

CRS Issue Brief for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Trade Negotiations in the 108th Congress

Updated October 12, 2004

Ian F. Fergusson
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Lenore M. Sek
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

U.S. Negotiating Strategy

Notification and Consultation Requirements

 Before the Start of Negotiations

 During Negotiations

 Before Signing the Agreement

 Entering Into the Agreement

Agreements Concluded and In Effect

 Bilateral Trade Agreements

 U.S.-Chile FTA

 U.S.- Singapore FTA

Agreements Signed or Concluded

 U.S.-Dominican Republic-Central American FTA (DR-CAFTA)

 U.S.-Australia FTA

 U.S.-Morocco FTA

 U.S.-Bahrain FTA

Agreements Under Negotiation

 Multilateral Trade Negotiations

 Regional Negotiations

 Free Trade Area of the Americas

 U.S.-Southern African Customs Union FTA

 U.S.-Andean FTA

 Bilateral Negotiations

 U.S.-Panama FTA

 U.S.-Thailand FTA

Other Potential Trade Agreements

 Middle East - North African Free Trade Agreement

 Enterprise for ASEAN

 New Zealand

 Taiwan

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Trade Negotiations in the 108th Congress

SUMMARY

The Bush Administration has made bilateral and regional free-trade agreements (FTAs) more important elements of U.S. trade policy, a strategy known as “competitive liberalization.” This strategy is designed to push forward trade liberalization simultaneously on bilateral, regional and multilateral fronts. It is meant to spur trade negotiations by liberalizing trade with countries willing to join FTAs, and to pressure other countries to negotiate multilaterally. Some argue, however, that the accent on regional and bilateral negotiations undermines the multilateral forum and increases the risk of trade diversion away from competitive countries not in the trade bloc.

The broadest trade initiative being negotiated during the 108th Congress is the multilateral trade negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO). In November 2001, trade ministers from 142 WTO member countries agreed to launch a new round of trade talks covering market access, WTO institutional rules, and developing-country issues. A framework agreement on future negotiations was concluded in Geneva on August 1, 2004, but a new deadline must be set for the talks.

Another major initiative is the Free Trade Area of the Americas. In April 1998, 34 Western Hemisphere nations formally initiated negotiations on tariffs and nontariff trade barriers in the hemisphere. Negotiators have released drafts of an agreement-in-progress. Trade ministers met in Miami in November 2003 and announced a blueprint for negotia-

tions, but the talks have now stalled.

The United States also participated or is participating in several regional or bilateral trade negotiations. Two agreements — FTAs with Chile and with Singapore — were concluded during the 108th Congress and are now in effect. In August 2004, President Bush signed implementing legislation for the Australian and Moroccan FTAs. FTAs have been signed with the five countries of the Central American Common Market (CACM) and the Dominican Republic and with Bahrain. Negotiations are underway with the Southern African Customs Union (SACU), Panama, and Thailand. Talks with the Andean nations of Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador began in May 2004. Several other trade initiatives are under discussion, including a U.S.-Middle East FTA and an FTA with countries in southeast Asia.

Most of the current trade negotiations began after trade promotion authority (fast-track authority) legislation was enacted in 2002. That legislation covers agreements signed before June 30, 2005, although a two-year extension is possible. Under the legislation, if the President meets notification requirements and other conditions, Congress will consider a bill to implement a trade agreement under an expedited procedure (no amendment, deadlines for votes). The notification requirements include minimum 90-day notices before starting negotiations and before signing a trade agreement.



MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

- In an address on October 7, 2004, the U.S. Trade Representative said that the following week he would be visiting the United Arab Emirates and Oman to prepare for beginning possible additional free-trade agreements (FTAs).
- At an October 6, 2004 hearing by the House International Relations Committee, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Administration officials said that trade disputes with Ecuador, and to a lesser extent with Peru, might endanger FTAs with those countries.
- On September 14, 2004, the United States and Bahrain signed an FTA.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

For over 50 years, U.S. trade officials have negotiated multilateral trade agreements to achieve lower trade barriers and rules to cover international trade. Before the 108th Congress, U.S. officials also negotiated four free-trade agreements with neighboring countries or strategic partners.¹ Currently, the Bush Administration is making bilateral and regional free-trade agreements more important elements of its trade policy. The multilateral arena is no longer the only means, or perhaps even the principal means, by which the United States is pursuing the benefits of trade.²

U.S. Negotiating Strategy

U.S. negotiating strategy is based on a concept known as “competitive liberalization.” As explained by the Administration, this strategy is designed to push forward trade liberalization on multiple fronts: bilateral, regional and multilateral. It is meant to further trade negotiations by liberalizing trade with countries willing to join free trade agreements, and to put pressure on other countries to negotiate in the WTO. As United States Trade Representative (USTR) Robert B. Zoellick has written,

we want to strengthen the hand of the coalition pressing for freer trade. It would be fatal to give the initiative to naysayers abroad and protectionists at home. As we have seen in

¹ The four agreements are the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement (effective 1985), the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (effective 1989), the North American Free Trade Agreement (effective 1994) and the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement (effective 2001).

