

will there be found any stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction as possessed by Iraq. Nevertheless, our troops have been deployed and stationed in that region since the beginning of the war, and the cost has been tremendous. With the government projected to run one of the largest deficits in history, it is not enough to simply consider the cost of the war today; we must also consider how much money we will be spending on it for years to come. Although the stated cost of the war on April 17 was \$34 billion, the actual cost was closer to \$47.6 billion, due to the \$13.6 billion we will be spending in interest. In addition, the cost of occupation is more accurately stated as \$5.46 billion monthly, of which \$1.56 billion is interest.

With respect to the situation in Haiti, there has been a cry for assistance by President Aristide. The poorest country in the Western Hemisphere that is celebrating its 200th anniversary of independence from French rule with over 8 million citizens aided by a 4,000-officer police force has requested humanitarian aid and security forces. The U.S. contingency plan to deal with the massive refugee exodus that will soon occur is to send them to Guantanamo, Cuba, which received thousands of Haitian refugees during the last crisis 10 years ago, when a military junta seized power from Aristide.

The exodus will indeed be massive; but we can avoid or at least ameliorate it by taking more forceful action to quell the situation immediately.

FEBRUARY 17, 2004.

Hon. COLIN L. POWELL,
Secretary, Department of State,
C Street NW, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY POWELL: I am deeply concerned about the escalating violence in Haiti. Haiti has long been suffering with dire economic conditions and the devastation of HIV/AIDS. But now, Haiti has reached a state of crisis. The recent uprising could rapidly degrade into a catastrophic civil war. I respectfully urge you to move immediately to get humanitarian aid and military assistance to the people of Haiti, in order to help bring about some safety and stability.

I understand that you may feel there is no "enthusiasm" at present for sending U.S. troops or police to Haiti to help quell the violence. However, I believe that the political will to address the problem is rising. We Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have long been supporters of an active role for the United States in providing needed assistance to Haiti. Many other Members of the House and Senate have expressed a willingness to support possible peace-making and peace-keeping activities, to prevent a full-scale civil war so close to our border, and to head off the large exodus of refugees to our shores that it might precipitate.

Furthermore, there seems to be a feeling in the international community and in Haiti itself, that some foreign intervention may now be necessary in Haiti. I hope that you will work with our allies and the United Nations to craft a resolution to this crisis. I am confident that you will exercise your excellent diplomatic skills to craft a political approach to promoting long-term democracy in Haiti. However, please also consider that it may be necessary to use more forceful means in the short run to prevent a humanitarian disaster.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss this matter or if I can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,
Member of Congress.

MORE HEMORRHAGING OF AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I begin this evening by offering the comments of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who could not stay with us this evening, but to announce her support of our efforts, or opposition, if you will, to the Central American Free Trade Agreement and her good work on opposing this agreement that will expand NAFTA to Central America and ultimately lead to the quadrupling of low-income workers, the doubling of the size of NAFTA and more hemorrhaging of American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush last Friday officially notified Congress that he supports the Central American Free Trade Agreement, that he plans to send it to Congress, probably sometime in May, and this body sometime after that will make a decision on whether it wants to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

It just amazes me, Mr. Speaker, that President Bush continues the same very much failed economic policies that he has promoted in this country for the last 3 years.

The Bush economic policies basically are twofold: continued tax cuts for people who need it least, for the most wealthy people in our society. Roughly half the tax cuts have gone to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country as we continue to run up huge budget deficits. That is one part of the President's economic recovery program which has led us to a jobless recovery, or, more precisely, Mr. Speaker, a job-loss recovery. One aspect is tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans as part of his policy for economic recovery.

The other part is to continue to pass trade agreements which have, frankly, shipped jobs overseas. That is why he is asking Congress, because he believes these trade agreements for some reason seem to be helping; but it is pretty clear we have lost lots and lots of manufacturing jobs, to China, Mexico, south of the border, across the ocean, to countries all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Ohio, one out of six manufacturing jobs has simply disappeared since President Bush took office. That means that tens of thousands of Ohioans are out of

work; literally hundreds of thousands of Americans in manufacturing have been thrown out of work. And it means something else: 30 or 40 years ago when we were in the midst of a recession, you figured most of those jobs, seven out of 10, statistics say, would return, people would get their jobs back. They would have temporary layoffs at a Ford plant, temporary layoffs at a steel mill. Seven out of 10 of those jobs would come back. Three of them would be lost forever. Other jobs might be created during a recovery.

During the Bush recession and recovery, they are predicting now only three of the 10 manufacturing jobs lost will return, and they have not even returned yet. So we have this jobless job-loss recovery, when the President says his tax cuts are working. They may be working for upper-income people who both get the tax cuts and now are seeing the stock market doing a little better, only a little better; but they are not working for Ohioans who have lost jobs. They simply are not working. The promises the President made simply have not been fulfilled.

The front page of The Washington Post today, a newspaper that has been pretty pro-Bush on Medicare, very pro-Bush on Iraq, pretty pro-Bush on a whole host of issues, this newspaper wrote on the front page, talked about the Bush job forecast.

With President Bush, every time he issues a statement, an economic report, every time he introduces legislation on the economy to Congress, he makes predictions. He predicted there would be 3.4 million more jobs in 2003 than there were in 2000.

Now, this prediction was not made before September 11, upon which he blames much of the economic stumbling, economic recession in some places, depression in others in this country. This was a prediction made 2 years ago.

The President said by 2003 there would be 3.4 million more jobs in this country than there were when he took office. You know what? We have actually seen a loss of 1.7 million jobs; 1.7 million fewer jobs today than when President Bush took office.

That is some kind of a record. There has not been a President of the United States for 7 decades that has actually seen a net loss of jobs during his presidency. Herbert Hoover was the last one, and Herbert Hoover obviously paid a political price at the next election; and, more importantly, Herbert Hoover paid a historical price in that he became the President that perhaps managed the economy worse than any President in the last century, until this President, who is kind of competing for the same kinds of records.

