



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2005

No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 12, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL C. BURGESS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year the House Majority Leader the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most influential Republican in the Congress, promised that this Congress would vote during last year on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a trade agreement that includes six countries in Latin America and the United States. December 31 rolled around, there was no vote.

Majority Leader DELAY then promised a vote by Memorial Day on CAFTA. Memorial Day came and went.

Majority Leader DELAY then promised a vote on CAFTA prior to July 4. July 4 has since come and gone. Now, Leader DELAY has said there will be a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement some time in July.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that there has not been a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement is because of the overwhelming opposition to that trade agreement, opposition from Republicans on that side of the aisle, Democrats on this side of the aisle, opposition from small manufacturers, machine shops, tool and die makers, small manufacturing companies, opposition from unions and all kind of worker organizations, opposition from environmentalists, opposition from religious leaders, opposition from in the United States to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, widespread opposition among leaders and religious leaders, labor leaders, environmentalists advocates for the poor, small business people, small farmers and ranchers throughout the six Latin American countries. The reason they oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement is it simply will not work for the great majority of people whether it is in Nicaragua or the United States, whether it is in Guatemala or the Dominican Republic.

All of us understand that this CAFTA does not make sense. We should renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement, get rid of this one, renegotiate one that works for everyone.

The reason CAFTA does not work is that it was crafted by a select few, negotiated by a select few to benefit a select few. The drug companies were at the negotiating table. They, of course, will benefit from the Central American Free Trade Agreement, but small manufacturers will not.

The insurance companies and the financial institutions and the banks were at the negotiating table helping to write the Central American Free Trade Agreement. The representatives of small farmers and small ranchers in small businesses were not at the table.

Oil companies and other big energy companies were at the table negotiating the Central American Free Trade Agreement. But consumers and people who will be hurt, the poor and working families in all seven CAFTA countries, were not at the table. It, as I said, was negotiated by a select few, for a select few.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason we know that our trade policy is not working is exemplified very well in this chart. 1992, the year I first ran for Congress, was elected, our trade deficit in this country was \$38 billion. In 2004 that trade deficit was \$618 billion, from \$38 billion to \$618 billion in the space of 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, those numbers, those are just trade deficit numbers. But what they represent is loss of manufacturing jobs in large part. The states in red are states that have lost 20 percent of their manufacturing jobs. My State of Ohio, at 216,000 in just 5 years. Michigan over 200,000, Illinois over 200,000, Pennsylvania over 200,000. The Speaker, the man in the Speaker's chair, his State of Texas, 200,000. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER's) State has lost 30,000 manufacturing jobs. The gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. PALLONE's) State of New Jersey has lost 105,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this trade policy is not working. These trade agreements are not working. This trade agreement is not about lifting up workers in the developing world. It is about U.S. companies moving plants to Honduras, outsourcing jobs to El Salvador and exploiting cheap labor in Guatemala, not to help those workers, because those

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5639

workers living standards under past trade agreements simply have not risen.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that we need a different CAFTA, and we have a different CAFTA when the world's poorest people can buy American goods, not just make them, we will know our trade policies are finally working. We should defeat this CAFTA and renegotiate a better Central American Free Trade Agreement.

CHANCE TO KEEP FAITH WITH AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Members of the House of Representatives will have a chance to keep faith with the American taxpayers and the interests of our each and every district. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I will offer an amendment to assure that the most expensive project in the history of the Corps of Engineers, the Upper Mississippi River Navigation expansion, is in fact justified.

This \$1.8 billion project will take up 10 to 15 percent of the entire Corps construction budget for years, perhaps decades to come, impacting projects in every congressional district. That is because the Corps' current backlog of construction is about \$58 billion and the construction budget is less than \$2 billion a year. We need to make sure that we are using our limited funding for worthwhile projects.

Now, while I have deep reservations about this project, I respect the hard work of our chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), of the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), and particularly of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), who, for years has worked hard in the committee and behind the scenes to make this a better project.

Out of respect for their hard work, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and I have come up with a compromise, not to eliminate the project, but simply to make sure that we are preserving the integrity of the Corps' project and the fiscal responsibility of Congress.