² For further information, see CRS Report RL31356, *Free Trade Agreements: Impact on U.S. Trade and Implications for U.S. Trade Policy*, by William H. Cooper.

the League of Nations, the UN, the IMF and the World Bank, international organizations need leaders to prod them into action.³

However, others argue that the accent on regional and bilateral negotiations will undermine the World Trade Organization (WTO) and increase the risk of trade diversion. Trade diversion occurs when the lower tariffs under a trade agreement cause trade to be diverted away from a more efficient producer outside the trading bloc to a producer inside the bloc. What results from the plethora of negotiated FTAs, according to one recent article, “is a ‘spaghetti bowl’ of rules, arbitrary definitions of which products come from where, and a multiplicity of tariffs depending on source.”⁴ Nonetheless, in the aftermath of the failure of the WTO Ministerial meeting in Cancún, Mexico, USTR Zoellick indicated that the United States would more aggressively pursue bilateral and regional free trade agreements. “We are going to keep trying to open markets one way or the other,” he said.⁵

The manner in which the Administration chooses potential partners has been the subject of scrutiny by some Members of Congress. Traditionally, regional and bilateral trade agreements have been negotiated for a mixture of economic, political, and development reasons. The U.S.-Canada Free-Trade Agreement (FTA) was primarily economic in nature: recognizing the largest bilateral trade relationship in the world between two countries at a similar stage of development. The partnership with Mexico to create NAFTA brought in a country at a different stage of development and gave attention to trade as a lever to encourage economic advancement. It also had a geopolitical rationale of encouraging stability in the U.S. neighbor to the south. The FTA with Israel is seen as an affirmation of U.S. commitment to the Jewish state, while the FTA with Jordan can be seen as a reward for Jordan’s cooperation in the Middle East peace process.

In May 2003, USTR Zoellick enumerated several factors to evaluate countries seeking to negotiate trade agreements with the United States, but he said there were no formal rules or procedures to make the determination.⁶ A GAO study released in January 2004 reports that an interagency process has been established to assess FTA partners using 6 factors. These factors include a country’s readiness in terms of trade capabilities, the maturity of its political and legal system, and the will to implement reforms; the economic benefit to the United States; the country’s support of U.S. trade liberalization goals; a partner’s

³ Robert B. Zoellick, “Unleashing the Trade Winds,” *The Economist*, December 7, 2002, p.29.

⁴ Jagdish Bhagwati and Arvind Panagariya, “Bilateral Trade Treaties Are a Sham,” *Financial Times*, July 14, 2003.

⁵ “U.S. Plans to Accelerate Own Trade Agreements Talks,” *Congress Daily*, September 14, 2003.

⁶ These considerations included cooperation with the United States in its foreign and security policies; country support for U.S. positions in the Free-Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) and the WTO; the ability of a trade agreement to spur internal economic or political reform in the target country or region; the ability to counteract FTAs among other countries or trading blocs that disadvantage American firms; the presence of congressional interest or opposition to an FTA; support among U.S. business and agricultural interests; the ability of a country to anchor broader trade agreements to spur regional integration; the willingness of a partner to negotiate a comprehensive agreement covering all economic sectors; and the capacity constraints of the Office of the USTR. “Following the Bilateral Route?,” *Washington Trade Daily*, May 9, 2003; “Zoellick Says FTA Candidates Must Support U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Inside U.S. Trade*, May 16, 2003.

compatibility with U.S. foreign and economic policy interests; Congressional or private sector support, and U.S. government resource constraints.⁷

Some Members of Congress have questioned the manner in which potential FTA partners are chosen. Representative Calvin Dooley has called for the establishment of a “strategic roadmap” to help define potential FTA partners that would advance the U.S. economic, geopolitical, and multilateral agenda, given the limited resources of the Office of the USTR.⁸ In addition, some business groups have expressed a desire to concentrate more on the multilateral negotiations of the WTO, which potentially could yield greater commercial gains.⁹

In the aftermath of the failed WTO Cancun Ministerial in September 2003, some legislators urged reconsideration of FTAs currently under negotiation. The focus of the talk of retaliation centered on the ‘G-21 countries’ a negotiating bloc whose demands centered on deep reductions in developed country agricultural subsidies, but who reportedly resisted opening their own markets. The United States is conducting FTA negotiations with G-21 countries such as South Africa, Guatemala, and Costa Rica. Potential FTAA partners Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela also signed on to G-21 negotiating positions. The United States has FTAs with two other G-21 participants, Chile and Mexico.

The Administration has also equated the concept of free trade with national security. It cites the negotiation of free trade agreements in multilateral, regional, and bilateral settings as an integral part of its strategy to enhance prosperity and freedom for the rest of the world. In the September 2002 National Security Strategy, the Administration elevated the concept of ‘free trade’ to a moral principle, “the freedom for a person or a nation to make a living.” According to this document, free-market economic and trade policies, more than development assistance, provides nations with the ability to lift themselves out of poverty and to insure stability.¹⁰

While the Administration is pursuing trade agreements on multiple fronts, some question whether the United States should be negotiating trade agreements at all. They charge that jobs are lost because of cheaper imports, and that relocation of U.S. production to other countries has been facilitated by trade agreements. Some argue that trade agreements do not adequately address the problem of countries with lower labor and environmental standards that are able to produce at lower cost. Some critics believe that the U.S. economy will be harmed by the Administration’s pursuit of free-trade agreements.

⁷ GAO Report 04-233, *International Trade: Intensifying Free Trade Negotiating Agenda Calls for Better Allocation of Staff and Resources*, January 2004, pp 9-10, 12.

⁸ “Business Treads Carefully in Assessment of Administration Trade Policy,” *Inside U.S. Trade*, June 20, 2003.

⁹ “Filling Up with Appetizers,” *Congress Daily AM*, June 11, 2003.

¹⁰ National Security Council, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, September 2002, [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>], pp. 17-21.

The result of the competitive liberalization strategy is that the United States is involved in an unprecedented number of trade negotiations. Multilaterally, the United States and over 140 countries are participating in the Doha Development Agenda under the auspices of the World Trade Organization. Regionally, the United States is meeting with 33 other countries in the western hemisphere to create a Free Trade Area of the Americas, and is beginning free-trade negotiations with countries in central America and in southern Africa. Bilaterally, it is seeking FTAs with Australia, Bahrain, and Morocco, and concluded agreements with Singapore and Chile. Furthermore, the President has recently proposed initiatives that could lead to free-trade agreements with the countries of southeastern Asia and the Middle East.

