

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

PRIVATE CLARENCE SPENCER AND SERGEANT FIRST CLASS ALLEN MOSTEIRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the bravest and most dedicated young heroes of north Texas and of our Nation.

Army Private Clarence Spencer was killed in Bilad, Iraq while fighting against enemy forces in one of the most important conflicts our Nation has ever engaged in. Clarence Spencer gallantly and selflessly gave his life for his country while fighting alongside his fellow soldiers of the 1st Cavalry Division of Fort Hood, Texas.

Private Spencer is survived by his mother and son and his loving wife, Army Private Charlotte Spencer, who has also devoted herself to our Nation's noble military profession.

Clarence Spencer served three tours in Iraq, two of which were as a marine. Wounded in Iraq on a previous tour, he demonstrated tremendous courage by deploying into harm's way once again. Private Clarence Spencer is gone, but he will never be forgotten. His memory lives in our hearts, and America is eternally grateful for his spirit and his dedication.

As Clarence's Dunbar High School football coach said about Clarence, "I have coached faster, stronger and more talented students, but I've never coached anyone I was more proud of." That is precisely the way that the Fort Worth community and our Nation feel about soldiers such as Private Clarence Spencer, a true American hero.

Madam Speaker, I also rise to honor a second hero of the Fort Worth community and of our Nation. A graduate of Fort Worth's Eastern Hills High School, Sergeant First Class Allan Mosteiro was an 18-year veteran of the Army, who was assigned as a scout leader in the 1st Cavalry Division based at Fort Hood, Texas. He gallantly and selflessly gave his life for his country as a result of wounds he received during a fire fight against enemy forces in Taji, Iraq on February 13, 2007.

Sergeant Mosteiro is survived by his loving wife, son, parents, one brother and three sisters.

The American people recognize their sacrifice and honor the Mosteiro family's patriotism. As a career soldier and senior noncommissioned officer, Sergeant Mosteiro's leadership was instrumental in developing younger soldiers, and he did not take his responsibility lightly. A veteran of Operation Desert Storm and of the current war, Allan Mosteiro dedicated his life to securing the freedoms that all Americans so rightfully cherish.

Sergeant First Class Allan Mosteiro is gone, but he will never be forgotten.

His memory lives on through the wonderful family that he left behind and the dedicated soldiers he so ably led.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 98th anniversary.

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senators as members of the United States Capitol Preservation commission:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN).

The Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, announced the appointment of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. AL-LARD) as a member of the United

States Capitol Preservation Commission.

FAILED TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I rise with my colleagues here this evening to talk about our failed trade policy.

As a former mill worker at Great Northern Paper Company in East Millinocket, Maine, I know firsthand how these trade deals have crippled our manufacturing base in the State of Maine.

When I ran for Congress, I told the people of the State of Maine I would fight for them, for their jobs and for their families every single day. Mainers know that these trade deals have left them behind. You can go almost anywhere in my district and find an abandoned mill or a vacant factory. They are painful reminders of what was and is no longer to be. Their jobs have been outsourced to countries that pay slave wages. How can we compete when our own workforce has been left behind?

The election results proved that the American public is sick and tired of their jobs being outsourced. They want a Congress that fights for our workers and businesses. They want this country to move in a new direction. They want this Congress to move in a new direction.

I will be the first to say that I am concerned when I am hearing from my fellow colleagues that we can't cut side deals on trade agreements. Some say maybe we can make a few concessions on both sides and a deal is cut. The American workforce is sick of these trade deals, these side deals being cut. They don't want more trade adjustment assistance; they want their jobs.

Some say that the pending free trade agreements, that we should do a side letter to appease labor, or maybe a couple tiny provisions that fix the environment. My mom always told me, you can't fix what's broken. Our trade policies are broken.

It is time to start from the ground up. It is time to renegotiate the Peru, the Colombia and the Panama Free Trade Agreements. With the TPA deadlines quickly approaching, we cannot rush something through. The American public deserves to have the new majority renegotiate these trade deals.

This election sent a strong message. It is to change course in what the Bush administration has done with our failed trade policies. There is no quick fix to this solution, not when these agreements are based on a flawed model. These agreements compromise our port security, they privatize Social Security, they threaten our intellectual property rights, they undermine

States' rights, and they infringe on access to medicines.

I strongly agree with Chairman LEVIN that we need to address these issues, and we need to do it now. Non-binding side letters are not good enough.

Regarding the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, there is no fix that can make this agreement acceptable. It is highly offensive that the Bush administration even initiated negotiations with a country infamous for having the highest rate of trade unionists assassinated. More than 2,000 labor union activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990. More than 2,000 labor unionists murdered since 1990, with 60 assassinated in 2006 alone, one per week. Until the Colombian Government changes this abominable situation, the United States should not offer any enhanced trade relations to Colombia.

And then let me touch on the biggest issue of them all: fast track. Fast track delegates away Congress' constitutional authority. It undermines our right to have a say in what goes on in these trade deals. We must replace this outdated, failed trade negotiating system.

Over 3 million American manufacturing jobs, one out of every six manufacturing jobs, have been lost during the fast track era. Before fast track, we had balanced trade. The United States trade deficit has exploded as imports surged. The worldwide gulf between the rich and the poor has widened since fast track.

