

to the KORUS agreement in order to ensure that U.S. textile, apparel and fiber jobs were not outsourced to Korea and China. These fixes concerned (a) loopholes in the enforcement portions of the agreement that benefit China, (b) a tariff schedule that gives Korean exporters better terms than U.S. companies and (c) the exclusion of textile components in the agreement's rules-of-origin that advantage non-signatories to the agreement such as China.

These mistakes not only hurt our manufacturing workers but also damage our industry's ability to supply our military with essential goods for our men and women in uniform. In particular, Korea's producers get longer phase-out schedules than U.S. producers on a number of sensitive product lines that include products that are needed by the U.S. military. Damaging surges by Korean producers because of this inequitable arrangement will hurt U.S. companies that the military depends on for a number of important products.

Unfortunately, the Administration chose not to address the concerns of textile workers in your districts, and we are concerned that their jobs are now in jeopardy.

Polls have shown a rising concern by the American voter regarding the outsourcing of American jobs, particularly manufacturing jobs, and the decline of the U.S. as an economic power. Recent Wall Street Journal and Pew polls show voter dissatisfaction regarding badly written trade agreements is at a record high.

An analysis by the Economic Policy Institute estimates that 159,000 good paying American jobs will be destroyed if the KORUS agreement in its present form passes Congress. Of that total, we estimate that between 9,300 and 12,300 jobs will be lost specifically in the U.S. textile and apparel sector as a result of legal KORUS trade. U.S. government figures show that approximately three additional jobs are lost to the U.S. economy for each textile job that is eliminated. In addition, U.S. job losses from illegal Chinese exports are not included and these would be significant. Total U.S. job losses because of the flawed KORUS textile text are expected to be at least 40,000 jobs.

With job creation a central concern in the country, we do not believe that this agreement meets that goal. We continue to urge that the textile portions of the agreement be renegotiated in order to ensure that textile jobs are not imperiled. Until that time, we ask you to stand firm on behalf of textile workers in your district and oppose the Korean FTA when it comes before a vote in Congress.

Sincerely,

AUGGIE TANTILLO,
Executive Director,
American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition.

KARL SPILHAUS,
President, National Textile Association.

PAUL O'DAY,
President, American Fiber Manufacturers Association.

CASS JOHNSON,
President, National Council of Textile Organizations.

RUTH STEPHENS,
Executive Director,
U.S. Industrial Fabrics Institute.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL
DAVID J. PALMER

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Lieutenant Colonel David J. Palmer, on the occasion of his induction as a distinguished alumnus of Mountain View High School.

After graduating from Mountain View High School in 1973, David J. Palmer enlisted in the United States Air Force as an aircraft maintenance specialist. Four years later, Mr. Palmer transferred to the U.S. Air Force Reserves, where, in 2004, he was commissioned to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Over his illustrious career, Lieutenant Colonel Palmer has earned fourteen medals and awards for his dedicated and selfless service.

Lieutenant Colonel Palmer received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees at the University of Scranton and has always been diligent in service to his community. He has worked with the Northern Tier Planning and Development Commission, the Susquehanna Housing Authority, and Wilkes University. Lieutenant Colonel Palmer continues to be active in many local organizations, including sitting on the Board of Trustees for the First Universalist Church, as well as serving as a Citizenship Merit Counselor for the Boy Scouts of America's Baden-Powell Council.

Lieutenant Colonel Palmer and his wife, Luann, have two sons, both of whom are combat veterans and have received a Purple Heart and Joint Service Commendation for their service in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Today, the Palmers reside on their farm, near Hop Bottom, Pennsylvania, where they raise sheep and train border collies.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, Lieutenant Colonel David J. Palmer, and ask my colleagues to join me in praising his commitment to community, country, and family.

(SCREEN) ACT FOR 112TH
CONGRESS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now (SCREEN) Act. This legislation will remove barriers to one of the most effective preventive health screenings available, saving lives and reducing health care costs in the process. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

The statistics surrounding colon cancer are startling. Colon cancer is the number two cancer killer in the United States for both men and women. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011)

Over 50,000 people will die this year from this disease according to the American Cancer Society (2010 Fact & Figures).

These deaths become more tragic when one considers that colorectal cancer is highly preventable with appropriate screening. Ac-

ording to the American Cancer Society (2010 Facts & Figures), the 5 year survival rate is 90 percent for those diagnosed at an early stage; however, less than 40 percent of the cases are diagnosed at that stage.