The President also predicted a couple of years ago the budget deficit would be down to \$14 billion. Well, it turns out that the budget deficit is \$521 billion. So he predicted, way after September 11, a couple of years ago, he predicted a 3.4 million jobs increase

and a budget deficit of \$14 billion. He got a 1.7 million job loss and a budget deficit of \$521 billion.

Again, The Washington Post, not exactly a liberal newspaper, a paper that supported President Bush on most of his initiatives, the headline in The Post, "Bush assertion on tax cuts is at odds with IRS data." President Bush runs the IRS; and still his statistics, even according to them, are inaccurate.

Now, we talked earlier about the tax cuts being the mantra. Whenever there are economic problems or whenever there are jobs lost, the President decides to cut taxes. Well, he also talks about trade agreements. Let me talk for a moment, and then my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), is also here and will join us and talk about some of these issues also.

The President has said that he is going to bring the Central American Free Trade Agreement to this Congress. If there is anything obvious to the American people, steelworkers in Ohio, lumber workers in Oregon where the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is, paper mill workers, auto workers in my State, rubber workers in my State, tool and die makers in my State, if there is something obvious to all of them, it is they believe an awful lot of their jobs have been lost overseas, because we have seen this kind of hemorrhaging of jobs, shipping of jobs overseas.

This week I was at a plant, Ohio Screw Products, in Elyria, Ohio, in my district, with Dan Imbrogno, who runs this company. They have about 70 full-time and a handful of temporary workers who punch out bolts and make products to be components in other products of all kinds, including some defense work.

But mostly he has seen a threat of jobs going to China, a threat of jobs going to Mexico, a threat of jobs going further south across the southern border in this country; and he just shakes his head, as do the workers who I met with at this company over lunch on one other visit a few months ago, just shake their heads over American trade policy. Why do we keep passing it? Why do we want to extend NAFTA, clearly a broken trade agreement, to the rest of Latin America? It is not working in Mexico. Why should we double it in size and population and quadruple it in terms of the number of low-income workers?

When we passed NAFTA in this body, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I both opposed it in 1993. When we passed that legislation, that agreement, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. Today our trade deficit with Mexico is \$25 billion.

Now, President Bush's father, who presided over a similar kind of economic decline, although this one is significantly worse than his father's, but President Bush, Sr., said for every \$1 billion in trade, because trade entails usually manufacturing of goods, for

every \$1 billion in trade, we lose or gain 18,000 jobs. So, in other words, if you have a \$1 billion trade surplus, it means you are making a lot of things, selling them overseas, for every \$1 billion in sales hiring about 18,000 American workers. If you have a trade deficit, as we have, you see it go the other way.

So we now have a trade deficit with China of over \$100 billion, a trade deficit overall around the world of some \$400 billion. All you have to do is do the math to see the kind of job loss that brings to our country.

So the answer from President Bush is more tax cuts for the richest people in our country and more trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs, that ship more jobs overseas? It simply does not add up.

In a moment I will yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). In a moment I will give some more details about what the Central American Free Trade Agreement actually does to our Nation, to our economy, and especially to manufacturing in my part of the country, where we are seeing these jobs shipped overseas every day, plant closings, layoffs, threats of more plant closings, threats by management to move overseas, so that workers see their wages stagnate or even go down with give-backs, all that happens with these trade policies; yet President Bush says we have got to do more of them because, frankly, I think that helps his investor friends, his major campaign contributors, the people who seem to have the most influence in this administration on economic policy.

□ 2115

Not working families, union or non-union; not small businesses that are struggling, but the people that have the influence in this administration; not Ohio Screw Products in O'Leary, Ohio, but are the large companies that gain from the trade agreements, they gain profits as they shed workers in this country. Those are the only people that benefit. It is President Bush and his campaign kitty and those companies, those executives and those investors that shift jobs overseas and pad their pockets and make bigger profits and get bigger bonuses.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oregon, who is holding one of his favorite books there that can tell more than I know.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is a must read for every American who is concerned about the future of our country, whether we will continue to be the leading industrial power in the world, whether there will be a future for Social Security, what will the rules of trade be and what are the objectives. This is the economic report of the President.

Now, we have to give the President's Chair of his Board of Economic Advisors, Council of Economic Advisors appointed by the President, full con-

fidence of the President, we have to give him some credit, because he is distressingly honest. In this book on page 229, he talks about the fact that one of the great benefits of trade is that when a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than to make or provide it domestically. Of course he does not deal with the fact that Chinese labor is oppressed and abused, that they have no protections in their workplace. Basically if someone gets their arm torn off operating a machine in China, they drag him away from the machine and put a new worker there, and then, after that, they might tend to some basic first aid before they send that person home or to the graveyard, but there are no benefits or significant health care provided. So they are recommending that the U.S. workers should somehow have to compete with this.

Now, it would be one thing if this was sort of a self-generated thing on the part of China or Mexico or any one of these other countries that are stealing our jobs. But guess what? It is being done with U.S. capital which are being subsidized with our tax cuts. Not only are we borrowing money from the Social Security Trust Fund to give to the wealthiest of Americans in tax cuts, we are also borrowing money, given our deficit situation, to subsidize the largest corporations in the world through OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Council, and others, to export American jobs.

Now, I mean, I think that is one place where conservatives, who are against government subsidies, and progressives, who are against undermining the U.S. economy and the wage and labor standards of Americans and our standard of living as a whole and our industrial infrastructure, have some grounds for agreement. Let us at least repeal the taxpayer subsidies, the borrowed money that is subsidizing these corporations to export jobs overseas.

But again, Mr. Mankiw, the President's chief economic adviser, in his official report to the American people this year, the economic report of the President, he says, shipping jobs to low-cost countries is the latest manifestation of the gains from trade that economists have talked about for centuries.

Now, we have to wonder what that gain is, how illusory it is, when the American middle class is being devastated by these exports. A few years ago when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and I opposed NAFTA, they said, oh, you Congressmen, you are like dinosaurs. You want to protect those old, inefficient manufacturing jobs. Do not worry, it will just be the low-skilled jobs that go to Mexico. Well, of course, that was a lie, and what we found out was that most of the major U.S. auto manufacturers were willing to invest in state-of-the-art plants in Mexico to access that cheap labor, and then reimport those vehicles into the U.S. And guess what? The

price did not go down for U.S. consumers, but many U.S. families, those who used to be able to buy the product because they worked in the factories, could not afford to buy that product anymore.