I could go on and on and on about fast track. Fast track has put us on the wrong track, and it is time to turn it around. Any acceptable version of fast track must include the bare minimum of some of the following:

It would restore Congress' right to decide which countries it is in our national interest to negotiate new agreements. It would set mandatory requirements for what must and must not be in every agreement, including core labor and environmental standards. It would require Congress to vote on a trade agreement content before it can be signed, and it would not allow for secretive negotiations. A new negotiating system must include more oversight on how past agreements are actually working. It would reinstate our system of checks and balances.

I am pleased that some of my colleagues are here this evening to join me in this trade discussion, and I look forward to their remarks. I would like to thank them for their leadership as well in this area.

I now would like to introduce Congressman PHIL HARE, a newly elected freshman from Illinois, to be the next speaker. PHIL knows firsthand about how these trade agreements affect our manufacturing industries. Prior to working for Congressman Lane Evans, PHIL's first job was at the Seaford Clothing Factory in Rock Island. During the 13 years, he cut linen for men's suits there.

PHIL served as a union leader and as the president of Unite Here Local 617. As district director for then-Congressman Lane Evans, PHIL HARE fought for the working men and women in his district. PHIL is a leader among the freshman class on trade issues.

PHIL, I want to thank you for your tremendous leadership on this very important issue that affects men and women throughout the United States. I yield to the good gentleman.

□ 1945

Mr. HARE. I thank the gentleman from Maine, and I also want to just commend you for your leadership on this whole issue of trade.

When I first came to this body, I campaigned on the sole issue of trade; and they said there are a couple of people you need to look up right away. I needed to look up Representative MARCY KAPTUR and MIKE MICHAUD for standing up for ordinary people.

With all due respect to the President, I don't consider this fast track legislation; it is wrong track legislation. I am a card-carrying capitalist, and I have said this many, many times. But I came out of an industry, the clothing and textile industry. But, for the life of me, I don't understand, this President just doesn't seem to get it. We keep losing good-paying jobs overseas, and for the life of me we are one of the few countries I know that actually subsidize our manufacturers for going overseas, if you look at the east coast and look what happened in your area from Maine all the way down and you look what happened in the Midwest with Maytag.

Today I sat and I listened to a person from my district, Dave Bevard, who worked at the Maytag plant. He had 32 years in and his wife had 30, 62 years between the both of them. Here, these workers gave up two wage concessions, if you can believe that, to keep this plant open, \$24 million from our State of Illinois in tax breaks to this company; and at the end of the day they ended up moving to Sonora, Mexico. The CEO of the company said, "I don't care about the workers and the community. I am here to make a dollar for my shareholders." It didn't matter about the health care and the pensions.

And Dave brought up today, you know, we have trade readjustment funds and things of that nature, but, as the gentleman knows, by the time you get them you have to decide between your unemployment compensation and whether you are going to be retrained. Then they tell you, well, you should go into a field that is growing, maybe like health care. So he said, of the 2,500 people that lost their jobs at that plant, 400 people tried the medical care, thinking they were going to get into medical care. Well, that worked great for the schooling, but when it came to practical exercise to go in and be able to learn the trade and be able to do it, they only had room for 30 people. So, 370 people are left out in the cold.

Another woman wanted to go through and wanted to get into daycare and needed a 1-year program at the community college. They only had a 2-year program; and they said, well, maybe she should just try being a cosmetologist instead.

When you take a look at the way we do this and the way we treat our workers, I said today this is a moral issue that I think we in this Congress have.

I support trade. I will always support trade. I know our country needs it. But I ask, at what price? And I want to know why is it that this President feels he doesn't have to basically come to Congress for anything, as you know, but particularly when it comes to the trade issue. He can outsource it, he can fast track, and he can do whatever he wants to do, and there is no congressional accountability, no oversight. We are left with a package we can't even vote up or down half the time because he has the secret back-door deals.

I, for one, as a freshman am tired. I am tired of going back to my district and seeing people like Dave Bevard and his wife who, by the way, has cancer. He is going to lose his health care.

And I ask a question very simply of this administration and for those on the other side of the aisle and maybe some within my own party who think that this is the way to go. I want you to come to Gifford, and I want you to see what is left of that Maytag plant, and I want you to see the people whose lives have been affected by this and the lack of health care.

Their prescription programs that they had, now they have lost their prescription drug program that they had, it equals for some of them their prescriptions per month, the pension that they receive. Now, they don't even get a pension, they have no health care, and somebody is going to try to convince me that this trade deal is going to work and that this was in the best interest of our manufacturing base?

Now I can't in good conscience do that. I think we had some interesting hearings today, but, ultimately, we have to be able to stand up.

And I agree with the gentleman from Maine. We had a directive I think this past election. I campaigned on this issue, as you know; and I campaigned very strongly about it. I said, look, I support trade, I support fair trade. So I am a fair trader, and I think that is what we should all be. And I think we have an obligation, as I said before, to ask this administration but also ask of ourselves: Are we here to represent the Dave Bevards of this country? Or are we here to represent the CEO that took the jobs to Sonora, Mexico?