During colorectal cancer screening by colonoscopy, pre-cancerous polyps are removed during the same encounter, thus preventing cancer from developing, as opposed to other cancer screenings where early detection is the goal. That is one reason why the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force provides an "A" rating for CRC screenings.

The CDC "colorectal cancer control program" screening target rate is 80 percent. The American Cancer Society and other patient advocacy groups have a target rate of 75 percent. Unfortunately, only half of the Medicare population is being screened, despite the availability of a Medicare colon cancer screening benefit. According to CMS and American Cancer Society (March 2011), Medicare claims indicate that only 52–58 percent of beneficiaries have had any colorectal cancer test and there is "clearly an opportunity to improve colorectal cancer screening rates in the Medicare population."

The latest findings by the American Cancer Society confirm that screening rates among the Medicare population continue to be in this 50th percentile range, with screening rates among minority populations are especially low among Medicare-aged beneficiaries.

The CDC concludes that 1,000 additional colorectal cancer deaths will be prevented each year if screening rates reached 70.5 percent. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011).

In addition to saving lives, colorectal cancer screening has been demonstrated to save Medicare long-term costs as noted by the New England Journal of Medicine in a recent article (Feb. 2008).

The direct costs of treating colorectal cancer in 2010 reached \$4 billion. (CDC Colorectal Cancer Vital Signs; July 2011)

I am pleased that Congress took steps to improve access to life-saving colon cancer screening when it passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act PPACA in March 2010.

While Congress has made tremendous strides in increasing colorectal cancer utilization rates in PPACA, this bill will further make live saving screenings more accessible to Medicare beneficiaries.

Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for any colorectal cancer screening recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. However, should the beneficiary have a precancerous polyp removed, the procedure is no longer considered a "screening" for Medicare coding purposes.

The unintended consequence of this is that the beneficiary is obligated to pay the Medicare coinsurance because the procedure is no longer a "screening." However, the purpose of the screening is to find and remove precancerous polyps.

the SCREEN Act waives all Medicare beneficiary cost-sharing for colorectal cancer screenings that become "therapeutic" or diagnostic procedures.

The legislation also resolves this unintended consequence for beneficiaries participating in health insurance exchanges beginning in 2014.

The SCREEN Act also provides incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries

so that our Medicare beneficiaries are in fact receiving the quality screening they deserve.

Lastly, the SCREEN Act removes barriers to screening rates by allowing a Medicare beneficiary to sit down and discuss the importance of the procedure before seeing the provider for the first time right before procedure. The federal government and colorectal cancer patient advocacy groups have concluded that the "fear of the procedure" is a major impediment to increasing colorectal cancer screening rates.

Promoting access to colorectal cancer screening is good policy. It will save lives and reduce costs to families and the health care system. Please join with me in the fight against colorectal cancer by cosponsoring this legislation.

H.R. 3078 COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 3079 PANAMA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 3080 SOUTH KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT, H.R. 2832 TAA AND GSP EXTENSION

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the three trade agreements this House is considering with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, respectively. At a time when our national unemployment rate is at 9.1 percent, with 14 million Americans looking for work, we cannot afford to pass trade agreements that cost jobs here in the United States. Instead, I urge my colleagues to bring a real jobs bill—one that will create jobs for American workers—to the floor of the House immediately.

America depends on trade with countries around the world to expand export markets for our products and create good-paying jobs in the U.S. To achieve fair trade, agreements must not export U.S. jobs or economically harm communities. We must insist that all trade agreements promote environmental sustainability, workers' rights, and improved living standards for people throughout the world. The negotiated trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea do not meet the standard of fair trade agreements and will leave Americans worse off. I do not support their passage.