Notification and Consultation Requirements

Later sections of this Issue Brief might refer to formal notifications by the Administration to Congress. Under trade promotion authority (TPA) legislation passed in 2002 (Title XXI, P.L. 107-210), the President must notify Congress before starting negotiation of a trade agreement and before signing a completed agreement. TPA legislation applies to trade agreements entered into before June 1, 2005, with a possible two-year extension. If the Administration meets the notification requirements, consults as required, and satisfies other conditions in the TPA legislation, Congress will consider implementing legislation for a trade agreement under expedited (“trade promotion” or “fast-track”) procedures.¹¹ The following briefly reviews the notification and consultation requirements.

Before the Start of Negotiations. Before starting negotiations, the Administration must notify Congress at least 90 calendar days in advance. (This requirement was waived for certain negotiations that were underway before enactment of the TPA legislation.) Before and after submitting this notice, the Administration must consult with the relevant congressional committees and the Congressional Oversight Group (COG).¹² The Administration must comply with certain additional consultation and assessment requirements for agricultural, textile and apparel, and fish and shellfish negotiations.

During Negotiations. In the course of negotiations, the USTR must consult closely and on a timely basis with the COG and all committees of jurisdiction. Guidelines developed by the USTR, in consultation with the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee (the revenue committees), cover briefings of the COG, access by COG members and staff to documents, and coordination between the USTR and the COG at critical periods of the negotiations.

¹¹ For further information, see CRS Report RL31974, *Trade Agreements: Requirements for Presidential Consultation, Notices, and Reports to Congress Regarding Negotiations*, by Vladimir N. Pregelj, and CRS Report RL32011, *Trade Agreements: Procedure for Congressional Approval and Implementation*, by Vladimir N. Pregelj.

¹² Members of the COG are the chairman and ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, three other members from each of those committees (no more than two from the same party), and the chairman and ranking member from any other committees with jurisdiction. COG members are official advisers to the U.S. delegation in trade negotiations. They consult with and provide advice to the USTR on the formulation of objectives, negotiating strategies, and other trade matters.

Before Signing the Agreement. At least 180 calendar days before signing a trade agreement (at least 90 calendar days for an agreement with Chile or with Singapore), the President must report to the revenue committees on proposals that might require amendments to U.S. trade remedy laws. At least 90 calendar days before entering into a trade agreement, the President must notify Congress of the intention to enter into the agreement. No later than 30 days after this notification, private sector advisory committees must submit reports on the trade agreement to Congress, the President, and the USTR. Also at least 90 calendar days before entering into a trade agreement, the President must provide the International Trade Commission (ITC) with the details of the trade agreement and request an assessment.

The USTR must consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with the revenue committees, the COG, and other congressional advisers, and with the agriculture committees when an agreement relates to agricultural trade.

Entering Into the Agreement. Within 60 days of entering into the agreement, the President must submit a list of required changes to U.S. law that likely would be necessary to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement. Not later than 90 calendar days after the President enters into an agreement, the ITC must report to the President and to Congress on the likely impact of the agreement on the U.S. economy and on specific industrial sectors. There is no deadline for submission of an implementing bill.

Agreements Concluded and In Effect

Bilateral Trade Agreements

U.S.-Chile FTA. The U.S.-Chile FTA went into effect January 1, 2004. The United States and Chile commenced formal negotiations on December 6-7, 2000.¹³ After two years of negotiations, an agreement was announced on December 11, 2002. On January 30, 2003, President Bush notified Congress of his intent to sign the agreement. The Agreement was signed on June 6, 2003, after a delay some attributed to the Administration's irritation over Chile's refusal to support U.S.- sponsored resolutions on Iraq in the United Nations earlier in the year. Implementing legislation (H.R. 2738) was passed by the House on July 24, 2003 by 270-156 and by the Senate on July 31, 2003 by 66-31. On September 3, 2003, President Bush signed the U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108-77). Negotiation with Chile was offered by USTR Zoellick as a template for negotiations with the Central American countries and for a Free Trade Area of the Americas. Debate on the Chile FTA focused on the future use of the agreement's labor and environmental provisions, capital controls, and immigration.

U.S.- Singapore FTA. The U.S.-Singapore FTA went into effect on January 1, 2004. The United States and Singapore launched negotiations on a bilateral FTA in December

¹³ For further information, see CRS Report RL31144, *A U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement: Economic and Trade Policy Issues*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

2000.¹⁴ The agreement was completed on January 15, 2003 after the two parties resolved outstanding differences related to capital controls. On May 6, 2003, President Bush signed the agreement with Singapore's Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong at the White House. Implementing legislation (H.R. 2739) was passed by the House on July 24 by 272-155 and by the Senate on July 31 by 66-32. On September 3, 2003, President Bush signed the U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 108-78) in Washington D.C. Debate centered around the future use of the agreement's labor and environmental provisions as a template for other FTAs and some members' dissatisfaction with the immigration provisions of the legislation.

Agreements Signed or Concluded

U.S.-Dominican Republic-Central American FTA (DR-CAFTA). On January 8, 2003, negotiations formally began on an FTA between the United States and the five nations composing the Central American Common Market (CACM) — Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.¹⁵ U.S. trade with the region totaled \$22.7 billion in 2003. The United States imported \$12.4 billion (primarily apparel items, bananas, coffee, and integrated circuits) and exported \$10.3 billion (led by apparel, textiles, electrical generating equipment, and electrical components for assembly).

On December 17, 2003, the United States concluded negotiations on a U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) with four of the five CACM countries (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua). Costa Rica eventually agreed to CAFTA on January 25, 2004, after resolving market access issues with the United States in the areas of telecommunications, insurance, and agriculture. President Bush notified his intent to enter into the agreement on February 20, 2004. The parties signed CAFTA on May 28, 2004, at a ceremony at the Organization of American States in Washington, D.C.