And they are going to keep doing it. Every single day we read of another small factory going. My clothing factory that I worked in was shut down, and now I hear that the remaining 350 people that were working there are hanging by a thread. Translation: In about a year, that plant is going to go simply because nobody wants to have

the initiative and the courage to stand up for an industry that has been hit, or dumping its steel. It goes on and on.

I don't want to use up the whole hour, but if the gentleman would just let me conclude by saying this. I would like to ask some of our folks on the other side that call me a protectionist, and I looked in the dictionary, and I think that means you are trying to protect something, and I am, and I know we are. We are trying to protect a basic fundamental right for people to have a decent-paying job.

You know, these aren't CEOs. These are ordinary people who want to put their kids through school, have health care. They want to be able to work, and work very hard, and be able to retire and not have to worry about it.

I am not going to stop on this issue, and I again applaud the gentleman from Maine for courage that he has. And I will promise you this, that I have said many times: I don't know how long I am going to be in this body, but as long as I am I am going to continue to come to this floor, I am going to continue to talk about those lost jobs and say we have to start thinking differently than we have before.

We have an obligation, and our obligation is to stand up for ordinary people. That is what I have always been about. And I think the basic job of a Member of Congress, when you really get down to it, after all is said and done, is all of us are here to do the best we can to help ordinary people out, to make their lives better, not complicated.

So to my friends on the other side that might think I am off base, I am not going to support fast track. I will vote against it. I am not going to have any part of outsourcing one more job from my district or from this country. I am going to stand up for workers, whether they are from Illinois or Maine or Ohio or Florida or wherever they are from, because we have a responsibility to do it. It is the right thing to do.

And, again, I just can't thank you enough, Congressman, for taking the lead on this. You and Representative KAPTUR have been great inspirations to me as a freshman here and campaigned on this issue of trade.

And, by the way, I would just say to people listening, it is okay to run on things you believe in and lead with your heart and on the right issues, and every now and then the good guys do come out on top. So I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate this evening and look forward to any questions or discussion you might have.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank you very much, Congressman HARE.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATSON). All Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. MICHAUD. I apologize, Madam Speaker.

I would like to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. It is I who ought

to thank you and the freshman class for your leadership in this area. You have actually brought forward a whole new fresh discussion about trade and what it has done to this country. So I really appreciate your leadership and look forward to continuing working with you as we move forward in this area.

There is another Member I would like to recognize, not a member of the freshman class, but this Member has been a true advocate for fair trade. Congresswoman KAPTUR has been a tremendous leader in this fair trade fight.

MARCY came to Congress from a working-class background. Her family operated a small grocery where her mother worked, after serving on the original organizing committee of an auto trade union at Champion Spark Plug. MARCY knows firsthand how these unfair trade deals have affected industry throughout her congressional district in Ohio and has been a key player in our trade working group in the House.

I really appreciate all the leadership and expertise that you have brought forward on this issue, Congresswoman KAPTUR. You have been a true leader, and you have been a mentor to me ever since I got elected to Congress. So thank you, and I yield you such time as you may consume.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman MICHAUD, thank you so much for bringing us together tonight and for your great contributions to this debate. That is probably the major economic debate this Nation faces. It is a real pleasure to be here with you this evening. I thank you for yielding me some time.

And to Congressman PHIL HARE from Illinois, who has just hit the ground running here and who I think is such a tremendous addition to our membership and to this great struggle for the cause of all people in our country, the dignity of their work, the future for their families and the future of our communities.

And to Congressman STEVE LYNCH of Massachusetts, who works so respectfully as an ironworker. He looks like that man that they have on that iron beam over New York City, that famous poster. Whenever I look at him, I think I see him. He is the one who is swinging the golf club with the ball or something.

It is a pleasure to be here with these gentlemen tonight, because they have all worked for a living, their families have worked for a living, and we need more people who bring this experience to the Congress of the United States.

The plant that Congressman MICHAUD discussed, Champion spark plugs, no longer exists in Toledo. Back when I was first elected, we tried so hard to get the Japanese to buy the spark plugs, the best plugs that were made in the whole country, Champion spark plugs.

I took them to Japan in 1985, and I said to Prime Minister Nakasone, "Your companies aren't buying from

our premier companies." Our trade deficit was beginning to really get bad back then, so I said, "So I would like to suggest that we give you these plugs for free for your manufacturers, and let them try them."

And we learned a lot about the keiratsu system of Japan and what a closed system indeed it is and that other companies couldn't bid into that production and that these very tight buying chains exist globally. Japan has been eating our lunch in the automotive market for a very long time now, but the Japanese market still remains closed, with less than 3 percent of the cars on their streets from anywhere else in the world. They didn't even take Yugos or bugs, VW bugs. So that market is a closed market, and we began to see how difficult it was to engage in trade with nations who truly were protectionists.

Congressman HARE talked about protectionist countries. You can see pretty clearly which ones they are when you look at what is on their shelves and what is on their streets.