But then as things evolved, and the trade deficit began to accelerate over this last decade; when I introduced legislation to establish the U.S. Trade Deficit Review Commission in 1997, the trade deficit was \$111 billion. It is almost quaint today. We are talking about \$500 billion. We are going to borrow a half a trillion dollars to finance the purchase of goods overseas by Americans. We are going to borrow another \$700 billion to run the Government of the United States and to give tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans. And a substantial amount of this money, almost all of the \$500 billion and 40 percent of the \$700 billion, is going to come from overseas. We are giving unbelievable leverage to those bastions of democracy like China, who is now the largest holder of U.S. debt, and others who may not have the best interests of the American workers or our economy in mind. But in any case, Mr. Mankiw thinks this is just fine.

Now, the President has tried to back away from this a little bit. He did that famous press event in front of a bunch of boxes which they had to repaint. Actually they said, oh, it was just an overzealous intern from the White House at one of his unbelievable staged press events that cost an average of \$400,000 each paid for by the American taxpayers, of course; the boxes, when he went to this one particular plant, all said "Made in China" on them, but he wanted to talk about American jobs; a little embarrassing. So this, of course, intern, with no direction from the political staff at the White House or anybody else, somehow came up with all new labels to run through and label them all "Made in the U.S.," of course another lie.

So what they are doing, Mr. Mankiw is an unbelievably honest man, because he admits that they are exporting jobs, and they think that is good because it makes a few people rich and just impoverishes a majority of the people in this country, and deprives them of their livelihoods, and undermines the industrial and economic might of our country; but the President is trying to pretend that he does not really believe in this stuff, but I guess why is his signature on page 4 if he does not really believe in it? There it is, the President's signature on this report, basically endorsing these policies.

We cannot continue this way. Do we know what that means? Let us break it down a little bit, and then I will yield back to the gentleman. Our current trade deficit, that is the amount of money we are borrowing from overseas to finance the purchase of goods, many of those goods manufactured by formerly U.S.-based corporations that have now seen fit to chase cheap labor and lack of environmental standards

and other things overseas, is \$1.5 billion a day. Mr. Speaker, \$1.5 thousand million a day.

Now, how is that sustainable? That is \$1 million per minute of U.S. wealth that is flooding overseas, giving unbelievable leverage to foreign governments over the U.S. dollar.

Just one last point on this, and then I am certain we will get on to other things. What do the economists say? Oh, do not worry, it has always been this way. What will happen is the U.S. dollar will decline, our goods will become cheaper, and then we will begin exporting again. But as I said to a number of these economists, none of whom can answer this question, I said, I understand how that used to work when we made things, but when we do not make things anymore, how does that work? If the dollar gets cheaper, then all of those imported goods we are buying become more expensive. We will see inflation in the United States. We will see the dollar continue to drop. We will see higher interest rates in the United States. We will see the dollar continue to drop.

We are headed toward an incredible economic train wreck here. And the chief engineer, George Bush, who signed this report, thinks it is just fine. Because guess what? A few tens of thousands of people, CEOs, his buddies, his principal campaign contributors, they are all going to make out like bandits. The profits are up. Wall Street's profits are up. We are just having this little problem called a jobless recovery; jobless because those jobs have been exported. The means of the production has been exported. The industrial might of this country has been exported. And I would say to the hawks on that side of the aisle, in fact, you are exporting the capability of defending the United States in the future against adversaries around the world.

With that, I am happy to yield back to the gentleman for a little further discourse on this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We think about this. He mentioned when he introduced his idea to better monitor and study and pay attention to, if you will, focus, on the trade deficit, how it has gone up since 1997. The trade deficit for the entire year of 1992 was smaller than the trade deficit, or was about equivalent in 1992 to the trade deficit for 1 month last month. We had a trade deficit of about \$40 billion a dozen years ago. We have a trade deficit in excess of \$40 billion a month now. I mean, that is what that means.

But more importantly, as the gentleman from Oregon pointed out, what that really means is that we are continuing to get further and further in debt as a Nation to foreign investors, to investors in other countries. That means that the Chinese, with their \$100 billion a year in U.S. currency, the trade surplus they have with our country, the fact that they sell us so much more than we buy from them, the Chi-

nese take that \$100 billion and are beginning to buy up a lot of scrap steel in the United States, driving up prices of steel, of scrap for U.S. manufacturers, making it harder for them to compete.

They are also buying energy companies in the United States, again driving up the cost of natural gas for American manufacturers and putting them more and more behind the eightball.

And, as the gentleman from Oregon said, when the worm turns, as economists like to say in their ivory and their traditional economic theory, when the worm turns, and our trade deficit gets so overwhelming that eventually the value of the dollar drops, we begin to produce more to sell to them, our factories are hollowed out. Our factories are not manufacturing things, because so many of them are closed. They are not going to be able to retool just because all of a sudden prices are a bit higher.

But what is disturbing about the economic report that the gentleman mentioned, and then I want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), who absolutely gets it on these job issues, partly because we live in a State where we have seen our economy devastated by these Bush economic policies, but what is disturbing about the economic report that Mr. Mankiw put out, the President's chief economic adviser, and that President Bush signed, is that they really see nothing wrong with the direction we are going. So what, we have a huge trade deficit. So what, we have a huge budget deficit. Let us keep doing tax cuts that overwhelmingly go to the most privileged; let us keep doing trade agreements that ship jobs overseas, in large part because profits right now are up for major corporations. So if the companies are making money, as the Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao said, if the stock market is going up, then there is really nothing wrong.

What is wrong, as Mr. Mankiw said, outsourcing is a good thing when blue-collar jobs; white-collar jobs, phone operators, computer engineers, computer programmers, when those jobs go overseas, I think there is something wrong with that, and it is mostly because George Bush and Mr. Mankiw have never looked an Akron rubber worker in the eyes, or never looked a paper worker in Oregon in the eye, or never looked a Silicon Valley in California, a computer programmer in the eye and say, yes, outsourcing is a good thing. Sorry about your job. Maybe you can get a job at Wal-Mart, or maybe you can get a job at McDonald's.