Under CAFTA, more than 80% of U.S. consumer and industrial exports would become duty-free immediately, with all tariffs removed within 10 years. Tariffs would go to zero on information technology products, agricultural and construction equipment, paper products, chemicals, and medical/scientific equipment, among others. Over half of current U.S. farm exports to Central America would become duty-free immediately, including "high quality" cuts of beef, cotton, wheat, soybeans, certain fruits, and vegetables, processed food products, and wine. At the same time, the U.S. conceded to slight increases in sugar quotas for the Central American countries. Advances were also made in other areas important to the United States, including services trade, intellectual property rights, investment, and government procurement. For Central American parties, benefits received under the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA) would become permanent.

Just as negotiations on CAFTA were completed, the United States began negotiating an FTA with the Dominican Republic that would integrate the Dominican Republic into the

¹⁴ For further information, see CRS Report RL31789, *Singapore-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*, by Dick K. Nanto.

¹⁵ For further information, see CRS Report RL31870, *The U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA): Challenges for Sub-Regional Integration*, by J.F. Hornbeck.

FTA with the Central American countries. The Dominican Republic is the largest economy in the Caribbean. Two-way trade between the United States and the Dominican Republic was valued at \$8.6 billion in 2003, with \$4.6 billion in imports and \$4.0 billion in exports. Leading exports include electrical circuitry, ignition and generating parts, computers, heavy construction equipment, cotton, and apparel. Leading imports are apparel, medical instruments, circuit breakers, electrical equipment, and jewelry.

Negotiations between the United States and the Dominican Republic began on January 12, 2004, and concluded on March 15, 2004. On March 25, 2004, the President notified Congress of his intent to sign the FTA with the Dominican Republic. The Agreement was signed by the parties in Washington, D.C., on August 5. As negotiated between the United States and the Dominican Republic, the Dominican Republic would have its own market access provisions, but would accept the CAFTA framework already negotiated.

In the United States, opposition has formed against liberalizing trade rules for Central America's major exports, apparel and agricultural goods. There is also considerable resistance to the agreement from labor groups, although many industry groups have come out in favor of the agreement. Further, U.S. officials say that a tax on beverages containing high-fructose syrup, which the Dominican Republic's legislature just passed, endangers an FTA with that country.

U.S.-Australia FTA. Formal talks began on March 18, 2003.¹⁶ The United States and Australia reached agreement on a bilateral free trade agreement on February 8, 2004. On February 12, 2004, the President notified Congress of the intent to sign the agreement. On March 3, 2004, the USTR released the draft text of the FTA, and the agreement was signed on May 18, 2004. On June 23, 2004, the House Ways and Means approved draft legislation to implement the U.S.-Australia free-trade agreement without amendment. The next day, the Senate Finance Committee disapproved the legislation as amended in Committee to include a controversial provision on beef safeguards. This tactical maneuver insured that the respective bills reaching the floor would be identical, thus avoiding the need for conference. The House approved its implementing bill (H.R. 4759) on July 14, 2004, by a vote of 314-109. A day later, the Senate passed its version of H.R. 4759 by an 80-16 margin. Language in the agreement concerning prescription drug re-importation proved to be controversial in the lead-up to the vote. President Bush signed H.R. 4759 into law on August 3, 2004 (P.L. 108-286). It passed the Australian Senate on August 13 with amendments that would fine pharmaceutical firms for frivolous patent extensions. Because the amendments were not included in the FTA as signed, the USTR must certify that they do not violate the provisions of the FTA before the agreement goes into effect as planned on January 1, 2005. The USTR has not yet made such a certification.

Two-way goods trade between the United States and Australia totaled \$18.9 billion in 2003. Livestock, wine, minerals, vehicles, and vehicle parts were leading imports from Australia, which totaled \$6.5 billion in 2003. U.S. exports amounted to \$12.4 billion, led by computer equipment, aircraft, vehicles, heavy machinery, and medical equipment. A

¹⁶ For further information, see CRS Report RL32375, *The U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement: Provisions and Implications*, by William H. Cooper.

desire to cement the U.S.-Australian strategic relationship, and Australia's cooperation in the war against terrorism, may have also underpinned these negotiations.

Under the agreement, tariffs would be eliminated on nearly all manufactured goods. However, the United States was able to maintain protection of several agricultural areas. Australia's sugar quota in the U.S. market will remain unchanged at 78,000 tons. The agreement provides a gradual increase in Australian beef and dairy quotas, and a gradual reduction of the above-quota tariff on beef and dairy. After 18 years, tariffs and quotas are lifted for Australian beef imports. U.S. negotiators were unable to negotiate the removal of the successor to the Australian Wheat Board and other monopoly export groups. The agreement does not provide for an investor-state dispute mechanism, which Australia opposed, nor does it provide for changes to cultural content policies for Australian television, film, and new media. Australia was also unwilling to modify the PBS, which sets and controls drug prices; however, the agreement provides for greater transparency in PBS decision-making. The ITC released its report mandated by TPA in May 2004; it concluded that the proposed FTA likely would have a marginal impact on U.S.-Australian trade, production, and employment with the total volume of trade between the two nations increasing only slightly.¹⁷

U.S.-Morocco FTA. On January 21, 2003, negotiations formally began on a U.S.-Morocco FTA.¹⁸ These negotiations culminated in an agreement announced on March 2, 2004. On March 8, 2004, the President notified Congress of his intention to sign the trade agreement, and on April 2, 2004, the draft text was released. On June 15, 2004, the two countries signed an agreement. On July 22, 2004, the House and the Senate passed implementing legislation (H.R. 4842) by votes of 323-99 and 85-13 respectively. The President signed the legislation on August 17, 2004 (P.L. 108-302).

While proposed with a strong national security and foreign policy rationale, the announced FTA also seeks to support U.S. economic objectives. These objectives include allowing U.S. agricultural products to compete more effectively against those of the European Union, which currently benefit from preferential access. From Morocco's perspective, the FTA could lead to an increase in U.S. foreign direct investment and provide preferences for textile and apparel exports to the United States. U.S.-Morocco trade totaled \$859 million in 2003, composed of \$463 million in U.S. exports and \$396 million in imports. Leading U.S. exports are corn, wheat, soybeans, aircraft parts, and coal; leading imports include electrical equipment, apparel, calcium and chalk phosphates, mineral oil, processed fish, and processed vegetables. The most sensitive issue in the negotiations was agriculture, and particularly wheat, where Morocco traditionally protected its large population of subsistence farmers with high tariffs.

