

shortly before I was elected House Democratic whip. George helped to take our staff to the next level, shaping and leading our office.

George loves sports analogies, so let me say that first in the whip's office and then in the leader's office, George recruited the best talent, ran creative plays and always knew how to put points on the board.

In the Democratic leader's office, George has been an innovative leader. He established a structure for reaching out beyond the Beltway; he built the strongest, most innovative Internet operation on the Hill; he has rolled up his sleeves with the policy staff; and he has helped shape our message to the American people. He is a gifted leader who gives staff guidance, but also room to grow. Young people in particular enjoyed working with him. He is both father figure and friend.

Throughout his career, George has largely worked behind the scenes. He is interested in accomplishments, not credit. He is strictly a shirt-and-tie kind of man, except when he is caught escaping to the golf course. And George has a comprehensive understanding of the rules of the House, and a keen sense of the Members. He has tutored so many Members, including me, on the intricacies of parliamentary procedure. He has earned the respect of Members and staff on both sides of the aisle.

For someone who seems to know everything about the House of Representatives, George is a remarkably well-rounded person. He has a wonderful family. He is a loyal Dodgers fan. He loves golf, and he is a maestro with orchids. He is a connoisseur of wines and an expert on vineyards.

Before his career on Capitol Hill, George held an assortment of jobs that reflect his unique spirit, including working as a baker, a short-order cook and a railroad brakeman.

Above all, though, George was and is a Californian at heart. That is why this goodbye is bittersweet for me; bitter because I will miss his unparalleled knowledge as well as his warmth and good humor, sweet because I know he will relish his return to the great Golden State of California. As a Californian for more than 36 years, I completely understand and share his desire to live in this country's most beautiful and most invigorating State.

George and his family, his wife Mel and his two sons, will be moving to the area of Santa Barbara not far from where the movie *Sideways*, a love letter to wine, was filmed, where he can enjoy the reds and the whites and get back to his golf game that I understand has suffered in recent years due to lack of attention.

He will always spend well-deserved time with his family. Again, I want to take the opportunity to thank George's wonderful wife Mel and his fine two sons, Curt and Casey, for sharing their father with us. It is hard to balance family life with work on Capitol Hill.

We all appreciate the sacrifices that the Crawford family has made.

I know that so many colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in wishing George luck in the next phase of his career, and many happy years with his beloved family in California.

With deep gratitude, respect, and affection, thank you, George, George Crawford, for your 24 years of service to the House of Representatives.

CAFTA IS NOT GOOD FOR THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor tonight to speak in opposition to CAFTA.

First I want to talk about my State of North Carolina. Of course I was not here in the Congress when the Congress passed NAFTA about 1992, and it was in effect in 1993. But let me tell you briefly what happened to North Carolina. First of all, we lost approximately 200,000 jobs in about a 10- to 12-year period of time. We also as a Nation lost about 2.5 million jobs.

CAFTA is the ugly cousin of NAFTA. That is all you can say about it. NAFTA and CAFTA are cousins, and actually CAFTA is about 85 percent of what NAFTA is. So therefore, I hate to say it, but CAFTA is the ugly cousin.

Let me also say that during that period of time, that prior to NAFTA, we had a surplus with Mexico, and now we have a deficit with Mexico. So now let me also share with you, Mr. Speaker, that prior to NAFTA, and then since NAFTA, we have had a 350 percent increase of illegal aliens coming to America since NAFTA became the law of the land. It did nothing to keep the Mexican workers down in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to take just a few minutes of my time, I know it is very limited, to tell you that last night on the floor of the House, I submitted completely for the RECORD, from the countries of Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, elected officials of those countries asked me last week at the interfaith conference of Protestants, Catholics, and a Jewish rabbi who are opposed to CAFTA to submit this, and I was glad to do it, so I submitted this for the RECORD in its entirety, but tonight for the last 2 or 3 minutes of my time, I want to read just certain points of what those people in the Central American countries are saying.

We know what it is doing to American workers, which is not good for the American workers, but let me share this with you very quickly. First of all, these are some points they made in this letter. These are elected officials from these Central American countries that said no to CAFTA.