I am here tonight to say that I have never supported fast track, because I don't believe Congress should ever let a fast ball go through here that we don't grab ahold of. And the problem is you can't amend a trade agreement. So even if you want to, as happened when we debated NAFTA, I can't remember a more piercing debate in this Congress other than votes on war. That NAFTA debate was the most significant economic debate we had here in 1993; and at the time that we debated that, it was purposefully brought to the floor in a way that we could not amend.

So let me just take one issue. We are going to have discussions this year on the issue of immigration. When that bill came down here, there were many of us who said we have to deal with the displacement that is going to happen in Mexico in the farm sector, because there is no transition provision in NAFTA and no currency exchange, that we knew that the Mexican farmers were going to be thrown off of their community oriented farming ejido systems. It has happened. No one wants to recognize it has happened, but over 2 million people were disengaged from their villages and towns, and they are wandering the continent, providing an endless stream of labor that is dirt cheap there and here. It is almost as if they didn't want us to talk about it because that fast track bill came through here.

Now, the NAFTA model is being used, they want to expand it to Colombia, they want to put it to Peru.

I wanted to say a word about Colombia this evening. I agree with Congressman MICHAUD. There is no nation in the world that allows the assassination of their labor leaders more than Colombia. Why would we want to sign a free trade agreement with a country that isn't free? Our cardinal rule ought to be: Free trade among free people.

When we look at what happened in Colombia recently, Chiquita brands, remember Chiquita Banana, which is headquartered in my State of Ohio, has just pleaded guilty to funding terrorism in Colombia. Several what are called unidentified high-ranking corporate officers of a subsidiary of Chiquita paid \$1.7 million from 1997 through 2004 to fund the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, a group that our country says is a terrorist organization. And Chiquita also bribed other groups inside of Colombia.

The company has now admitted to this wrongdoing and agreed to pay \$25 million in fines. They said that the money was paid to protect employees from violent paramilitaries who fight over the banana plantations. I wouldn't wish working on a Colombian banana plantation to any living human being.

□ 2000

And yet we are about to sign a free trade agreement under fast track that we can't amend and stand up for the dignity of people in Colombia.

We know that the Colombian worker isn't safe; yet the President evidently thinks it is okay to sign an agreement where there is no transparent justice system, where bribes and protections and murders are every-day occurrences. Where are our values as a country? Why has it taken us almost 20 years from 1985 to 1995 to 2005, now it is 2007, to bring this issue up? We had to have so many casualties in this country. We tried 23 years ago so the hurt would not be so bad. And the gentlemen that are here this evening, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HARE, Mr. ELLISON, they represent those who are suffering in our country. There are people suffering in other countries, too.

I want to say I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks this evening. And what you said about those who have been murdered in Colombia, we know 72 were murdered in 2006, and the gentleman talked about prior assassinations of those who were trying to form groups there so they could earn a decent wage. Almost none have been prosecuted. It is like their lives have no meaning. So we need to set a higher standard. Maybe our Constitution really should stand for something and we should look for an agreement among the peoples of the Americas that uses democracy and liberty as its fundamental principles, not the diminishing of workers, be they farmers or industrial workers.

I oppose the Colombian free trade agreement and stand up for human rights, the middle class, the rule of law, and everything that this Nation should be committed to.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you, and I look forward to working with you as we move forward.

We also have been joined by Mr. ELLISON, who represents the Fifth District in Minnesota with distinction. Congressman ELLISON believes NAFTA and CAFTA have encouraged the move-

ment of manufacturing and agricultural jobs out of Minnesota to be done under sweat-shop conditions in other countries.

A 2003 report by the Minnesota Fair Trade Coalition reported that at least a quarter and likely one-third of the net 45,000 manufacturing jobs that Minnesota lost from 2001 to 2003 were directly attributable to trade deals such as NAFTA.

Congressman ELLISON has been a leader among the freshman class, along with Congressman HARE, in fighting for fairer trade deals. I yield to Congressman ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you. I thank you for your leadership on this issue of fair trade. I think that the time is right, the time is now to begin talking about fair trade. I want to commend all of the Members here tonight talking about this critical issue.

This election sent a strong message: no staying the course on Bush's failed trade policy. So now what do we hear, that the Bush administration wants to send to Congress NAFTA expansion agreements with Peru and Colombia. Consider the problems that Democrats have endlessly raised in writing, in hearings, on the floor, think about these problems and the administration's trade agreement model, how we have continually demonstrated that the Bush trade model is killing American jobs and is an enemy of the middle class.

Then consider what the administration chose to put in the deals anyway. Democrats are for consumers' right to affordable medicine. The 2002 trade negotiation authority instructed the Bush administration not to lard up and pack up these trade deals with new protections for big pharmaceuticals that could cut poor consumers off from access to medications and cause endless deaths in poor countries. But the administration inserted this poison pill into the FTAs. The TRIPS-plus requirement needs to come out.

Democrats are against privatization of Social Security. We believe the elderly in whatever nation they are in should have safeguards for their security as they age. Yet the Peru free trade agreement requires Peru to open its social security system for privatization. That has to come out.

Democrats believe that foreign businesses operating on U.S. soil shouldn't have greater rights than U.S. businesses. And we believe that our environmental and health safeguards cannot be exposed to attack in international tribunals. But the administration included the extreme foreign investor rights and investor state enforcement of NAFTA's Chapter 11. That needs to come out as well.