¹⁷ *U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement: Potential Economywide and Selected Sectoral Effects*, Investigation No. TA-2104-11 (Publication 3697; May 2004).

¹⁸ For further information, see CRS Report RS21464, *Morocco- U.S. Free Trade Agreement*, by Raymond L. Ahearn.

U.S.-Bahrain FTA. On January 26, 2004, formal negotiations began on a U.S.-Bahrain FTA. Talks concluded after three rounds on May 27, 2004.¹⁹ On September 14, 2004, the two countries signed an agreement. Implementing legislation has not yet been submitted.

The Administration has praised the economic and commercial environment of the sheikhdom. The proposed FTA is touted by the Administration as a first step in the creation of the Middle East Free Trade Area by 2013 and foresees the possibility that other nations in the gulf region could link in to this agreement as they reform their economies and develop their trade potential. Bahrain is a kingdom of 640,000 persons, 40% of whom are guest workers, with a GDP of \$7.9 billion in 2001. Bahrain was a founding member of the WTO in 1995 and signed a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) with the United States in 2001 and a Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA) in 2002. The nation has diversified its economy away from dependence on petroleum and has created a services hub for information technology, telecommunications and health care. U.S. merchandise trade with Bahrain totaled \$875 million in 2003: imports of \$378 million included apparel, textiles, fertilizers, chemicals, and aluminum and exports of \$497 million were led by aircraft and aircraft parts, military equipment, passenger vehicles, machinery, and, not surprisingly, air conditioning equipment.

Agreements Under Negotiation

Multilateral Trade Negotiations

At the 4th Ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Doha, Qatar on November 9-14, 2001, trade ministers from over 140 member countries of the World Trade Organization agreed to launch a new round of multilateral trade negotiations.²⁰ The negotiations became known as the Doha Development Agenda, because of the possibility of increased participation of developing-country members, which now account for about four-fifths of the WTO members.

The work program combined on-going negotiations on agriculture and services liberalization with new negotiations on trade barriers for industrial products, WTO rules on dumping and subsidies, several topics that developing countries had sought such as easier access to medicines under the existing WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), and so-called “Singapore issues” (investment, competition, transparency in government procurement, and trade facilitation).

On August 1, 2004, negotiators in Geneva reached agreement on a framework for the conduct of future negotiations. This framework was the goal of the unsuccessful Cancún Ministerial, which was held in September 2003. The framework provides a blueprint for

¹⁹ For further information, see CRS Report RS21846, *Proposed U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement*, by Martin A. Weiss.

²⁰ For further information, see CRS Report RL32060, *World Trade Organization Negotiations: The Doha Development Agenda*, by Lenore Sek and CRS Report RS21905, *The Agricultural Framework Agreement in the Doha Round Negotiations*, by Charles Hanrahan.

future negotiations on agriculture, non-agricultural market access, and services. Ministers also agreed to begin negotiations on trade facilitation, however the other so-called Singapore issues of government procurement, investment, and trade and competition policy were dropped from the Doha round negotiations. Members acknowledged that the December 31, 2004 deadline for completion of the round would not be met, and the framework set no new deadline. Negotiators announced that the 6th Ministerial would occur in December 2005 in Hong Kong.

Regional Negotiations

Free Trade Area of the Americas. In 1994, 34 Western Hemisphere nations met at the first Summit of the Americas, envisioning a plan for a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) by January 2005. The FTAA is a regional trade proposal among 34 nations of the Western Hemisphere that would promote economic integration by creating, as originally conceived, a comprehensive (presumably WTO-plus) framework for reducing tariff and nontariff barriers to trade and investment.²¹ The United States traded \$715.5 billion worth of goods with the FTAA countries in 2003: 277.7\$ billion in exports and \$437.8 billion in imports.

Formal negotiations commenced in 1998, and five years later, the third draft text of the agreement was presented at the Miami trade ministerial held November 20-21, 2003. The FTAA negotiations, however, are at a crossroads, with Brazil and the United States, the co-chairs of the Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC) that oversees the process, at odds over how to proceed. Deep differences remain unresolved as reflected in the Ministerial Declaration, and have taken the FTAA in a new direction. It calls for a two-tier framework comprising a set of “common rights and obligations” for all countries, augmented by voluntary plurilateral arrangements with country benefits related to commitments. A follow-up meeting in Puebla, Mexico, was unable to clarify the details of this arrangement and subsequent efforts have been inconclusive, leaving the future of the FTAA unclear.

Progress on the FTAA itself, including setting a date for the 2004 ministerial, still rests with Brazil and the United States agreeing on the common set of obligations and defining parameters for plurilateral arrangements. This goal remains elusive, despite ongoing communications between their trade representatives. In the meantime, the trade dynamics of the region are changing, with much of the region heading toward bilateral agreements with the United States. Brazil and other Mercosur countries may have to evaluate the welfare tradeoffs of entering a deeper versus a shallower two-tier FTAA, or no FTAA at all given the agreements forming around them. This picture is still unclear and how it develops may depend on whether the U.S. Congress passes implementing legislation for the DR-CAFTA, Panama, and Andean agreements, as well as whether progress on agriculture issues outlined in the Doha Work Programme (framework agreement) adopted by the WTO on August 1, 2004, changes Brazil’s negotiating position in the FTAA.