In Colombia, the intimidation and murder of trade unionists and human rights workers is widespread. According to Human Rights Watch, over 50 trade unionists were murdered last year. The Colombian government's human rights record may be improving but it is still very poor. This is not the time to reward Colombia's poor record with a preferential trade arrangement. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The proposed free trade agreement with Panama fails to create any American jobs. Widely known as a tax haven for multinational corporations, Panama has not shown the inclination or ability to change its status as an off-shore tax shelter. This practice rewards U.S. companies that ship jobs overseas to avoid taxation here. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

In South Korea, between 2001 and 2009, the U.S. ran a trade deficit in goods of approximately \$125 billion. The Economic Policy Institute found that implementation of the Korea trade deal would increase U.S. trade deficit by \$16.7 billion and result in 159,000 American jobs lost over the next seven years. According to Public Citizen, almost 8,000 good-paying jobs would be lost in the 4th Congressional District of Minnesota. This agreement does not advance fair trade, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

As we've seen with free trade agreements with China, NAFTA, and CAFTA, unfair trade deals cost American jobs. This is why Trade Adjustment Assistance, TAA, exists—to provide training to workers who lose their jobs due to trade. Considering TAA while we consider these three agreements is evidence that these deals result in the loss of jobs here in the U.S. I support the passage of the needed TM extension, H.R. 2832, in order to provide some protections for American workers.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose these unfair trade deals and support the badly-needed extensions of TAA.

YES ON COLOMBIA AND PANAMA
AND NO ON KOREA

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, at one time, North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District was one of America's manufacturing power houses. Over the years, our manufacturing strength has been compromised by discriminatory trade practices that unfairly benefit overseas competitors.

Unfortunately, the Korea-United States Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) is a critically flawed trade proposal. With respect to textiles, South Korea has a highly sophisticated and vertically integrated industry. In 2010, South Korea was America's 8th largest supplier of textiles and apparel by volume. For example, yarns and fabrics, the largest component of the U.S. industry, South Korea was America's 2nd largest source of imports this past year.

The U.S. textile industry is staunchly opposed to the KORUS agreement due to the fact that it provides Korean textile exporters with instant, duty-free access for virtually all textile and apparel products, while giving U.S. producers no time to adjust. At the same time, KORUS has a number of non-reciprocal tariff phase-outs that favor the South Korean textile industry in key product areas.

We also understand that China could exploit the KORUS agreement by utilizing business relationships in South Korea to reach U.S. markets.

Our manufacturers are competing against foreign trade barriers, high tariffs, export subsidies, state-ownership of enterprises, and currency manipulation. The goals of this Congress should be to prioritize fixing U.S. trade policy, stopping manufacturing job loss, and closing the trade deficit.

South Korea and its people are true allies of the United States, and I value our diplomatic relations. As a Korean War-era veteran, I have witnessed first-hand how relations between our two great nations have improved dramatically over the years.

Unfortunately, I cannot support KORUS because it will do real harm to the North Carolina textile industry. I am sure that our two countries will continue our harmonious relations, but I am hopeful that we can reach a trade deal someday that is fair and equitable to both trading partners.

On the other hand, trade with Colombia and Panama does not pose similar threats to the textile industry in the United States generally and North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District specifically. In fact, textile trade among these great nations is healthy and balanced—we trade raw materials, value added materials and finished goods. Furthermore, agreements with Colombia and Panama are far less likely to be exploited by countries such as China or Vietnam.

Colombia and Panama are strategic diplomatic partners with America in Central and South America. Free trade agreements with these countries will boost our economy, according to the International Trade Commission. A deal with Colombia will boost exports of goods by \$1.1 billion and add \$2.5 billion to our Gross Domestic Product. An agreement with Panama will greatly improve the export of American agricultural goods, manufactured goods, specialized services, and support other diplomatic efforts to close a notorious tax reporting loophole that involves money laundering and tax cheating.

The agreements with Colombia and Panama show the way fair trade agreements should be written. My hope remains that a similar deal can be reached with Korea in the near future.

UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE
TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMEN-
TATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 11, 2011

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the U.S.-Korean Free Trade Agreement (KORUS). Put simply, this agreement is a bad business deal for the United States.

KORUS is an example of an agreement that stands to benefit certain industries at the expense of others. For instance, the Obama administration went to great lengths to include special provisions to ensure that our auto manufacturers have equal access to South Korean markets. While the economic fairness may help, the effect is likely to be minimal. Currently, over 95 percent of South Koreans drive South Korean cars. Because of this, I have serious concerns about the realistic ability of our auto industry to succeed in a reluctant Korean market.

In addition to my concerns with the feasibility of success for the auto industry in South Korea, it is widely acknowledged that textile workers will lose out because of the deal. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that 159,000 American manufacturing jobs will be lost, and because of the administration's failure to address textile issues, it is estimated that 40,000 textile jobs will be lost. I have always said that 1 job lost as a result of free trade is too much.