

Evans simply assigned the word to the definition that was already provided by President Bush as well as members of his administration.

Breaking with a pattern on the part of the State Department of using alternative and evasive terminology for the Armenian genocide, Ambassador Evans pointed out that "no American official has ever denied it."

Now, Ambassador Evans was merely recounting the historical record which has been attested to by over 120 Holocaust and genocide scholars from around the world. In so doing, he was merely giving a name, the accurate description of genocide, to this very administration's statements on the issue.

President Bush on April 24 of each of the last four years when commemorating the Armenian genocide used the textbook definition of genocide with words and phrases such as "annihilation" and "forced exile and murder." Before him, President Reagan used the word "genocide" in 1981 when describing the annihilation of over 1.5 million Armenians.

□ 2000

In the day of the genocide, our U.S. ambassador, then Henry Morgenthau, had the courage to speak out against the atrocities which he stated were a planned and systematic effort to annihilate an entire race.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my name and my voice to all those who, like Ambassador Evans, know the truth and speak it plainly when discussing the Armenian genocide.

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. STRICKLAND) time.

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

There was no objection.

#### CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in strong opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, otherwise known as CAFTA, or DR-CAFTA.

CAFTA is largely based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, also referred to as NAFTA.

By signing CAFTA, the Bush administration has ignored the mistakes that we know here in the U.S. because of NAFTA, and in fact, CAFTA is nothing more than what I would say NAFTA-plus.

Ten years ago, NAFTA proponents promised increased wages and economic development in the U.S., Mexico, Canada and promised decreased migration. The agreement has failed on all accounts.

Over 750,000 jobs in the United States have been lost due to NAFTA, and immigration to the U.S. has increased. Through NAFTA, the administration granted a gift to corporate interests who prioritize access to cheap labor first and working families last.

Inadequate free trade agreements not only hurt the U.S. but they also hurt our neighbors.

I recently visited Mexico and saw firsthand for myself the devastating consequences of NAFTA. In the Maquiladora zone in Ciudad Juarez and other border cities, wages are low, union organizing is suppressed and industrial pollution jeopardizes the health and safety of workers and residents.

Now, those same U.S. jobs that were exported to Mexico are being sent to China, leaving the economic situation in many areas of Mexico worse off than before NAFTA.

As in Mexico with NAFTA, CAFTA would cause the loss of family farms and would lure more workers, most of them women, from the rural areas, poor women. CAFTA may create jobs for women, but the working conditions are unimaginable to the American public.

The bulk of these jobs are found in the export processing zones known as the Maquiladoras. Women that work in the Maquiladoras have reported forced pregnancy testing, sexual harassment and physical abuse.

CAFTA does not require compliance with international labor rights and does not protect women from being discriminated against.

In 2001, I traveled to El Salvador and witnessed first hand hundreds of young girls lined up at 5 o'clock in the morning to enter into the sweatshops. It provides for many of the textiles that are now being imported here, going on shifts anywhere from 12 to 14 hours a day.

I am not opposed to trade. So I want to be clear on that. I support free and fair trade. Let me be clear. Fair trade.

We need to level the playing field and enact trade agreements that include meaningful labor and environmental standards that will prevent the exporting of our U.S. jobs and the exploitation of workers abroad.

Our trade policies should lift people out of poverty, not keep them in poverty.

Opposition to CAFTA is strong in Central America, too. In fact, I was contacted, as well as other Members of Congress, by elected officials rep-

resenting El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras. They sent many letters to other Members of Congress asking us and urging us to defeat CAFTA.

CAFTA will mean more job loss and wage decline for American workers, as well as Central American workers. Lack of enforceable labor standards leads to a downward push on U.S. workers' wages, particularly Latino workers.

U.S. Latino workers have been disproportionately hurt by NAFTA because they tend to be concentrated in industries such as textiles and other manufacturing sectors.

While Latinos now represent well over 12 percent of the U.S. workforce, they account for 26 percent of the textile and apparel industry workers, and in California, the State that I represent, Latinos make up an estimated 80 percent of the hardest hit California garment industry. Almost 50 percent of U.S. workers applying for trade adjustment assistance, that this Congress approved, happen to be Latino.

In fact, 51 percent of American voters oppose NAFTA and claim it would hurt workers, wages and hurt our jobs. They also believe that CAFTA would do the same thing. So I know that in my community there is a strong, strong resistance to move forward on any semblance of what NAFTA and now CAFTA-plus would do.

In fact, the league of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, one of the oldest and largest Latino civil rights organizations in the country, has come out in opposition to CAFTA. LULAC claims that CAFTA falls short of being acceptable and fears it will unleash enormous losses for all workers in the United States, including Central America.

As the only Member of Congress of Central American descent, I understand the importance of supporting efforts to promote sustainable development and preservation of agricultural sectors in regions. However, U.S. policy towards Latin America should go well beyond free trade policies that do little to raise wages and working conditions of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also submit for the RECORD information on surveys and a letter from LULAC, as well as to make a notation that a book on CAFTA and free trade, *What Every American Should Know*, has just been released, and I would urge the public to look it up. It is by the author, Greg Spotts.

NEW POLL SENDS A CLEAR MESSAGE TO WASHINGTON: AMERICANS OPPOSE CAFTA

A RESOUNDING NO! ON CAFTA

American voters oppose CAFTA by a solid margin:

A majority of American voters oppose CAFTA! 51% of American voters said they oppose this trade agreement while just 32% support it. After presenting both pros and cons about CAFTA, opposition increased to 54% and support fell to 30%.

Voters oppose CAFTA regardless of their party. Democrats oppose CAFTA by a 53 to 31 percent margin, Independents oppose it by