U.S.-Southern African Customs Union FTA. On November 4, 2002, the USTR notified Congress of the intent to negotiate an FTA with the Southern African Customs

²¹ For more information, see CRS Report RS20864, *A Free Trade Area of the Americas: Status of Negotiations and Major Policy Issues*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

Union (SACU).²² The first round of talks began in Johannesburg on June 3, 2003. SACU is a customs union composed of South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, and Swaziland. A large degree of economic integration exists among the SACU states led by South Africa, the dominant economic power. U.S. exports to SACU totaled \$2.8 billion in 2003, led by aircraft, vehicles, construction and agricultural equipment, and computers. U.S. imports from SACU totaled \$5.6 billion, composed of minerals such as platinum, diamonds, and titanium, textiles and apparel, vehicles, and automotive parts. Potential problems include competition issues concerning the South African telecommunications industry and government procurement, U.S. textile tariffs and quotas, and intellectual property rights especially with regard to access to HIV/AIDS medicines. While all the SACU states are eligible for the tariff preferences under the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (Title I, P.L. 106-200), the negotiation of an FTA would “lock-in” and potentially expand such tariff advantages.

U.S.-Andean FTA. On November 18, 2003, the Administration formally notified Congress of the intent to initiate negotiations for an FTA with Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. The negotiations began on May 18-19 between Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador in Cartagena, Colombia, and four rounds have been held so far. Negotiators anticipate an agreement by early 2005. In 2003, the United States imported \$11.6 billion from the four Andean countries and exported \$6.5 billion, for a total of \$18.1 billion in trade. Colombia and Peru accounted for 71% of that total. Leading U.S. imports in 2003 from the four countries were crude and refined petroleum oils, which were primarily from Colombia and Ecuador; bananas; copper; coffee; and cut flowers. About 10% of U.S. imports from the region came in under existing Andean trade preferences. Leading U.S. exports were machinery parts, data processing machines, corn, wheat, and telecommunications transmission apparatus such as cell phones.

Bilateral Negotiations

U.S.-Panama FTA. During the FTAA summit in Miami on November 18, 2003, USTR Zoellick announced that the Administration had formally notified Congress of its intent to begin negotiations for an FTA with Panama. Those bilateral negotiations began formally on April 25, 2004, in Panama City, Panama. The negotiations have progressed quickly in part because they have relied on the text of the DR-CAFTA agreement as an overall framework for discussion. In announcing the proposed FTA, the USTR cited Panama’s return to democracy, its position as a regional financial and commercial center, and its assistance with counternarcotics, antiterrorism, and anti-money laundering efforts. Panama was the 63rd largest trading partners of the United States in 2003 with imports of \$290 million, lead by shrimp, fresh fish, precious or semi-precious metals, refined petroleum, and sugar, exports of \$1.7 billion, comprised of refined petroleum, aircraft, medicaments, corn, computer parts and accessories and telecommunications equipment. Total trade (exports + imports) amounted to nearly \$2 billion. In the negotiations, the United States will seek to address high tariff levels on some agricultural products, restrictive licensing practices, and the lack of regulatory transparency. Panama will seek greater access to its largest market, the United States, which purchased 47% of its exports in 2002. Given the similarities

²² For further information, see CRS Report RS21387, *United States-Southern African Customs Union (SACU) Free Trade Agreement Negotiations: Background and Potential Issues*, by Ian F. Fergusson.

between the Panama and Singapore economies as major transshipment centers, the United States may seek to incorporate in an FTA with Panama certain customs and intellectual property provisions in the U.S.-Singapore FTA.

U.S.-Thailand FTA. On February 12, 2004, the Administration officially notified Congress of its intent to negotiate an FTA with Thailand. Negotiations began formally on June 28, 2004 in Hawaii.²³ The White House sees potential benefits as: (1) promotion of U.S. exports, notably benefitting U.S. farmers and the auto and auto parts industries; (2) protection of U.S. investment; and (3) advancement of the Enterprise for ASEAN Initiative (mentioned later in this issue brief) and the U.S.-Singapore FTA.²⁴ It also emphasized Thailand's importance on military, security and political issues. Thailand is the 18th largest U.S. trading partner. Two-way trade in 2003 was \$20.5 billion — \$15.1 billion in U.S. imports, \$5.4 billion in U.S. exports. Leading U.S. imports were computers and parts, television receivers, and jewelry, and leading exports were integrated circuits, semiconductors, computers and computer parts.

Other Potential Trade Agreements

Middle East - North African Free Trade Agreement. On May 9, 2003, President Bush announced an initiative to create a U.S.- Middle East Free Trade Agreement by 2013. This initiative reportedly would begin a multi-stage process to prepare countries in the region for an FTA with the United States. Countries would begin the process by negotiating accession to the World Trade Organization²⁵ and subsequently concluding Bilateral Investment Treaties (BIT) and Trade and Investment Framework Agreements (TIFA) with the United States.²⁶ As domestic reforms progress, countries would then negotiate FTAs with the United States, possibly linking to other existing or planned FTAs, such as with Jordan, Morocco or Bahrain. At a September 2004 meeting of the Congressional Oversight Committee, USTR Zoellick identified the United Arab Emirates and Oman as the next likely countries for FTA negotiations. Qatar also has been mentioned as a candidate.

The Administration's rationale for this regional FTA is to provide the incentive for the transformation of the economies of the Middle East and their integration into the world economy. One study reports that, since 1980, the share of world exports emanating from middle eastern countries has dropped from 13.5% to 4%, and that per capita income has fallen by 25% in the Arab world.²⁷

²³ For further information, see CRS Report RL32314. *U.S.-Thailand Free Trade Agreement Negotiations*, by Raymond J. Ahearn and Wayne M. Morrison.

²⁴ The White House. Fact Sheet on Free Trade and Thailand. October 19, 2003.

²⁵ In the Middle East region, Afghanistan, Algeria, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen are not members of the WTO.

²⁶ "President Bush Lays Out Broad Plan for Regional FTA with Middle East by 2013," *International Trade Reporter*, May 15, 2003.

²⁷ Edward Gresser, "Blank Spot on the Map: How Trade Policy Is Working Against the War on Terror," Progressive Policy Institute *Policy Report*, February 2003.