Speaking of McDonald's, and then I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), in this economic report, something the media have not paid much attention to, and that is these economists, and these are not exactly people who know a lot of people who work in America's factories, but these economists are having a debate inside the Bush administration on how to classify manufacturing.

Now, we have lost one out of six jobs in manufacturing in Ohio. We have lost literally well over 2 million jobs nationally in manufacturing, and they are trying to figure out how to define manufacturing.

Well, they are debating whether or not to define the fast food restaurant industry as a service job or a manufacturing job, because, you know, if you work in McDonald's, it is not just like somebody comes up and orders, and you take it off the shelf and give it to them. I am not making this up, it sounds like it, but it is in the Bush administration's book, you have to manufacture these hamburgers. You have to take the bun, you got to unwrap it, so you take the wrapping off, you take it out of the box, unwrap it, put the bun down; then you have to take the hamburger, and you have to chemically change the hamburger, it is a chemical process called cooking, put the hamburger on the grill, and put it on the bun after it is cooked. Then you have to get the cheese, and you might have to chemically alter the cheese because you have to melt the cheese. You put the cheese on the hamburger, and then you add a couple of things. You add a slice of tomato, so that is an extra element in the manufacturing. You put the tomato on, unwrap the lettuce, peel the lettuce off the head, so that may be another manufacturing part. This is pretty complex; almost like making a Ford in Ohio or manufacturing steel or making tires in Akron, Ohio, used to be.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, people are going to think we are making this up. I am not making this up. But let us go to the source. Economic Report of the President, signed on page 4 by President George Bush and endorsed by all of his economic advisers, and it says right here: "When a fast food restaurant," this is page 73, chapter 2, halfway down the page, "When a fast food restaurant sells a hamburger, for example, is it providing a service, or is it combining inputs to manufacture a product?" Well, we can erase that very embarrassing manufacturing job loss that George Bush has provided, the largest manufacturing job loss in the history of the United States, worse than the Great Depression, we can erase that in one fell swoop. All we have to do is turn to page 73 and say, well, of course, as the President's chief economic adviser says, that is manufacturing a product. That is not a service.

□ 2130

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that means if you live in O'Leary, Ohio, and you have worked in what we used to call in this country traditional manufacturing, not "Mc manufacturing" is, I guess, the fast-food restaurant category. I guess there will be two categories of manufacturing, traditional manufacturing and "Mc" manufacturing. It will be Mc, with the arches, manufacturing.

This is not really funny. It is kind of depressing that they would think that this is what we are going to, in the new era, the new Bush era, the new 21st century, that this is what we are going to call manufacturing; that these workers in O'Leary, Ohio, who have been in traditional manufacturing making \$12, \$14, \$16 an hour, with decent health benefits, with a decent retirement, that they will lose their jobs in manufacturing, they will get another job in manufacturing, working at McDonald's for \$7 an hour with no benefits, with no health care and no retirement.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, do not forget the farmers and ranchers. I had some cattlemen come to my town hall last week who say, hey, we are next. Not only was Canada a huge threat to our industry and not only are they bringing in stuff that might kill the American people with mad cow disease, but the so-called free trade agreement with Australia, Argentina, other target countries in CAFTA, that is going to kill off the U.S. agriculture people. So we will import the beef that will be probably ground up overseas because that is value added, but then when the frozen patties get here, we will still manufacture them into a finished device which is, i.e., a Big Mac or a Whopper, we do not want to short-change Burger King here and/or whatever you want to call it, and somehow we will prosper as a Nation by doing this.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the point is that the Bush administration, the Bush's chief economic adviser, Gregory Mankiw, with the President's signature on this economic policy, does not see anything wrong with the direction they want to take this country's manufacturing: huge numbers of loss of jobs, reclassifying, underpaid service jobs with no benefits as manufacturing for political purposes, making excuses, justifying this all in the name of this global economy that helps wealthy investors, i.e., helps Bush contributors but hurts workers in the U.S., hurts farmers in the U.S., hurts ranchers in the U.S., hurts workers in the developing world but helps the wealthy of both countries. It simply does not make sense.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), who has been a real leader in trying to do the right things to restore Ohio's and America's industrial base.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friends that what they are describing here is almost humorous, talking about the putting together of a hamburger as being a manufacturing activity, but it is serious because it represents deception. It represents an effort, quite frankly, to mislead the American people; and I hope they are listening tonight because this information is coming from the "Economic Report of the President";

and as my colleague said, it has got his name on it. So he is responsible for this charade.

I would like to read just one sentence from page 25, and I hope unemployed steelworkers along the Ohio River, I hope those who work in the pottery and ceramic plants along the Ohio River, on the Ohio and West Virginia side of that great river, I hope they understand what this means: "When a good or a service is produced at lower cost in another country, it makes sense to import it rather than to produce it domestically."

Let me say that nearly everything we make in this country can be produced in another country at a lower cost. I was in Mexico about 2 months ago. I talked to a woman who works for an American company. She works 9½ hours a day, 5 days a week. She showed me her weekly check, \$38. Nearly every job in this country can be produced for less cost somewhere else; and the President's report says, "If a good or service is produced at lower cost in another country, it makes sense to import it rather than to produce it domestically." Apparently, they are willing to give up the entire employment base of this country, anything to get it a little cheaper. It is a race to the bottom. It absolutely is a race to the bottom.

I would hope the President would publicly renounce this report, disassociate himself from it, take his name off it. This is a report that is based on the theory of comparative advantage. If you can do it for less cost somewhere else, that is where we ought to do it. Where does it stop?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an excellent point; but of course, they are following exactly the same rules, are they not? Do we not have a level playing field? Are they not required to provide health and safety, environmental protections, child labor protections? Are we not competing on a level playing field here?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The answer to that is pretty obvious; but what is interesting, I remember standing on this floor 10 years ago with David Bonior, who was the real leader on these trade issues in Congress years ago, and they promised in those days with NAFTA that only the good-paying jobs would stay and these low-end, low-wage jobs would go overseas; and over time in Mexico they would begin to have stronger environmental laws, over time they would make higher wages, over time they would have good labor law, worker safety, all of that.