First of all, let me read this: CAFTA will only lead to more social instability in the region as more medium

and small farmers will lose their livelihoods and become part of the poor population numbers. CAFTA will only lead to more migration to the United States as more people are unable to make a living working in the rural areas and the job perspectives in the cities do not improve.

The 20 million people who are currently poor and those that will be further displaced will turn to immigration to the United States as the only solution to their economic problems.

Again, this is from the elected leaders of these countries that have asked me to submit this, and they have written every Member of Congress; not just me, but everyone else.

Two or three other points very quickly. These seven elected officials as legislative representatives of the region, who represent a diverse perspective of political views, we respectfully ask you to vote no on CAFTA. In addition, they say that the opposition keeps growing all throughout the region, because this treaty threatens to weaken the already vulnerable democratic institutions that were created during the long conflicts of the 1980s.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and then I will close, CAFTA is a bad trade deal because it puts the interests of international corporations ahead of the welfare of the working poor and the poor in Central America. If CAFTA is approved, this social instability that CAFTA supporters like to use as a reason for approving this agreement will come not from the outside forces, but from the pressures created by the millions of displaced workers who will fall further into poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I must say tonight in closing that we in this Congress should do what is right for the American people, and that is to defeat CAFTA and go back to the negotiating table and do what is right for the American workers and do what is right for the people in Central America, and then we will do what the Bible says, and that is to help each and every one that needs to be helped.

God bless America. Thank you.

CAFTA IS BAD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if one was to look at this chart, and the black bars represent the extraordinary growth in the United States trade deficit over the last 14 years, and you see you are digging yourself a hole for the American people, for the future of the American economy, of over \$600 billion in 1 year. This year we are going to eclipse that. We are headed toward \$2 billion a day of foreign borrowing.

Now, most people say, well, Alan Greenspan says that is great. They are willing to lend us money. Shows how strong our economy is. But what Alan Greenspan and the other pointy-headed

hack economists around here forget is that those are real dollars which can come back to bite us, and they are coming back to bite us when you have a Chinese Communist-controlled oil company trying to buy a major American oil company with substantial reserves around the world. For a country that is importing 20 million barrels a day of energy, we want to be selling off our oil assets, our reserves around the world to the Chinese Communist Government? I do not think so. But they think this is just working great.

The point is we have a failed and failing trade policy here in the United States of America. We lost 3 million manufacturing jobs, good high-wage, high-benefit jobs, through NAFTA, and the WTO and permanent most favored nation status for China. Those have cost the American people dearly. Millions of Americans have lost good jobs.

And the trend is accelerating. We are losing our manufacturing base. And the question becomes with CAFTA before the United States House of Representatives, do we think that these big black lines, these huge deficits, this borrowing, this putting America up for sale and in hock is a good trend? Yeah, it is a good trend for a few people, a lot of friends of the President. They are making a bunch of money. They own the stock. They run the multinational corporations. They are getting tens of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars sometimes, in stock options because of selling off our country.

Yeah, it is good for a few people, but it is bad for the majority of the American people. It is bad for the workers. It is bad for our future. It is bad for our economic security, our military security, if you look at some of the recent trends dealing with China.

So the question becomes should the United States House of Representatives, should those who are undecided now, particularly on the other side of the aisle, get pressured by the President to do something that they know is wrong and is against the interests of the people they represent?

This is not a partisan issue. You know, Bill Clinton was a disaster on trade policy. The problem is you cannot find much difference between Ronald Reagan, Bush the first, Bill Clinton and Bush the second on trade policy. They are a bipartisan disaster, selling out the American people, selling out our industrial infrastructure.

And people say, well, CAFTA is really not that big, so why are you so concerned about it? Well, you are right. It is not very big. If you combine the buying power of all of the people of the CAFTA nations and say somehow this is going to create jobs in America, well, whew, you need to have your head examined, because if all of those people living in those countries applied every cent they earned, whatever currency it is, to purchasing American goods, it would not be a tiny blip on the radar screen of the American economy.