The amendment we will offer will authorize the project to proceed if the minimum economic justification that has been offered for the project is met. The planning is such that this project is going to be in a planning stage for the next 5 years. So our amendment will not in any way interfere with the planning process itself. It will simply require that over the course of the next 3 years that the projections for barge traffic at the minimum level are met.

Now, this is the key justification because barge traffic is cited in scenarios put forward by the Corps to show the

need for this massive project because they claim that barge traffic on the Mississippi River system is going up. But according to the Corps' own data, barge traffic has declined 23 percent from 1992 to 2003. Last year it dropped by 19 percent.

While it seems the Corps' traffic scenarios are wildly overoptimistic, and that barge traffic is likely to continue its decline, our amendment will allow the Corps to go forward with its planning project if, over the next 3 years, they meet the lowest scenario that makes this project economically justified.

Why is this special attention so important? Well, I have already pointed out it is the largest project in the history of the Corps and is going to impact projects all across the country that are worthy and much more important. But we ought to consider the troubled history of this project, for this project is, for many people, the project that launched the Corps Reform movement. In 2000, the Corps economist, Donald Sweeney, claimed that the Corps officials ordered him to cook the books in order to economically justify this project. After a whistle blower investigation, the Army Inspector General agreed, and two generals and a colonel lost their jobs.

This project epitomizes the need for reform and modernization of the Corps of Engineers. It is an example of how the Corps' planning system has a bias towards large structural projects. The National Association of Science has concluded that the Corps has ignored nonstructural alternatives such as congestion fees, scheduling and switch boats, that will enable the system to work better. And we do not yet have a good system of independent review, which, if it had been required of this project, we would not be arguing about it today.

Several National Academy of Science reports have examined the project. In 2001, the panel concluded the Corps had relied on over optimistic projections. In December of 2003 a second panel renewed their objections, concluding it was not possible to evaluate the benefits of lock expansion until an efficient system for managing the waterway was implemented. Last year an additional report concluded that despite the Corps' efforts, "the study contains flaws serious enough to limit its credibility and value in the policymaking program."

While I believe we have gone a long way in modernizing many of the Corps activities, I salute my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the committee for the work that WRDA has done. It is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to look at this amendment, and I urge its approval.

KARL ROVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is time President Bush's Deputy White House Chief of Staff Karl Rove level with the American people and explain exactly what his role was in the leak of a covert CIA agent.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. But from the way the White House has been handling it, you would think it is no big deal. Valerie Plame was a covert CIA agent stationed in many hot spots around the world. When someone in the White House decided to leak her name to reporters they were jeopardizing any undercover operations that Plame had worked with in the past.

You would think that President Bush would take this issue very seriously, since it was his father who said in a presidential address at the CIA headquarters back in 1999, and I am going to quote that, "that I have nothing but contempt and anger for those who betray the trust by exposing the name of our sources. They are, in my view the most insidious of traitors."

Now those are some tough words from the first President Bush who knew the CIA well from his days as director of that agency. But when Valerie Plame's name was first leaked, this president, the current President Bush, also had some tough comments for whoever was responsible. In September 2003 he said in response to a question regarding the leak of Plame's name, and again I am quoting, "if there is a leak out of my administration, I want to know who it is, and if the person has violated the law, the person will be taken care of."

Well now, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we know who one of those people is. And now the question is, will President Bush hold Karl Rove accountable for his actions?

Karl Rove has also repeatedly denied any involvement. When he was first asked if he had any knowledge or involvement in the identification of the CIA agent, Rove simply said no. Then earlier this month, when interviewed by CNN, Rove amended that statement slightly and said, and again I am quoting, "I will repeat what I said to ABC News when this whole thing broke some number of months ago. I do not know her name and I did not leak her name."

Well, we now know that he may not have necessarily given the reporter Valerie Plame's name. But he certainly told the reporter that Joseph Wilson's wife was a covert CIA agent.

Now how difficult would it be for a reporter to find out the name of Wilson's wife? Not that difficult, obviously.

Mr. Speaker, it is troubling that neither Karl Rove nor the Bush administration have leveled with the American people about Rove's real involvement. Shortly after the leak became news, White House Press Secretary Scott