But as the gentleman from Oregon's (Mr. DEFAZIO) questions intimate, obviously these countries are not moving in that direction. In fact, we are seeing our country move in their direction. Our country move in their direction in terms of there are significantly fewer pension systems in this country, good pensions for workers than there were 10 years ago, and particularly fewer than

there were in 1973 when this trade debacle really started in this country. That was really a key year in terms of turning the way we did trade.

We have seen our pension system atrophy. We have seen wages stagnate in most of these 30 years. We have seen environmental laws and States played off against States, and the Federal Government played off against the Mexican Government to weaken all these standards. Food safety laws are not as enforced, and clearly our food supply is not as safe as it would be if these trade agreements would actually raise their standards.

Instead of passing a trade agreement with Latin America to raise up their living standard, to raise their wages, to raise their workplace safety conditions, to raise their food safety standards, to raise environmental standards, we are seeing pressure on our government to bring those standards down so that we can compete with these countries. We should compete with them. They should compete with us, but let us raise living standards so ultimately they can buy our products, have a safer environment, have better food safety, have better worker safety and all that.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning Ohio's Governor Taft is going to be here in the capital city meeting with those of us who are Representatives from the State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio has been devastated, absolutely devastated and especially my district that stretches all along the Ohio River, some 330 miles. I have perhaps the poorest, the oldest, and the sickest district in Ohio. I have got lots of veterans. I have got lots of unemployed steelworkers. And what does the President say to them? How can the President come to Ohio and own this statement, "When a good or service is produced at lower cost in another country it makes sense to import it"? What does that mean?

We all have constituents and we are all concerned about our constituents. I am a little parochial in my concern I guess because I have got a lot of constituents who do not have jobs, who have lost jobs. As a result, they have lost health care. They have lost nearly everything they have worked their entire lives for, and we have an administration that is encouraging the outsourcing of jobs to other countries. It buffaloes me. I do not understand what kind of thinking goes into a document like this that is called the "Economic Report of the President."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, think about this: we have a President who is always at the beck and call of his corporate contributors. When it comes time to pass a Medicare bill, it is written by the insurance and the drug companies. When it comes time to pass Social Security privatization, it is written by Wall Street. When it comes to pass an environmental law, the President gives us a

bill written by the chemical companies or the energy companies. Issue after issue after issue.

What we have really seen happen from the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. STRICKLAND) suggestion, what we have seen is as we pass trade agreements like this, making it harder for us to compete with Chinese workers, with Mexico, with Costa Rica, with El Salvador, one of the things that happens is we have seen a stagnation of U.S. wages and a weakening of food safety, environmental standards, and worker safety standards.

We also see in this body many of my Republican friends, particularly Republican leadership, are trying to pass legislation with the President to cut overtime in the U.S., to cut comp time opportunity in the U.S., to weaken environmental standards in the U.S., to weaken food safety standards in the U.S. So what they are doing internationally is in a lot of ways what they are doing domestically. It really does not cause George Bush or Gregory Mankiw, as chief economic adviser, to lose a lot of sleep that U.S. wages are stagnant, does not cause them to lose a lot of sleep if there is a downward pressure, a pulling down of environmental and worker safety standards, because that is what they are doing domestically.

So when Mr. Mankiw says they can do it cheaper in other countries, that means they have got comparative advantage, so send them overseas. The only way that we are going to compete in this Bush new world is to weaken our environmental standards, which is what they are trying to do anyway; to cut overtime, which is what they are trying to do anyway; to end comp time, which is what they are trying to do anyway; to roll back food safety, environment worker safety, wages, all of that. That is exactly what they are doing domestically.

It is what these trade agreements will do internationally. And who benefits? It is not the workers in Mexico. We have no axe to grind with them. It is not the slave laborers in China or the workers in awful conditions that are not slave labor in China, but the exploited generally. I was going to say young women, but really girls because they are not old enough to be women yet. We have no quarrel with them. They are hurt by these trade agreements just like American workers are hurt; but the investors who fund the Bush campaign and the chemical companies, the drug companies, the insurance companies, they get their legislation through. They love these trade agreements because it means more profits and it means more bonuses for these executives.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I come from a State that back when we were fighting NAFTA, I was pretty lonely up there in the Pacific Northwest, and we were told, what is wrong with you, you

are going to be a major beneficiary. The State of Oregon on the Pacific Rim, strategically perched just north of Mexico and south of Canada, your State, your people are going to be a big winner, but it turns out that we are one of the top 10 losers under NAFTA.

As the gentleman alluded earlier, lumber and wood products are suffering because of subsidized Canadian lumber and wood products. The paper industry is seeing paper flee overseas to countries that do not observe any environmental practices or controls, and then a number of other more high-tech industries have gone elsewhere.

I sat next to a fellow who worked for Hewlett-Packard on the plane flying home a week ago, Hewlett-Packard in Corvallis. I said, what do you do? He said, I work in the ink jet division. I do engineering, design, and development. I said, God, that is really great. I am glad to see you are still working there. I was worried about those jobs. He said, well, no, actually, he said, my entire division was exported to Bangalore, India, last year. I am just working on a special project here in the United States, but my division is gone. The next design development, the next ink jet technology is going to come from Bangalore, India. He said they can get an engineer there for 8 to \$10,000 bucks a year.

Are we telling Americans they should go to college for 4 years, incur \$50,000 of debt to get a degree in engineering technology or whatever it is going to cost them to do it, and then they are going to work for \$8,000 a year, raise a family, buy a home and all the other things that are a part of the American Dream? These people are killing the American Dream. That is what they are doing.

There are a few people who are going to profit from it, and those are the people that support them; and they are so insulated from it some of them do not even realize what they are doing to destroy our country.

One other point. Sometimes that is not even enough to say to an American, 4-year, 6-year degree, you are going to compete with some guy or woman from Indian who worked for \$8,000. Sometimes it is not enough. You know what we also do? We are subsidizing, the American taxpayers, through our taxes, are subsidizing the export of these jobs. Here is a short list:

Motorola laid off 42,900 workers while investing \$3.4 billion in China with a \$190 million taxpayers subsidy.

