

this week will be on these two trade agreements, which are frankly more of the same, more NAFTA, more hemorrhaging of jobs, more weakening of environmental and food safety laws, and all of the values we in this country hold dear.

Most of all, these trade agreements with Chile and Singapore are all about jobs. When we look at what has happened with NAFTA in the last 10 years since NAFTA passed this Chamber in November 1993, in these 10 years we have seen a trade surplus with Mexico turn into a huge trade deficit. We have seen job gains with Mexico and Canada turn into huge job losses. We have seen since Congress has passed Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China and Most-favored Nation status temporary renewals every year the last dozen years. We have seen our trade deficit with China go from \$100 million in 1990, to \$100 billion in 2002.

Every billion dollars, according to President Bush, Sr., meant a loss of 18,000 jobs. So with a trade deficit of \$450 billion, all we have to do is do the math to understand why the job picture in this country is so bleak and with passing Chile and Singapore trade agreements and the rest of the President's trade agenda, Central America free trade agreement, Free Trade Act to the Americas to extend NAFTA to the whole hemisphere, we understand why the job picture in the future is even bleaker.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago on Sunday I spoke to a rally of Goodyear workers in Akron, Ohio. There are 14 Goodyear plants scattered across the United States. There were rallies held by the Steel Workers, formerly the Rubber Workers, at each of these 14 plants across this great country. Everyone that came up to me before, during, and after the rally talked about job loss, talked about their anxiety, economic insecurity and kept asking why does President Bush want a trade agreement with Singapore, why does President Bush want a trade agreement with Chile, why does President Bush want to extend NAFTA to Central America and why does President Bush want to extend NAFTA to all of Latin America.

Those workers understand that trade is a four-letter word, and it is spelled J-O-B-S. They spell better than President Bush and the leadership in this Congress because they understand that these trade policies with Chile, with Singapore, with a Central America free trade agreement, with the Free Trade Act with the Americas, these trade agreements, in addition to weakening our environmental standards, in addition to undercutting labor standards, in addition to weakening food safety standards, in addition to undercutting what we hold dear in this country, they understand these trade agreements more than anything else are about jobs. They are about the loss of jobs, about the hemorrhaging of jobs, about jobs going overseas year after year after year; and they are not coming

back unless we change our trade policy.

H.R. 693, MILITARY DEATH GRATUITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Members can see beside me and behind me are photographs of men and women who have died in Operation Freedom; and the reason I come to the floor with these photographs, I do not want us as Members of Congress to ever forget, not that we ever would, the high cost of freedom, because someone has given a life to ensure that the American people as well as the people of Iraq can have the freedom that we in America are guaranteed by our Constitution.

The reason I wanted to come to the floor is because many of my colleagues, as well as people throughout this country, do not realize that each and every family that has a loved one killed in the military receives what is called a death gratuity. It is a small amount of money, I do not think it is enough, but it is a check for \$6,000. What makes it even worse than the amount is a tax on part of the \$6,000.

In the 107th Congress, I introduced legislation to eliminate the tax, and let me say that the House did its job in a bipartisan way and passed the legislation, sent it over to the other body and they failed to act on that legislation. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, families throughout this country, actually 292 military families, had to pay a tax on the death gratuity they received on the death of a loved one serving this Nation and possibly fighting for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, if the other body does not pass this legislation that we have sent over there again this year, meaning 2003, very possibly in 2004 there could be as many as 200 to 300 families in this country that will receive from Uncle Sam a notice that they owe tax on the death gratuity. I think this is unacceptable. I think it is deplorable that any family that would give a loved one to serve this Nation who has given their life to protect freedom would next year receive a tax notice from Uncle Sam.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is unacceptable. I think the other body needs to do its job and pass legislation to ensure that in the year 2004 the families who lose loved ones serving this Nation will not have to pay a tax on a \$6,000 death gratuity. I think we as Congress must ensure that the families who have lost those loved ones will not be asked by Uncle Sam to pay a tax on the small amount of \$6,000 for that loved one who has given their life. I close by encouraging the other body to do its job and

not leave this fall and not have passed this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I close as I always do in my district, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, I ask God to please bless their families, I ask God to please bless the families who have lost loved ones, I ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God, I ask God to please bless the President of the United States that he will do what is right in the eyes of God, and I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to rise to urge my colleagues to listen a bit about this discussion that I am going to enter into regarding the U.S.-Chile and U.S.-Singapore free trade agreements. And as one of my colleagues said, it is about jobs, J-O-B-S.

Mr. Speaker, understand I am not opposed to free trade. I want to underscore that we want to seek fair trade, and I point out the chart next to me because I want to talk about the high unemployment rates in my country, but also here in my own district. Right now the national percentage for unemployment is 6.4. I have communities in my district that have well above 10.8 percent unemployment. Many of the job losses have stemmed from jobs going abroad, particularly in the garment industry, in light manufacturing and other jobs like that.

I want to point out that if we do move forward with the U.S.-Chile and U.S.-Singapore free trade agreements, we should try to enact legislation that would provide fair treatment of people who enter into this country. One of the questions I have right now is that this trade agreement with Chile and Singapore is not fair. What it would do is allow for a vast influx of foreign temporary workers from low-wage nations that would be competing with our communities, with people who are faced with not having jobs right now, who are well trained, by the way.

I would like to draw Members' attention that last night as I was watching the news on Channel 7, they were doing a depiction of people who had recently lost their jobs, people who had considerable training and background and degrees, people in finance and technology. They are now working at the local hamburger stop, or in marketing positions that pay well below \$9 an hour, or somewhere around minimum wage, \$5.15.