Democrats believe in the right of Congress and the President to protect this Nation's security. We have made it clear that the trade pacts cannot subject our decisions about who should operate U.S. ports to attacks in international tribunals or demands for com-

pensation. Yet although the Dubai Ports World operates Peru's ports and thus would have the right to such a claim, you included the "landslide port activities" in the Peru and Colombian agreements. That has to come out.

Democrats believe in reducing poverty in the developing world. We believe in providing farmers in the Andean nations opportunities to earn a living without resorting to illegal drugs that will end up on our streets here in the United States. But despite the warnings from Peruvian and Colombian Governments and the record of NAFTA displacing 1.7 million compesinos, the President has insisted on zeroing out corn, rice and bean tariffs in those things. That has to come out.

Democrats believe consumers have a right to safe food. But the administration included provisions allowing food imports that don't meet our standards. That needs to come out.

Democrats believe that when governments spend tax dollars, they must do so in the best interest of the taxpayers. But the administration included language in these FTA procurement texts that could expose Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws, renewable energy standards and more to challenge. That must come out.

It would only require striking a sentence here or a word there to remove the FTA terms that directly conflict with these core Democratic Party values and goals.

And then there is what is missing, the enforceable labor and environmental standards in the core of the text of the agreement equal to the commercial provisions.

Regarding the Colombia FTA, there is no fix to that and there is nothing that can make this agreement acceptable in my view. It is highly offensive that the Bush administration would exploit the enormous discretion fast track provides even to initiate negotiations with a country infamous and, unfortunately, famous for having the highest rate of trade union assassinations. More than 2,000 labor activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990. Sixty were assassinated in 2006 alone; one per week. The Colombian Army is implicated in many of these murders, but few have been prosecuted. Until the Colombian Government changes its situation, the United States should not offer any enhanced trade relations to Colombia.

Mr. MICHAUD, thank you for your excellent work and leadership. The American people deserve fair trade agreements. The American Congress must take back its constitutional authority to make sure that any agreement that the United States engages in is an agreement that is in the best interest of the American working people.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce my co-founder of the Congressional Labor and Working Families Caucus, a member of the House Trade Working Group, Mr. STEVE LYNCH.

During his career as an ironworker, Congressman LYNCH worked at a General Motors plant in Framingham, Massachusetts, the General Dynamics shipyard in Quincy, Massachusetts, and the United States Steel plant in Gary, Indiana, all of which were shut down due to foreign competition and unfavorable trade conditions.

Mr. LYNCH's firsthand experience in seeing the effects of plant closures on American workers and on local communities has led him to focus on efforts to improve United States trade policy and help protect not only American workers but also American businesses which also feel strongly about these trade deals and have been working very closely with the United States Business and Industry Council to make sure that we have fair trade deals. I look forward to hearing Congressman LYNCH's remarks.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you very much. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join the rest of the Members here tonight to say how proud we are of the fashion in which you have defended American workers and led this cause for all Americans.

I rise tonight to address the House on the matter of the pending trade agreements with Peru and Colombia and the general trade promotion authority.

There has been much talk over the past couple of weeks and all of us have heard it about the desire of our country to export democracy to the Middle East. I just have to say that I am a firm believer that you do not export democracy through the Defense Department, as has been suggested by this administration.

What we are talking about here in these trade agreements, this is how you export democracy. If you are going to do it at all, it is through trade agreements which give other workers in other countries a fair opportunity to have a decent standard of living, and it is really incumbent upon us through the Commerce Department and these trade agreements to make sure that at the same time we protect our own workers, we also give a fair chance at a decent living to those of our neighbors internationally.

Just like the job loss that has been described by Mr. HARE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MICHAUD, as the gentleman from Maine indicated, I worked at a General Motors plant in Framingham, Massachusetts, and I saw the impact in Massachusetts and in Framingham of those 2,300 workers getting laid off.

The same thing happened at the General Dynamics shipyard where I worked in Quincy, Massachusetts, and I saw the impact there, as well as the steel plants in the Midwest that I worked at which have also been closed down.

What really gets me is as an iron-worker hearing the talk in Washington, especially this administration, they talk about job loss like they talk about the weather, like it is something beyond their control, like it is a nat-

ural disaster that they have nothing to do with, when in reality when you look at the policies this administration has put forward, it is a deliberate cause and effect. The reason we are losing jobs is because of the policies that we have adopted.

Just like so many other so-called free trade agreements, this Colombia and Peru trade agreement contain no meaningful language or effective labor and environmental standards for workers in those countries, nor does it provide adequate protections to our own workers.

Madam Speaker, these trade agreements are based on deeply flawed models of NAFTA and CAFTA. We continually repeat the same mistakes and offer the same problematic language in our trade agreements. Instead of enforceable labor provisions, these free trade agreements merely suggest that those nations that we deal with adopt and enforce their own labor laws. They offer no assurance that existing labor problems will be resolved, and they allow labor law to be weakened or eliminated in the future with no possibility of recourse for those workers.

