relief and development funds as part of an overall program of engagement and trade. Trade preferences linked to improved labor rights and environmental standards change the financial incentives for countries seeking market access and increased foreign direct investment; debt relief and aid can help provide the resources necessary to implement higher standards.

The U.S. government needs to address the problems of chronic trade imbalances and offset agreements, whereby U.S. technology and jobs are traded for market access.

But before Congress and the Administration craft fundamentally different trade policies, we must take urgent steps to fix problems in our current trade agreements. NAFTA has been in place for five years now and has been a failure.

We must strengthen the labor rights protections in NAFTA, so that violations of core labor standards come under the same strict dispute settlement provisions as the business-related aspects of the agreement.

We must renegotiate the provisions on cross-border trucking access. It is clear that fundamental safety issues are far from being satisfactorily addressed. The safety of our highways must not be compromised for the sake of compliance with a flawed trade agreement.

The safeguard provisions in NAFTA have proven ineffective in the cases of auto and apparel imports, which have surged unacceptably since NAFTA's implementation in 1994. These provisions must be corrected. We must insist on an equitable sharing of automotive production among the three North American countries, so that all three countries can benefit from growth in the North American market, as well as sharing in its downturns. And we must ensure that the investment provisions of NAFTA, which grant new powers to corporations in their disputes with governments, are fixed and not used as a model for any future agreements.

In addition to fixing trade policy, we have to make sure that our policies toward investment, development, taxation, and the international financial institutions support economically rational, humane, and worker-friendly rules of competition. We must change the rules of the international economy, not so we can have more trade, but so we can build a better world, for working families here and abroad.

Finally, it is important to remember that the United States has the right to withdraw from trade agreements to which it is a party. The U.S. government should undertake an aggressive review of existing trade agreements to determine whether they adequately protect U.S. interests or whether the U.S. should exercise its withdrawal rights.

## WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 16, 1999*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act. This bill increases the authorization for the Women's Business Center Program from \$8 million to \$11 million in FY 2000.

I support this bill because the Women's Business Centers are instrumental in assisting women with developing and expanding their own businesses. The Centers provide comprehensive training, counseling and information to help women succeed in business.

Women are starting new businesses at twice the rate of men and own almost 40 percent or 8 million of all small businesses in the United States. Women of color own nearly one in eight of the 8 million women-owned businesses or 1,067,000 businesses.

Women start businesses for a variety of reasons. With the recent spate of corporate downsizing in large companies and the various changes in the marketplace, small businesses are becoming a vital part of the economic stability of the country.

Women often start businesses because they want flexibility in raising their children, they want to escape gender discrimination on the job, they hit the glass ceiling, and many desire to fulfill a dream of becoming an entrepreneur. We should encourage this current trend of women-owned businesses by supporting the Women's Business Center Amendment appropriation.

The Women's Business Centers offer women the tools necessary to launch businesses by providing resources and assistance with the development of a new business. This includes developing a business plan, conducting market research, developing a marketing strategy, and identifying financial services. The centers also offer practical advice and support for new business owners.

Access to this information is essential to success in small business. The Women's Business Centers provide a valuable service to aspiring entrepreneurs.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

## ASSISTING SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFICIARIES IN THEIR RETURN TO WORK: THE WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

**HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 18, 1999*

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the introduction of "The Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999." This legislation is designed to help Social Security Disability Insurance and SSI beneficiaries participate more fully in our nation's economy. It provides new opportunities and new incentives for people with disabilities to return to the work force.