I think it is a disgrace that we are not doing enough to focus in on those individuals who we represent in our communities. I would like to ask this

administration and the Congress to consider first investing in America in the jobs that we need here at home. It is great that we are able to help out other countries, but we have to help them become self-empowered so they can determine their own destinies as well.

I had a chance last year to visit Central America, and I saw what the power of our country could do if we were to just expand programs that invested in microenterprise programs that would allow women, in particular, low-income skilled people to begin to invest in their own businesses, not taking away jobs from Californians or the rest of the country, but investing in their own human capital and keeping those people there instead of bringing them to this country.

I am not against bringing people in, but let us be fair and truthful what we want to do. First, we need to prioritize our own homeland, and that is investing here in America.

What baffles me most is the Bush administration has negotiated agreements to allow for foreign temporary workers in the U.S., when unemployment is in some places above 10 percent. The worker rights provisions in the Chilean and Singapore agreements will be disastrous if also applied to future trade agreements, and I speak in particular to the Central American free trade agreement which is coming shortly.

Many of those countries do not have labor provisions for their workers. They would like to take away the rights of health care workers right now in countries like El Salvador and Guatemala, and I hear over and over again the problems faced by many people there who would like to unionize. They are harassed and intimidated. That is not right, and I think the American public needs to know what negotiations are going on between our country and others to foster trade.

Again, I think jobs are important. I think it is very important to underscore that, yes, as Americans we know it is important to sustain other countries, but let us make sure that our principles are clear.

Last year, I and other Members of this House voted on the Jordan Free Trade Agreement, which I believe was a little bit better than what we are seeing is going to come before this House later this week, but I think we have to remember one of the reasons it got a lot of support was we had protections for workers' rights and for the environment. Those two major issues are lacking in this upcoming Chile and Singapore agreements.

I would underscore the need here is about jobs, jobs in America and making sure that we do not undercut our workforce or the workforce of those foreign countries, because many of them will not have the same protections as we as workers have in this country, and I point that out because we hear too often about the abuses

with young children, no labor provisions to protect children abroad. I would ask my colleagues to oppose these agreements.

U.S.-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 2003, the United States and Chile signed a historic and comprehensive free trade agreement designed to reduce barriers and facilitate trade and investment between both countries. Negotiations had begun back in December 2000, and 14 negotiating rounds were held. In the final round, 230 negotiators worked 9 straight days to come up with an agreement that contains more than 800 pages of text and annexes.

The result of all this hard work is a state-of-the-art trade pact that includes groundbreaking provisions which have never been negotiated as part of a free trade agreement. For example, the agreement includes new anticorruption rules in government contracting, and commitments to make end-user piracy of copyrighted works a criminal offense. Also included are new customs procedures which will increase transparency, efficiency, and timeliness of customs clearance procedures while maintaining strong border security.

Chile has agreed to new regulatory transparency commitments that will govern the interaction of service regulators with private parties, increasing public access to rulemaking procedures. In addition, the dispute settlement process will become more transparent with more public hearings, access to legal submissions, and the rights of third parties to submit views.

But beyond the precedent-setting features of the agreement, there is a bottom-line reality. Right now most of Chile's products enter the United States duty free under the GSP, or generalized system of preferences. In contrast, our exports to Chile face a uniform tariff of 6 percent. Once the U.S.-Chile free trade agreement enters into force, Chile's 6 percent tariff will be removed immediately from more than 85 percent of U.S. exports. Tariffs on the remaining products will be phased out over 4 to 12 years.

This is a good agreement which covers a particularly wide range of products and services. Not only does it address the liberalization of merchandise trade; it also includes groundbreaking areas such as e-commerce, express delivery services, strong copyright and trade protections, and across-the-board liberalization of trade in services.

In short, there is something for everyone to like in this agreement. But as with other trade agreements, there

is also something for everyone to question. The three areas that are often addressed by Members who have not had an opportunity to focus on the agreement, and we heard from a couple of them this morning, are: labor, the environment, and immigration. For instance, some Members who are not familiar with Chile and its labor laws question whether the labor provisions in this agreement are strong enough. The facts are that Chile has recently rewritten most of its Pinochet-era labor laws, reaffirming its obligation as a member of the international labor organization, and committed in this agreement to a key binding obligation not to fail to effectively enforce its labor laws through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction. Labor protections within Chile and within this agreement are strong and sound.

And because it is a free trade agreement, other Members question whether it preserves environmental protections, but this free trade agreement includes provisions requiring parties to establish high levels of environmental protection and to not weaken or reduce environmental laws to attract trade or investment. It provides for dispute settlement and for environmental cooperation between the parties.

And last, some Members have questioned the impact this agreement may have on our immigration policy and whether it will open the door to a new wave of immigrants. The answer is no. It is true that in order to facilitate trade and services this agreement does allow for temporary entry of business professionals into Chile and into the United States. The number of professionals allowed entry into Chile is unlimited, while the number of Chilean professionals in the United States is 1,400. But I want to point out that the implementing legislation ensures that Chile professional category comes under the existing H-1B umbrella as H-1B1.

Further, the legislation clarifies that the Chile H-1B professional category is capped and these individuals will count under the overall H-1B program cap. The same fees can be charged for entry, and the agreement permits the U.S. to require attestations modeled after core elements of the Labor Condition Application of the current H-1B visa program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good agreement with a good trading partner that will be good for our businesses and workers. I plan to vote for the U.S.-Chile trade agreement, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

COLUMNIST BLOWS CIA AGENT'S COVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.