On May 22, 2003, the Middle East Trade and Engagement Act (S. 1121-Baucus/H.R. 2267- Smith) was introduced to provide duty-free access for import-sensitive goods that are currently excluded from the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). According to Senator Baucus, this legislation would be modeled on the existing African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and Andean Trade Preference Act, and that the legislation could serve as an interim step before these countries join FTAs with the United States.²⁸ The proposal includes a declaration by Congress that bilateral free trade agreements should be negotiated, where feasible, with interested countries or political entities in the greater Middle East, in order to increase U.S. trade with the region and increase private sector investment in the region. The Administration has not taken a position on the legislation.

Enterprise for ASEAN. This initiative, announced by President Bush on October 26, 2002, provides the impetus for the negotiation of bilateral FTAs with individual countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or ASEAN (Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam). The first stage of this process is expected to be the negotiation of a region-wide trade and investment framework agreement (TIFA), which is seen as the first step in the process of negotiating individual FTAs with ASEAN member states. Thailand is the first candidate for an FTA under this initiative (see earlier section on Thailand). As stated by the Administration, the principal benefits to the United States of FTAs with ASEAN member states are the potential to reduce high tariffs on agricultural products and to eliminate restrictive tariff-rate quotas on other U.S. exports, while the major benefit to ASEAN countries would be improved access to the U.S. market. The initiative is also seen as a way of countering growing Chinese influence in the region. Two-way trade with ASEAN reached \$122.5 billion in 2003, with exports of \$41.9 billion and imports of \$80.6 billion.

New Zealand. During the 108th Congress, there has been Congressional interest in launching FTA negotiations with New Zealand. Fifty House members wrote to President Bush in January 2003 advocating the initiation of negotiations, as did 19 Senators in March 2003. Proponents claim an FTA with New Zealand would be a natural complement to ongoing U.S. FTA negotiations with Australia due to the high degree of integration of the Australian and New Zealand economies. However, Administration officials have enumerated several political and security impediments to a potential FTA, including New Zealand's longstanding refusal to allow nuclear powered ships into its harbors and its refusal to support the United States in the Iraq war.²⁹ An FTA with New Zealand may also entail tough negotiations on sensitive U.S. agriculture sectors such as beef, lamb, and sugar, although many of these issues are currently being negotiated with Australia. For its part, New Zealand fears that a solo U.S.-Australian FTA would reorient U.S. trade and investment away from New Zealand towards Australia. New Zealand was the 46th largest trading partner of the United States in 2002 with two-way trade slightly greater than \$4 billion. U.S. exports of \$1.7 billion were led by machinery, aircraft and parts, electronic equipment and vehicles; U.S. imports of \$2.3 billion were led by meat, dairy products, wood products, and machinery.

²⁸ Remarks of Senator Baucus, *Congressional Record*, May 22, 2003, S. 7005.

²⁹ "Zoellick Says Relationship with New Zealand Makes FTA a Challenge," *Inside U.S. Trade*, May 23, 2003.

Taiwan. An FTA with the Republic of China on Taiwan has been advanced by proponents in the last several years. In the 108th Congress, H.Con.Res. 98 (Ramstad) calls for a free trade agreement with Taiwan, and House Majority Leader Delay lent support to an FTA with Taiwan in a speech to the American Enterprise Institute on June 2, 2003.³⁰ Taiwan is the 8th largest U.S. trading partner with total two-way trade in 2003 equal to \$47.6 billion in 2003; the United States is now Taiwan's second largest trading partner after mainland China. The U.S. imported \$31.5 billion in merchandise from Taiwan with computers, circuitry, vehicle parts, television transmission, and telecommunications equipment leading. U.S. exports to Taiwan, which totaled \$16.1 billion, include integrated electronic circuits, electrical machinery, aircraft parts, corn, and soybeans. While the Bush administration has indicated support for the concept of a U.S.-Taiwan FTA, it cites several outstanding trade disputes, including Taiwan's enforcement of intellectual property rights, the imposition of excessive standards, testing, certification and labeling requirements, and Taiwanese rice import quotas.³¹ In addition, the negotiation of an FTA with Taiwan likely would encounter the ire of the mainland Chinese government, which considers Taiwan to be a province of China. Taiwan acceded to the WTO on January 1, 2002 and signed a Trade and Investment Framework Agreement with the United States in 1994.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

The WTO

- CRS Report RL32053. *Agriculture in WTO Negotiations*, by Charles E. Hanrahan.
CRS Report RL32060. *The World Trade Organization: The Doha Development Agenda*, by Lenore M. Sek.
CRS Report RS20448. *Foreign Investment Issues in the WTO*, by James K. Jackson.
CRS Report RS21492. *Services Negotiations at the WTO: An Overview of the U.S. Offer*, by James K. Jackson.
CRS Report RS21569. *Geographical Indications and WTO Negotiations*, by Charles E. Hanrahan.
CRS Report RS21609. *The WTO, Intellectual Property Rights, and the Access to Medicines Controversy*, by Ian F. Fergusson.
CRS Report RS21610. *WTO: Trade Remedies in the Doha Round*, by Vivian C. Jones.
CRS Report RS21664. *The WTO Cancún Ministerial*, by Ian F. Fergusson
CRS Report RS21905. *The Agricultural Framework Agreement in the Doha Round Negotiations*, by Charles Hanrahan

Free Trade Area of the Americas

- CRS Report RL30935. *Agricultural Trade in the Free Trade Area of the Americas*, by Remy Jurenas.

³⁰ Available at [http://www.aei.org/include/news_print.asp?newsID=17544].

³¹ U.S. Trade Representative, *2003 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers*, p. 358.

CRS Report RS20864. *A Free Trade Area of the Americas: Status of Negotiations and Major Policy Issues*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

Proposed Regional and Bilateral FTAs

CRS Report RL32110. *Agricultural Trade in a U.S.-Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA)*, by Remy Jurenas.

CRS Report RL32322. *Central America and the Dominican Republic in the Context of the U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA)*, coordinated by K. Larry Storrs.