□ 2145

In General Electric, 260,000 U.S. workers, while investing \$1.5 billion in China, \$2.5 billion in corporate subsidies paid for by U.S. taxpayers. Insult to injury. Steal their jobs, destroy the economic future of our country, our kids and our grandkids, and charge us to do it. That is what they are doing to

average wage-earning Americans, because most of this is coming out of Social Security wages, out of payroll taxes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding once again to me.

I said a little earlier that I feel kind of parochial in these concerns because each of us represents, I do not know, 630,000 or so men, women and children. I represent people who are desperate for jobs. Now, in a little town that my colleague represents that I think he is familiar with, Salem, Ohio, there is a company, the Elger Company. They make bathroom sinks and wash basins and so on. They decided a few months ago that they would go to China. That means that there are going to be lots of families without a job.

A short time ago, although the company has not really closed the operation in Salem yet, that is going to happen this spring, I got a call from one of the employees there, and they had just gotten a shipment of goods back from China, and they opened up the crates, and guess what they had stamped on the sides of those sinks and so on? "Made in the USA." The mold had not been changed, so they were forced to grind off the "Made in the USA" label. That is just an example.

I guess in China they can make a bathtub or a wash basin or a toilet for less cost than we can do it in Salem, Ohio, where these workers got living-wage jobs, paid taxes, supported their schools, gave to their churches, and cared for their children. They were good, solid, living-wage American jobs. But they can do it for less cost in China, so this administration says, oh, that is where it should be done then. So every worker at the Elger plant in Salem, Ohio, should know, and the community that depends upon those jobs should know, that this administration believes that is the right thing to do. As the President's report says, if it can be done more cheaply somewhere else, that is where it should be done.

If a cheap product is a cheap product or a reduced cost to the consumer is the ultimate good, then maybe what we are doing is the right thing. But if we believe that in this country people and the communities in which they live should have living-wage jobs which enable the workers to pay taxes, to support their schools, to contribute their taxes to the State and to local government, to be a fully functioning taxpayer.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To buy the products.

Mr. STRICKLAND. And to buy the product, absolutely. If what we want is a cheaper pair of blue jeans from Wal-Mart, then maybe we are headed down the right road. But if we want a secure country, with stable families and secure communities, we had better change our way, because we are going to lose the American way of life. We

are going to lose the middle class, and we are going to lose the ability to continue to support the infrastructure that makes us uniquely American.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for those comments.

What is disturbing to me is that in this economic report, as the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) said, on page 4, signed by President Bush, this economic report put out by the President just this month says that there is nothing wrong with the way the global economy is operating. He said outsourcing is a good thing.

Mr. Mankiw actually said, as we are seeing some of the most highly-skilled American workers, radiologists, for example, seeing their jobs threatened, Mr. Mankiw says an MRI or an X-ray will be taken that will be e-mailed to perhaps Bangalore, perhaps somewhere else, and read by a physician there who makes some minute percent of whatever the physician makes here, and then it comes back, because those radiologists are not in as much demand today as they once were. He said, well, it is a question of comparative advantage. Perhaps we just need to quit training so many radiologists. They cannot compete. We need to maybe train more general surgeons or more family practice doctors.

Let me do a little tour around the world to show what the gentleman from Oregon said about how there simply are not going to be enough people to buy these goods. If a Nike worker in Oregon loses his job to a Nike worker in China, there is one less consumer to buy cars; one less consumer to buy clothes, because the Nike worker in China is not making much to buy anything.

Let me tell a quick story. About 5 years ago, when Congress was considering the fast track legislation to in those days lay the groundwork to extend NAFTA to Latin America, which President Bush is trying to foist on us, I, at my own expense, flew to McAllen, Texas, rented a car with a couple of friends, drove across the border and went to Reynoso, Mexico. I went to a worker's home who worked at General Electric Mexico, one of the largest employers in Mexico. The home of these workers were about 20 feet by 30 feet. They lived in a one-room shack: dirt floor, no running water, no electricity. When it rained hard, the dirt floor turned to mud. When you walked behind the shack, you saw a ditch of human and industrial waste. Who knows what it was. Children were playing nearby, as children will. The American Medical Association said that area along the border is perhaps the most toxic area in the Western Hemisphere.

Now, as you walked through this neighborhood of these shacks, you could tell where the workers worked because their homes were constructed out of packing material, boxes, wood platforms, crates, whatever, of the company for which they worked or the supplier for the company for which they worked.

We then visited nearby an auto plant. These workers at this GE plant in this home were making about \$45 a week and working about 60 hours a week. But we went to this auto plant, and this auto plant in Reynoso, Mexico, 3 miles from the United States of America, looked just like an auto plant in the United States, just like a GM plant in Lordstown, near my colleague's district, or a Ford plant in Avon Lake or Lorain. It was modern. In fact, it was newer than the auto plants in our State mostly. It was modern, it was clean, it was the latest technology, and the workers were productive and hard-working.

There was one difference between the Mexican auto plant and an American auto plant. That difference was there was no parking lot in the Mexican auto plant because the workers do not make enough to buy the cars that they make.

You can go halfway around the world to Malaysia to a Motorola plant, and you will see the workers do not make enough to buy the cell phones they make. You can come back to this hemisphere and go to Haiti and see that the workers do not make it, to a Disney plant, and the workers do not make enough to buy the toys for their children they make. You can go back around the world to China and go to a Nike plant and see the workers do not make enough to buy the shoes which they make.

Now, the lesson is this continued downhill slide with globalization. If we pass a Central America Free Trade Agreement, if Congress passes the Free Trade Area of the Americas, if Congress continues the tax cuts for the wealthy and continues to allow the drug companies and the insurance companies to sit in the Oval Office, with a Vice President who is still on the Halliburton payroll, I might add, at \$3,000 a week, allows them to continue to write this legislation, we are going to have a country like Brazil, with a very wealthy group at the top and a bunch of people at the bottom that are not making enough money to buy the shoes and to buy the toys for their kids, and to buy the cars, and to buy the cell phones.

