

and helping them back to the fold. From working with young adults and raising money for college scholarships to comforting and sharing the wisdom of the elderly members of his congregation, Reverend Netters and his church are actively engaged in building a better Memphis.

The Mount Vernon Baptist Church-Westwood was founded in 1902, and Reverend Netters has been their pastor for the past 55 years, earning the distinction of being the longest serving pastor of a single church in Memphis. I wish Dr. Reverend James L. Netters, Sr. many more prosperous years with Mount Vernon Baptist Church, so that he can continue working tirelessly to lift up his congregation and our great city of Memphis.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 3078, H.R. 3079,
AND H.R. 3080

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 2011

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to all three trade agreements under consideration in the House this week. I believe these agreements will only exacerbate our unemployment crisis, undermine America's manufacturing sector, and allow the continued hemorrhage of our jobs to foreign countries.

I am a proponent of trade, but any agreement that reduces barriers and removes avenues to redress unfair practices should preserve American jobs, ensure a level playing field, respect the rights of worker's and our environment, and provide significant economic benefits. These proposed agreements, individually and collectively, do not live up to those standards.

Since 1977, the real median hourly wage has decreased \$.53 for workers in this country. In manufacturing, it has decreased \$1.40. In the same timeframe, the U.S. has lost approximately 7 million manufacturing jobs, over 250,000 in the state of Indiana alone. These are middle class jobs, and each lost job means lost wages, lost health care, and lost retirement benefits for a family. It is getting harder and harder for America's working class to make it, and that is a shame. With the unemployment rate at 9.1%, we must do everything possible to create new jobs, and protect every single American job that exists. Congress should have a singular focus of promoting American workers and creating American jobs.

Instead, Congress is going to pass three trade agreements that will cause a loss of jobs; necessitating the passage of a TAA package to train those whose jobs are being outsourced. What a terrible and wrongheaded policy. Further, the TAA package that Congress is considering would pare back the eligibility requirements and funding levels for displaced workers that were established in 2009. Are American workers less vulnerable to trade than in 2009? I find it ludicrous that we would choose to reduce this assistance when long term unemployment continues to plague millions of American families.

All three of these agreements are similar to NAFTA, and we know, all too well, the effects of NAFTA. In 1993, before the enactment of NAFTA, we had a small trade surplus of about

\$1.6 billion with Mexico. NAFTA was enacted in 1994 and by 1995 that surplus had turned into a deficit of almost \$16 billion. By 2007, this deficit had grown to a staggering \$75 billion. These policies have displaced millions of jobs, and we cannot afford to aggravate the problem with more misguided trade agreements. Further, the jobs that aren't displaced are diminished through depressed wages and benefits.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the South Korea agreement will expand the U.S. trade deficit by \$13.5 billion and eliminate 159,000 jobs within seven years. Proponents of this deal will cite estimates by the International Trade Commission indicating a small positive impact on our trade deficit and negligible domestic employment gains. However, I would point out that the ITC projected a \$1 billion increase in the trade deficit and a negligible effect on employment before China's ascension to the World Trade Organization. The results turned out to be dramatically different. Between 2001 and 2008 our trade deficit with China increased by \$185 billion and we have lost approximately 2.4 million jobs.

The manufacturing supported by the United States' automobile supply chain is the backbone of our economy. The provisions of this agreement allow duty free imports of vehicles with up to sixty-five percent of the content coming from outside South Korea. I fear that countries that have circumvented our trade laws in the past will use this as a new opportunity to increase the presence of unfairly subsidized products in U.S. markets by going through South Korea. The resulting job losses are as inevitable as they are unacceptable.

Finally, South Korea has a history of currency manipulation and erecting significant non-tariff import barriers. Are we foolish enough to believe they won't continue to aggressively protect their domestic industries at the expense of manufacturing jobs here in the U.S.?

Specific to the Colombia agreement, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that this deal would eliminate 55,000 American jobs within seven years, while growing our trade deficit by \$3.3 billion. Additionally, Colombia has a disturbing history of violence against labor unions. Nearly 2,680 unionists have been murdered there and only six percent of these crimes have been prosecuted. That is an appalling fact. The administration's Action Plan is a positive step, but it does not guarantee the basic rights of workers, nor their protection from retaliation. Further, the Action Plan is not part of the FTA, and is therefore subject to the discretion of the Executive Branch. I will not be satisfied until I see sustained long term progress for workers' rights in Colombia.

These trade agreements will come at the expense of the middle class at the worst possible time. They will do away with at least 214,000 American jobs and undermine key industries throughout our economy.

Trade can have positive benefits for the U.S. economy, but it has to be done right, and it has to be done fairly. These agreements do not reflect the lessons we have learned. Again and again, we have seen countries acting aggressively to support and promote their domestic job creating industries while protecting them from competition. Even when our companies have legal recourse, it is almost always too little too late, the damage has been done,

and the jobs are gone. That is why I am concerned about the failure of these agreements to have robust mechanisms to ensure that the provisions are enforced.

We should be using our time to pass legislation to rebuild America's economic infrastructure using American workers and goods and products made in the United States. I encourage my colleagues to oppose all three agreements.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH WEEK

HON. KURT SCHRADER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 14, 2011

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National School Lunch Week and National Farm to School Month in support of our National School Lunch Programs and to express my concern regarding some of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's proposed rule changes to the program. As the representative of the fifth district of Oregon, I am committed to improving the contribution of the school meal program to the nutritional needs of school children.

A recent Gallup poll found that 19 percent of American families are food insecure. According to a study by the USDA, nearly 17 million American children struggle with hunger. This same study concluded that 13.7 percent of households in my home state of Oregon suffered from food "insecurity" meaning they lacked consistent access to adequate amounts of nutritious food. That is over 500,000 Oregonians. One of our most important programs that is essential in helping hold the line on hunger and food insecurity is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP. As of August 2011, over 780,000 people in Oregon depended on SNAP to help piece together their food budgets.

Over one-half of our students in Oregon, over 280,000, are eligible for free or reduced priced lunch. A decade ago that percentage was only one-third. For these students, the availability of the National School Lunch, School Breakfast, and Afterschool Meal programs shield them from hunger and increase their family's food security. School meals are important to ensure all low-income students receive proper nutrition. Not only do school meals help reduce hunger, but they also increase the health of children and their ability to learn.

With this increased demand for free or reduced priced meals at school, we need to recognize the added burden this puts on already strained budgets. Changes to the school meal plans must consider the constraints faced by school lunch providers. School lunch providers need to offer nutritious affordable options that children will eat and that will encourage continued high rates of participation. For many children, the school meals are their prime source of nutrition for the day. Changes that discourage participation will reduce the overall health and wellness of American children.

While 2010 Dietary Guidelines recommends higher consumption of fruits and vegetables, the proposal would eliminate some of the most popular and economical vegetables available to schools. Contrary to recommendations made in the Guidelines, USDA would limit