CRS Report RS21464. *Morocco - U.S. Free Trade Agreement*, by Raymond J. Ahearn.

CRS Report RL32375. *The Proposed U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement: Provisions and Implications*, by William H. Cooper.

CRS Report RS21846. *Proposed U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement*, by Martin A. Weiss.

CRS Report RL32540. *The Proposed U.S.-Panama Free Trade Agreement*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

CRS Report RS21387. *United States - Southern African Customs Union (SACU) Free Trade Agreements Negotiations: Background and Potential Issues*, by Ian F. Fergusson.

CRS Report RL31870. *The U.S.-Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA): Challenges for Sub-Regional Integration*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

CRS Report RL31144. *The U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement: Economic and Trade Policy Issues*, by J. F. Hornbeck.

CRS Report RS21868. *U.S.-Dominican Republic Free-Trade Agreement*, by Lenore Sek.

CRS Report RL30652. *U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement*, by Mary Jane Bolle.

CRS Report RL31789. *The U.S.-Singapore Free Trade Agreement*, by Dick K. Nanto.

CRS Report RL32314. *U.S.-Thailand Free Trade Agreement Negotiations*, by Raymond J. Ahearn and Wayne M. Morrison.

General

CRS Report RS21554. *Free Trade Agreements, Developing Country Preferences and the WTO*, by Jeanne J. Grimmett.

CRS Report RL31356. *Free Trade Agreements: Impact on U.S. Trade and Implications for U.S. Trade Policy*, by William H. Cooper.

CRS Report RL31974. *Trade Agreements: Requirements for Presidential Consultations, Notices, and Reports to Congress Regarding Negotiations*, by Vladimir N. Pregelj.

CRS Report RL31932. *Trade Agreements: Impact on the U.S. Economy*, by James K. Jackson.

CRS Report RL31844. *Trade Promotion Authority (Fast-Track Authority for Trade Agreements): Background and Developments in the 107th Congress*, by Lenore Sek.

Negotiations on Trade Agreements During the 108th Congress

(Agreements Concluded and Implemented are in Bold; Agreements Concluded Only are in Italics)

Agreement	U.S. Total Trade* (\$ bill.)	Status	Sensitive Areas
Doha Development Agenda of the WTO	\$1,842	A work program was produced at the trade ministerial meeting in Doha in Nov. 2001. On August 1, 2004, negotiators reached a framework agreement on the conduct of future negotiations. Ministers also put off the December 31, 2004 deadline to complete the round.	Agriculture, industrial market access, trade facilitation, services, development issues
Free Trade Area of the Americas	\$715.5	Formal negotiations began in 1998. Trade ministers met in Miami on November 20-21, 2003, where the third draft text of the agreement was presented. Talks are at a crossroads, with no date for the next ministerial meeting.	Agriculture, antidumping, textiles and apparel, worker rights
U.S.-Andean FTA	\$37.5	On November 18, 2003, the Administration notified Congress of intent to begin negotiations with Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia. On May 18-19, the United States began FTA talks with Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador.	IPR, agriculture, investment
U.S.-Singapore FTA	\$29.2	President Bush signed agreement on May 6, 2003. President Bush signed the Implementing legislation (P.L. 108-78) on September 3, 2003. Effective January 1, 2004.	Capital flows
<i>U.S.-Central America FTA</i>	<i>\$22.7</i>	<i>Talks were formally launched on Jan. 8, 2003. An agreement was reached among the U.S. and four Central American (CA) countries on Dec. 17, 2003. A fifth CA country joined the agreement, and the text was released, on Jan. 25, 2004. The agreement was signed on May 28, 2004.</i>	<i>Textiles and apparel, rules of origin, worker rights, agriculture, environment.</i>
U.S.-Thailand FTA	\$20.5	The Administration officially notified Congress of its intent to negotiate an FTA on February 12, 2004. Negotiations formally began on June 28, 2004.	Agriculture, trucks, telecommunications, IPR
<i>U.S.-Australia FTA</i>	<i>\$18.9</i>	<i>Talks began in March 2003. The Agreement was signed on May 18, 2004. Implementing legislation was signed by the President on August 3, 2004 (P.L. 108-286).</i>	<i>Agriculture, investment, pharmaceuticals</i>
<i>U.S.-Dominican Republic FTA</i>	<i>\$8.5</i>	<i>Talks formally began Jan. 12, 2004. An agreement was concluded on March 15, 2004. On March 25, 2004, the President notified Congress of the intent to sign the pact, and the parties signed the agreement on August 5, 2004.</i>	<i>Agriculture, IPR, textiles and apparel</i>
U.S.-SACU FTA	\$8.4	Talks began on June 3, 2003. It is not clear whether an agreement will be reached by the end of 2004 as planned.	Telecom, textiles, pharmaceuticals
U.S.-Chile FTA	\$6.4	President Bush signed the agreement on June 6, 2003. President Bush signed the Implementing legislation (P.L. 108-77) on September 3, 2003. Effective January 1, 2004.	Capital flows, agriculture
U.S.- Panama	\$2.0	On November 18, 2003, the Administration formally notified Congress of intent to begin negotiations with Panama. Talks began formally on April 25, 2004.	Agriculture, transparency, transshipment
<i>U.S.-Bahrain FTA</i>	<i>\$0.88</i>	<i>Talks began on Jan. 26, 2004. An agreement was announced on May 27, 2004, and signed on Sept. 14, 2004.</i>	<i>Serve as hub for Middle East FTA</i>
<i>U.S.-Morocco FTA</i>	<i>\$0.86</i>	<i>Talks formally began on Jan. 21, 2003. An agreement was signed on June 15, 2004. Implementing legislation was signed by the President on August 17, 2004 (P.L. 108-302).</i>	<i>Agriculture, textiles & apparel, part of Middle East FTA</i>

* Domestic exports (Fas value) plus imports for consumption (Customs value) with countries of the proposed agreement in 2003.