If that is the society we want, then I guess maybe this report says let us keep doing it. But if it is not the society we want, then we need to say no to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and we need to say no to this economic policy that has caused some of the highest unemployment rates in the country, in Oregon, and has devastated eastern Ohio and north-east Ohio where I live and damn near the rest of the State. We need to say no to that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, when I lay this out to my constituents, they say, well, certainly the CEOs and others could not support that; they would not want to live in those communities or under those conditions or see those things happen. Well, the fact is today's CEOs,

where there is still a manufacturing job, earns 500 times what a worker earns. It is only a couple of decades since the ratio was only 20. They do not live in the same communities. They do not live in the same world. They live on a different planet.

They live behind gates in their mansions with their servants. Now there will be a lot more servants out there for them, and probably the cost of servants will go down, so this will be a great benefit to them. Of course, under Bush we can import those, too, or maybe Americans can work for those low wages. Their kids go to private schools, so they are not worried about what the gentleman from Ohio was talking about, the support for our societal infrastructure, schools and those sorts of things.

They do not really need the police. I guess we have not gone back to private for-profit fire departments yet, that is probably not far away, but they have private security so that we do not find a lot of support from them for police infrastructure or first responders, particularly not with the administration cutting their budgets under the homeland security proposal.

And then when they want to go somewhere, they go to the private country club in their chauffeur-driven limousines. Or if they go further away, they go in private executive jets so they do not even have to deal with the deregulation of the airline industry, the overcrowding and all those sorts of things. But these are true international folks. They are talking about globalization and international trade and all the benefits. There are benefits for them, just not for the masses of America.

Whatever happened to Henry Ford? "My workers are going to be able to afford the product they make." We all did better under that system. We created the envy of the world here in the United States. We created the largest middle class. Everybody did better together. But a few people got greedy, and now they have got their hands on the levers of power, and they simply do not care about the majority. But they might find ways to distract them with wedge issues, social issues, or something else to distract them from the loss of their jobs, the opportunity for their kids, the lack of educational opportunities, or the future of this country.

I do not think the American people are going to be fooled for very long. They are going to demand changes, and we have to bring about changes. This trade policy is one of the most devastating levers of power that they have to wield against the American system, against American workers, and against the wealth of this country, and they are using it ruthlessly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague put his finger right on it when we talk about these workers and the way that they are paid.

The key to our Nation's success, and the gentleman mentioned Henry Ford

before, the key to our Nation's success is that workers share in the wealth they create. They are able to do that because we have a democracy. They are able to do that because we have a relatively strong labor union movement. They are able to do that because of mobility of labor, and a whole bunch of reasons in a free society here.

When workers are more productive, as they are in the United States, as they increasingly get more productive, that means their wages should go up. They have not in large part because of the downward pull of these trade agreements. In Mexico, for instance, and I remember David Bonior, the former Democratic whip, talking about this a dozen years ago, as productivity went up in Mexico, wages did not go up with them because they had a government that was authoritarian by and large, because they did not have free trade unions. They had government-controlled, business-controlled trade unions.

So do we want a country like that? Do we want a country where the workers share in the wealth they produce, or do we want a country like a bunch of Wal-Marts, where the workers barely get minimum wage in many cases, rarely have health benefits, and often have to work off the clock while the Wal-Mart family, several members of the Wal-Mart family, rank as some of the richest people in the country? Billions of dollars have accrued to many members of the family, billions and billions, tens of billions to many members of the family, but the workers do not really share in the wealth they produce.

That is a society that I do not think we want. We have seen that this country worked best, as the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, when workers at Ford got paid a wage where they could buy the cars, and workers all across the board were paid a decent livable wage that made an absolute difference in their lives.

I go back, Mr. Speaker, to some of the promises we have seen in this administration's economic policy. Understand again that the foundation of their economic policy is more tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our society and more trade agreements that end up shipping jobs overseas. That is the foundation of their society. It makes the wealthy, the Bush contributors, wealthier; it weakens and dilutes the middle class; and it is particularly hard on families barely making it.

We are going to see more promises in the next 8 months, as we have seen all along. This administration promised 3.4 million jobs. After September 11 they made a promise there would be 3.4 million more jobs in 2003 than there were when he took office. In fact, what we have seen is 1.7 million jobs lost. Again, more tax cuts for the rich and more trade agreements that ship jobs overseas. That is what the economic job loss is all about.

□ 2200

President Bush at the same time said we will have a budget deficit of only \$14 billion. In fact, the budget deficit is \$521 billion. We see these kinds of promises, and we will see them again. We see it in the new economic report. They promise 2.6 million jobs this year alone. Now they are backing off that. That is 200,000 jobs a month, and we are creating no jobs per month and we are still losing manufacturing jobs. They simply have not lived up to any of their promises. The only promise they live up to is a promise to their corporate contributors that they will continue to do them favors, they will continue to enrich them with their tax policy, and with the new laws they make on the Medicare bill and the Social Security bill and the environmental bills and the energy bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). The gentleman made reference to our former colleague, David Bonior. I remember when NAFTA was passed some 10 years ago; and David Bonior stood on this floor, as did others, and told us the truth. The other side told us what we now know are falsehoods. They told us if we pass NAFTA we are going to create more jobs in America and raise the standard of living of the folks who live in Mexico. They said it is a win/win. We know that manufacturing wage rates have actually declined in Mexico since NAFTA, and we have lost jobs here in this country.

This trade deal is only a part of the overall picture. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) pointed out we have an exploding budget deficit. A Medicare bill was passed at 6 a.m. after arm twisting and deals were made, and perhaps even illegal activities, we do not know for sure, but that is certainly worthy of investigation; and it is being investigated. The fact is we now find out that it is not a \$400 billion bill; it is a \$534 billion bill, in part because there are no cost savings. There is no way to control the costs of prescription drugs in that bill because of our sellout to the pharmaceutical industry, basically.

But I believe this trade issue is the overarching issue because we cannot deal with our health care problems; we cannot deal with all of the other problems that face us, funding education, prescription drugs for our seniors, caring for our veterans; we just cannot do that unless we solve this trade deal that is bleeding jobs out of this country.