From our experience, we understand that attaching nonbinding side letters is not enough; especially when you consider, as my colleagues mentioned tonight, the record of deplorable labor conditions in the two countries under consideration: Peru and Colombia. They are among the worst examples of labor laws and protections and enforcements in the world.

Peru, as my colleague from Maine has pointed out, the U.S. State Department documented the failure of Peru's own labor laws to comply with U.S. internationally recognized worker rights and ILO core labor standards. Our own State Department included violations of child labor laws with an estimated one-quarter of all Peruvian children between the ages of 6 and 17 employed.

The State Department also indicated Peru's noncompliance with minimum wage guidelines with roughly half of the workforce, about 50 percent of the workforce in Peru, earning the minimum wage or below. These conditions are a far cry from free trade.

Instead, American workers are being asked to compete with underpaid, exploited and child labor workforces. One would think with such deplorable conditions in Peru, that the U.S. would insert enforceable labor standards in the agreement. However, the labor protections are weak and nonbinding.

The same goes for Colombia, a country that is infamous for having the highest trade union assassinations in the world. Mr. MICHAUD pointed out that more than 2,000 labor activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990.

□ 2015

Until the Colombian government takes action to change this volatile situation, the United States should not

offer any enhanced trade agreements with Colombia.

We also must consider the national security implications of these agreements. Both Peru and Colombia harbor terrorist organizations with heavy involvement in narcotics trafficking. While both countries have established financial intelligence units for analyzing and disseminating financial information connected with anti-terrorist financing regimes, greater cooperation from the Peruvian and Colombian government is crucial in undermining the funding mechanisms for these organizations. This crucial issue of national security cannot be overlooked when we consider these trade agreements.

Madam Speaker, while sanctions and serious remedies are granted to the commercial trade and investment provisions of these free trade agreements, the labor, environmental and international security standards are completely ineffectual.

There is no quick fix that can make trade agreements with these countries work for Colombian and Peruvian workers.

To truly strengthen the trade agreements, Congress must also strengthen its negotiating mechanism. Not only are free trade agreements flawed trade models, it is paired with a flawed blueprint for negotiation, and that is the trade promotion authority. Congress needs a new procedure for trade negotiations because we are being held responsible for the damage all over the world. Under the TPA, Congress cedes its ability to control the content of these U.S. trade pacts. Yet we are stuck time and time again with the political liability for the damage that these trade pacts cause.

This damage falls mainly to the American middle class, but also the Peruvian and Colombian agreements are replicating the same model of NAFTA and CAFTA that have been disastrous for the U.S. economy. Since NAFTA, over 1 million jobs have been lost nationwide, with over 23,000 jobs lost in my State of Massachusetts alone. This has reduced wage payments to U.S. workers by \$7.6 billion for just 2004. The administration's trade agreement model is killing the American middle class, plain and simple.

Not only has NAFTA been harmful for American workers in Mexico, it displaced 1.7 million campesinos and forced them towards overcrowded cities and to enter the U.S. illegally. Yet the administration has evidently not learned from NAFTA's mistakes. Instead, the administration insisted on zeroing out corn, rice and bean tariffs, even in the face of warnings from the Peruvian and Colombian governments. Such measures will expand the NAFTA disaster to Peru and Colombia.

In their current form, the Peru and Colombian trade agreements will only export more economic hardship rather than democracy for foreign workers.

So I urge my colleagues and I urge everyone to reject the Peru and Colombian trade agreements until the rights

of labor and the environmental issues are contained in these agreements. They should be rejected.

I believe in the potential of free trade, like my colleagues Mr. HARE and Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MICHAUD, but along with power, as the major world power, we have a responsibility to use that power in a way that softens the impact of globalization on our own American workers, as well as the workers from Peru and Colombia.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for his comments. We have talked a lot about the individual workers, but, also, this really devastates the community.

Three days after I got sworn in as a Member of Congress, the company I worked for filed bankruptcy. The Great Northern paid approximately 65 percent of the tax base in the town of East Millinocket. That had a devastating effect on what is going to happen to the school system as far as being able to get the taxes owed because of the mill going through bankruptcy. But also other small businesses in the community actually had to close down because they relied on the workers in the mill to help keep the small businesses going and running.

When you talk about getting re-trained, my colleagues I worked with at the mill, they were up in the age of 50 or 60 years old. Now they have got to go back to school. A lot of them never went to school beyond high school. Now they had to go back and try to further their education, which is very difficult, and get trained. For what?

If you look at what happened in our State, we had mill after mill, paper machine after paper machine, shut down. It has been very, very difficult to find jobs in these communities, and it is very disheartening to see grown men and women for the first time in their lives that they actually had to go and ask for help for food. They had to raise funds to fund the food bank, and it is very difficult.

I just hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have seen the failed trade policy that has come about starting with NAFTA, and I know it was a Democratic administration, but probably conceptually sounded good. But now we have got a track record of what NAFTA has brought us; and, hopefully, we have learned our lesson and will be able to move forward in the manner that we do have fair trade deals.

I will open it up for any discussion that my colleagues might have.