This is the same people who sold us NAFTA, and they said it was going to

produce 400,000 jobs. Instead it lost 800,000 jobs. They were only off by 1.2 million jobs in their estimates.

Now the President goes on television this week and says, oh, this will be good for the American people. This is going to create exports. What he forgot to tell them was his own experts say it will create more imports from Central America than exports. It is going to be yet another loser for the American people. They will see their jobs go south.

American workers should not be asked to compete with people earning 80 cents an hour, and guess what, people who earn 80 cents an hour are not going to be buying a lot of manufactured American goods.

□ 2230

So now CAFTA is the same disaster that was NAFTA, that is the WTO, and MFN for China. It is just saying, we have dug ourselves a deep hole. Here is a shovel; keep digging. Pretty soon you may come out in the other end in China, but by then they will own us.

So it is time for this Congress to stand up to this President, the same way they should have stood up to Bill Clinton or to Bush the First or to Reagan. We want a trade policy that benefits the American people, our national security, our economic security and brings and keeps jobs that pay decent wages and benefits home here.

Vote "no" on CAFTA.

CAFTA—PROPERTY RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss perhaps the most fundamental of the reasons for my opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement or CAFTA—the serious conflicts it raises with private property rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that CAFTA contains 1,000 pages of international law establishing, among other things, property rights for foreign investors that may impose restrictions on U.S. land-use policy. Chapter 10 of CAFTA outlines a system under which foreign investors operating in the United States are granted greater property rights than U.S. law provides for our own citizens!

Mr. Speaker, that's not encouraging free trade. That's giving away our natural resources and our national sovereignty. CAFTA would empower foreign investors to go to UN and World Bank tribunals to challenge state and federal policies here in the United States regarding property rights that violate their assumed "investor rights." Those foreign investors then could demand compensation in the form of U.S. taxpayer dollars for the losses caused by complying with the same domestic policies and regulations that apply to all U.S. citizens and businesses.

The standards for property rights protection that are used by the UN and World Bank to award U.S. taxpayer dollars to foreign investors would NOT be those of the U.S. Constitu-

tion, but rather international property rights standards set forth in CAFTA, as interpreted by an international tribunal. And I'm not the only one upset about this. No less than the Conference of State Supreme Court Chief Justices is among those concluding that CAFTA provides greater property rights to foreign investors than U.S. law provides you and me as U.S. citizens!

Furthermore, current rules under Trade Promotion Authority granted by Congress require that trade pacts grant to foreign investors "no greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than U.S. investors in the United States." Yet even a cursory review reveals that CAFTA fails the test on both counts. Although some words included in NAFTA's investor protection system were changed in CAFTA, the changes were simply procedural and not substantive.

Instead of basing foreign investors' property rights on U.S. law, as Congress requires, CAFTA provides foreign investors in the United States with a "minimum standard of treatment" set forth by "customary international law" and established in "principle legal systems of the world." The effect is to throw U.S. sovereignty and property rights out the window in the name of "free trade." CAFTA exceeds U.S. law by empowering foreign investors to go to international tribunals in an effort to be compensated in U.S. taxpayer dollars for regulatory takings.

Furthermore, new language in CAFTA almost unbelievably extends the outrageous benefits of this foreign investor-state dispute resolution system to corporations that have a "written agreement" with the federal government regarding "natural resources or other assets that a national authority controls." For example, foreign investors could circumvent the U.S. court system entirely by bringing arbitrary challenges over oil and gas, mining, and water contracts to an international tribunal. If a foreign investor is granted a land concession for logging and, as a condition of the contract, is told that the trees must be replanted, the foreign investor can challenge the requirement to replant as an infringement on their "foreign investor rights" and "minimum standard of treatment" through UN and World Bank tribunals. The U.S. logging company down the street can only go through U.S. courts and has no such special rights.

The very notion that international tribunals should get a say in how we manage U.S. property rights and grant concessions on U.S. land is simply unacceptable. Opening new markets between Central America and the United States is one thing. Asking me to cede decisions over U.S. natural resources and property rights to international tribunals while giving foreigners greater rights to our land than our own citizens have is something else entirely. I won't accept it, and neither should you.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

There was no objection.