I get discouraged sometimes, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), what does the gentleman think can be done to reverse this? What is it going to take to reverse this?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that either the President needs to change his mind, or we need to change the President. President Bush

came to Richfield, Ohio, on Labor Day, and to his credit, he created a job that day. He said he was going to start a new office called the job of the manufacturing czar. He promised the job, but he has not filled the manufacturing czar's job yet. It is pretty clear when the President's answer to everything is the same tired, trickle-down economics, tax breaks for the wealthiest people and more trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs. If he is not going to change his mind, then this country is pretty clearly going on a different course.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is one exception to free trade. People have to realize who runs this administration. There is one exception to free trade, and it is for the first time in a trade agreement with Australia. It is a prohibition on the importation or the reimportation of FDA-approved, U.S.-manufactured pharmaceuticals from Australia, not because they are unsafe like the phony baloney they are giving us about Canada, but because they are cheaper there. That is in the trade agreement. What is that doing in the trade agreement if this is not all about big business and multinational corporations? It is not about making things cheaper for American consumers. If it was, why did President Bush insist on prohibiting the reimportation of FDA-approved, U.S.-manufactured drugs from Australia at half the price? It is not about making things less expensive and benefiting our consumers and our society. It is all about benefiting a very privileged few.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for their 10 to 15 years of working on these issues.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to express my concerns about the Central American Free Trade Agreement. My concerns regarding this agreement cover many issues such as access to U.S. markets for agricultural goods, textiles and apparel, rules giving foreign investors the right to circumvent domestic courts and sue countries in binding arbitration, and the failure of the CAFTA to include enforceable, internationally-recognized, core labor standards.

CAFTA will lead to the expansion of export-oriented factories that are notorious for poor working conditions and exploitive working environments. Central America's textile industry is one of the most developed in the region. Companies that hire mostly women aged 15-25 at low wages and under poor working conditions produce most of the clothing.

One of the poorest groups in the region are women that reside in rural areas. In fact, women are the heads of greater than 8 million rural households. Support for the rural sector in Central America is reflected by the lack of investment in rural infrastructure, financial services and human capital in the region. CAFTA only exacerbates the problems of the financially vulnerable small and medium sized farms forcing increased impoverishment of rural women.

Additionally, I want to discuss the effect these agreements will have on our trade deficit and how they will harm American workers.

The City of Cleveland in my congressional district currently has an unemployment rate of 13.1 percent. Much of that is due to lost jobs in the manufacturing sector. In fact, Cleveland has lost nearly 72,000 manufacturing jobs in the last four years. Additionally, in the State of Ohio, 18.8 percent of manufacturing job loss can be directly attributed to international trade. I anticipate that the most likely traded item this agreement facilitates will only be more U.S. jobs.

Like NAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement will cause shifts in production from the US that will further engorge the already bloated trade deficit and lead to the loss of more US jobs. Both of these agreements facilitate the shift of U.S. investments while doing little to increase U.S. exports. Even U.S. investors do not escape unscathed, because the agreements contain large loopholes that allow foreign investors to claim rights above and beyond those our domestic investors enjoy. The agreement before us today is taking us down the path of further job losses and I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Thank you Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting time. I sat listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle decry the effects of outsourcing of jobs, which of course I agree, there is a significant problem. It is interesting to note also that during this entire hour when we have talked about jobs and when we have talked about the fact that American workers, even those that are employed, are making less than they were before, that wage rates have been depressed throughout the country, which is undeniably true for people who are low skilled, and it is also the case for hundreds of thousands of Americans who have been displaced from high-tech jobs because of the number of people who have come into this country under H-1B visas. And it is also true that we are facing a crisis, I think, in our system and in our economy. The economy grows, but jobs do not. Job growth is not there, and the jobs that we are seeing being developed are jobs that by and large are not going to Americans.

Recently California published a study which showed that although there had been a very marginal improvement in job growth in the State, when it was looked at carefully, it was found that those jobs did not go to American citizens. They went to people coming here from foreign countries, aliens, some legal, most not. Those are the people

getting the jobs. Interestingly, we did not hear a word in 1 hour of discussion about jobs, and the problems with outsourcing and the rest, not one word was mentioned by the other side during their hour here about the fact that immigration, massive immigration into this country, costs Americans jobs.

It also costs American workers wages because of course this is a supply-demand system; and the more supply there is, the more downward pressure there is on wages, and we see it all of the time throughout the country, but no one talked about that. No one dared mention the word "immigration" in this discussion of 1 hour about jobs. They want to blame it all on President Bush's policy or the administration's policies regarding outsourcing. I am certainly critical of the administration's policy on a number of issues, particularly their immigration policy; but I ask people to be evenhanded in their criticism of what the problem is.

I have had a bill now for over a year, and certainly we will reintroduce, and I will be interested to see how many on the other side of the aisle will sign on. It is a bill that abolishes the H-1B visa program. This is a program where supposedly companies would be able to bring in people for a short period of time with very specific skills, skills that were not available here in the United States, no worker possessed them, they had to go overseas to get them.

Now, we have to think about that. Really and truly, how many people do you think there are in the United States presently employed in the high-tech industry or have been employed in the high-tech industry who would not be able to meet the criteria that we have established for these jobs, these certain high-tech jobs? I suggest very few. I suggest that American citizens are quite capable. I believe that we are producing enough people in our colleges and university system to take the jobs that may be available; but, of course, the difference is American workers were demanding higher pay, and so corporations began to look at H-1B visas to bring in cheap labor. So they forgot about the provision that said you can only bring people into this country under this particular visa status that had special skills and that would go back in a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, guess what? Nobody has gone back. We have maybe a million people in the country with H-1B visas. Nobody has the slightest idea how many, if any, have gone back home after the 5 years were up that they were supposed to be able to work in the United States. I assure Members most, if not all, of them are still here.

I have a bill to abolish that category. I do not think, no, I am positive there is not a single Member who spoke here for the last hour that is on that bill.

How about the bill to attack the L-1 visas status which is now being used by major corporations to bring people in