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, one of the things that I think we need to do here is we have to start bringing some commonsense back to all of this. I think sometimes we think in too broad of thoughts. For example, some of the questions I would ask is, why can we not make a television in this country anymore, why can we not make stereos, and why can we not have textile mills in this country? We have quality workers. They were trained. They knew what they were doing.

My colleague, Representative KAPTUR, and I have been talking about getting a group of Members of Congress to go around to areas that have been hit and to interview those workers who have lost their jobs and to put it on tape and to show that to people. I would appreciate the gentlewoman might want to comment about that.

But what we are talking about here, Madam Speaker, is letting ordinary people tell us what has happened to them. These are people who are our veterans. They fought in the wars. They have come back, and they are working in the factory. They lose everything they have ever had, and some of them with very little or no notice at all, and yet we are so quick to want to find work outside of this country when we have people going to bed in this country hungry. Those jobs in Ohio and in Maine and in Illinois, they are gone.

I think we have to start doing something proactive. We have to stop this hemorrhaging of jobs, and we have to start thinking about how we are going to keep the jobs that we have here and expanding them.

The late Senator Humphrey said that the American worker was the most productive worker in the world, and that has never changed. So I appreciate the gentleman for giving me a little bit of time. I thank you for allowing me to speak this evening, but perhaps the gentlewoman from Ohio might want to comment.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Congressman HARE and I are thinking about going to track the whole Maytag saga, starting in his home community but then going over to Iowa and the whole buyout of Maytag by Wall Street and the shedding of jobs, thousands, thousands of jobs.

Then, in my home State of Ohio, 2,000 more jobs hang in the balance at a place called Hoover Vacuum, which was part of this leveraged buyout. There was an article recently in the paper about the Maytags now being made by Samsung in South Korea, 250,000 of them being recalled in this country because they are burning up. They are actually catching on fire because water is dripping off the back onto the electrical panel. That never happened with Maytag. The Maytag repairman really was in that little room, and nobody bothered him.

I think it is important for us as Members to tell the story, whether it is Maytag, whether it is Champion, Dixon Ticonderoga, companies that Congressman MICHAUD worked for, and whether it is Maytag. We need to help America give full voice to what is happening.

It is interesting how little is on television, because some of the very same advertisers that own the airwaves do not want this story on there.

I understand Lou Dobbs is coming to Congress this week for a hearing that Congressman SHERMAN is going to have. That is one of the few reporters that even talks about this, but for the

most part you do not see this on the evening news.

So I am very anxious to travel and tell the Maytag story and then maybe tell the story of Brachs Candy and tell the story of some our steel mills and to give these workers, first, appreciation for the fine products that they have built and it is not their fault and to say that we understand, but we know we are outnumbered sometimes, but our numbers are growing.

Mr. HARE. They are.

Ms. KAPTUR. But our numbers are growing.

We said when NAFTA passed it was the first battle in a long war, and we knew there were going to be casualties, and it literally broke our heart because we knew what was going to happen on this continent.

But now we have the next wave that came in when Congressman MICHAUD arrived; and now, with 39 new Members in your class, Congressman HARE, to come here, and you cannot imagine what that means to the more senior Members.

Our only sadness is all the casualties that are out there and all the people that have had to suffer. We had hoped to protect America from that. We had hoped to protect those families, but we did not have the votes. But now I think we have the votes.

I know one thing, we have the American people. Sometimes things get a little convoluted once it comes into this city, but we know the American people are with us. Let us make them famous. They are the ones that have lived this. Let us put it on our Web sites. Let us tell their stories. If others will not, let us do that. They surely deserve that. They have lived it.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. The American people, they do get it, and that is why they sent so many freshmen Members here in this Congress on the very issue that they talked about in their campaigns, and that issue is trade.

We are heading for disaster, a perfect storm. We have the largest budgetary deficit in the United States history, with over 45 percent approximately is owned by foreigners. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, over \$202 billion with China alone. It is over I think approximately, what, 7 percent of our GDP?

We are heading on a collision course. We must make sure that we have a strong manufacturing base here in the United States, and that is why I look forward to working with my colleagues here on the floor, look forward to working with a good, diverse group of the United States Business and Industry Council, labor, environmental groups, my colleagues across the aisle, Congressman WALTER JONES, DUNCAN HUNTER, TIM RYAN on our side of the aisle and BETTY SUTTON.

So I am really excited. We see new life here in Congress as it relates to trade, and we have just got to keep talking about trade so that our colleagues will start paying attention to what is going on here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I think that if we look at those people that are trying to sell off chunks of America piece by piece, I am offended by that. I am truly offended by it.

When I heard the announcement that Hershey, one of America's logo companies, right, was going to move production to Mexico, they are already making those big kisses there, I guess. I did not know that. When you think of all the dairy jobs in Pennsylvania, you think of all of the factory jobs, you think of all of the distribution jobs. I mean, this is a massive American company. It was America. It was America. And so now we are going to let that go? And then they dumbed down the recipe so the chocolate is not as good? They put more wax in it or whatever. Come on.

Do not take the American people for fools. We understand what is going on, and we know that we are being sold out. America is being sold out from under us, and the American people do not like it at all. They expect us to stand up for them.

So it is just a joy to have you here, to be a part of this effort, and to say that the Peru and Colombian free trade agreement that is supposed to come through here on fast track, again, it is more just of NAFTA. It is more of the same. We should not approve it.

But what has surprised me the most, as much as the American people have been hurt by NAFTA, if we go back, what has shocked me, what I never expected or anticipated, was all the casualties across the continent in terms of job loss and people hurt. I never thought I would see the people of Latin America rise up in Mexico, in Brazil, in these massive demonstrations. That has literally humbled me as a citizen of the continent to think that the poorest among us, many have been risking their lives, to say the pain on them is even greater than on us. Their wages have been cut in half. They are losing their little stakeholds in Mexico, for example, and they are just being thrown off their land, and yet they are going to Mexico City and demonstrating by the millions.

I never anticipated that that would happen, and I think what is going to happen here, those folks in Wall Street and other places thought they were going to be so smart. I think you are going to see another generation come behind us. They are going to create a charter for the people of the Americas that we should have created. Some of us wanted to, but we did not have the votes here, and I think that the backlash on NAFTA and on these kinds of free trade agreements that cause so much harm, I think Wall Street has only begun to see what is going to happen.

So I put my faith in the people, I put my faith in the institutions of good governance, and I hope that, I do not know how harshly God will judge those who have done so much harm, but it did not have to happen.

□ 2030

We don't have to repeat the mistakes of the past, so I thank my dear colleagues here this evening, Congressman MICHAUD and Congressman HARE and Congressman LYNCH and Congressman ELLISON, for understanding what it is going to take to turn this continent and our values to put the values forward that were the ideals.

When I think about John Kennedy and his Alliance For Progress, and you go down in Latin America and in every home there is a picture of John Kennedy because he cared for them. He cared for them first. I thought how did we go so far? Why couldn't we get a majority here? What was wrong with us back in the 1990s, that is, that we couldn't put that together? I see a rebirth of that spirit of idealism here this evening, and I know that the continent is waiting for us.

I thank my dear colleagues for sponsoring this Special Order this evening and for helping us speak on behalf of the people who expect us to be here for them.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you, and I thank Congressman HARE once again for coming to the floor this evening to talk about it. We have a lot to talk about. We have fast track, we have the trade deals we are talking about. We will be talking more about the value-added tax as that comes forward in a couple of weeks, and also the trade balancing act, which I will be resubmitting again in this Congress to look at trade in a comprehensive manner.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is an American issue. This is an issue that is important to this country, important to our long-term stability.

2008 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Speaker, tonight, and the next 60 minutes, we are going to talk a little bit about one of the major issues that will be on the floor here in the House of Representatives as people vote later this week, and that will be the budget of the United States Government for the next fiscal year, the fiscal year that begins later this year. It's called the 2008 fiscal year budget.

There will be several budgets offered; but if history is any guide, the one that is most likely to pass is the one that is being offered by the majority party, or the majority Democrats, in this case.

That budget is a travesty. Tonight, we are going to show you why, why that is not the budget that should pass, why that is not the budget that should govern the United States taxpayers' money over the next year. This budget that we will see later this week pro-

posed by the Democrat majority has the largest tax increase in American history. Let me say that again: this budget you will see the Democrats propose this week has the largest tax increase in American history. It has no reform of any of the entitlements.

If we are going to save Medicare, we are going to save Social Security for future generations, as we will explain to you later, they are unsustainable. They have to be reformed. They have no reform whatsoever.

They do not save or preserve the Social Security surplus. You know, people pay Social Security taxes. When they do, they presume that money goes to pay for Social Security. Makes sense. That is why it's called a Social Security tax.

But, no, every year, a portion of that money is used to pay various other priorities of the Federal Government. The budget that the Democrats will propose this year for the next 5 years will not change that one little bit. Yes, this budget, Democrat budget later this week, is full of empty promises except to give you the largest tax increase in American history.

Now, let's bore into a few of these things. Let's look into a little bit of this in detail. In order to do that I have a few charts here. I don't want to have anyone have some flashback to Ross Perot, I know he had charts, so I have charts too. I have charts to show you what's happening.

This first one shows there is a misconception there, particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, in spite of all the statistics, that somehow the deficit that we are in today was caused by the tax relief that was enacted back in 2003, that somehow allowing people at home to keep more of their own money to spend on their priorities, rather than Washington's priorities, that somehow allowing people to do that caused the deficit that we have today. It's absolutely not true.

If you look at this chart, you will see that total Federal revenues declined until 2003, when the tax relief was enacted, and they have risen and are now up somewhere around 46 percent. Since then, the Federal Government has 46 percent more revenue, 46 percent more money than it did in 2003.

I would ask the average American taxpayer at home, do you have 46 percent more money, more revenue, more income than you had in 2003? If you don't, you should understand, the Democrats believe that the 46 percent increase for the Federal Government wasn't enough, and that whatever you got, it was too much. Because they want to take some of what you have and put it right here in Washington, right here in the midst of the Federal Government.

So the tax relief did not cause the deficit, actually caused an increase in revenue. Spending caused the deficit, too much spending, something the budget, the Democrats are proposing the majority party does, is more. Their