

important, that without their success we are in great danger.

But as you look at those fine young men and women and when you are there, when they move on to become second lieutenants, you just can't help but notice that that's the reason why our men and women in uniform today are led by very, very fine leaders.

Well, I see that we're nearing the end of the time for this Special Order. I'm sure there is more to be said about the fine men and women who are leading our military, and that's what we were about this evening, to talk a little bit about the conflict we're involved in, the importance of that leadership and the people who are leading and certainly to talk about General Peter Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Pete, I think it was my colleague, ROBIN HAYES, who said, we love you, and we thank you, and we wish you all the best. And I know that sometimes you thought about these words, I certainly have over the years, President Ronald Reagan said way back in 1985; he said, some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference in the world, but the Marines don't have that problem. And Pete Pace has never had that problem. He has been a great leader. He is a great leader. We're looking forward to his leadership in the closing months of his tour as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We thank him for everything that he has done, that he is doing and that he is going to do.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH BELL GRAHAM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Ruth Bell Graham, wife and confidante of the Reverend Billy Graham. Ruth Graham died last week at the age of 87, having lived a rich and selfless life of service.

She epitomized the faithful wife and mother and was a close spiritual adviser who probably did more than any other human being to make possible the global ministry of Billy Graham. I doubt whether we exaggerate when we say that Billy Graham could not have been the man he is known as today without the unwavering support of his wife.

While she may not have claimed much of the spotlight in his life, she raised a family that to this day is having a tremendous impact on the world.

Reverend Graham paid her the best tribute. He said that Ruth Graham was "the most incredible woman I have ever known." And when asked to name the finest Christian he had ever met, Billy Graham would always say, "My wife, Ruth."

In tribute to her, he said that, "She was a spiritual giant, whose unparalleled knowledge of the Bible and commitment to prayer were a challenge

and inspiration to everyone who knew her. No one else could have borne the load that she carried. She was a vital and integral part of our ministry, and my work through the years would have been impossible without her encouragement and support."

Despite her declining health in recent years, she always placed her husband and family before herself. She gladly accepted a role in the Graham family that involved offering support, prayer and encouragement. Never one to clamor for the public eye, Ruth nonetheless was a vital part of Billy Graham's ministry. She was a bulwark against the demands of the endless public involvement of Billy Graham's many responsibilities as a worldwide evangelist.

Ruth Bell Graham was born in China in 1920 to her medical missionary parents at a Presbyterian Hospital far north of Shanghai. She spent her childhood on the mission field, and sensed a calling to serve God and give her life to spread the gospel.

Ruth connected with her eventual home in North Carolina when she completed high school in Montreat, North Carolina, while her parents were home from China on furlough. She would later enroll in Wheaton College where she met her future husband, the fervent evangelist hailing from Charlotte, North Carolina.

After no small internal struggle over her desire to become a missionary, Ruth decided to invest her life in the mission of evangelism that so captivated Billy, and they were married in Montreat on August 13, 1943.

As Billy Graham's responsibilities as an evangelist continued to grow, Ruth and Billy moved to Montreat near her parents. Here, Ruth would raise a family of five children strong and stand behind the man who was preaching to millions of people across the world.

Ruth was a woman who lived the written word and treasured the Bible. She enjoyed assisting her husband as he wrote sermons and was an accomplished author herself. Over the course of her life, she would author or co-author more than a dozen books.

She also did not hesitate to start ministries of her own. Always concerned with reaching out to those in need, whether her local community or the global community, Ruth Graham created the Ruth Bell Graham International Children's Health Fund to help the world's neediest children and helped create the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center in Asheville.

Franklin, their son, founded Samaritan's Purse Ministry which is based in Boone, North Carolina.

Ruth enabled and freed her husband to concentrate on his evangelistic calling. When he needed someone to turn to, Billy Graham knew that he could turn to her for counsel, encouragement and an intellect steeped in learning the scripture.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Graham family today as they

mourn the passing of a peerless wife, sacrificial mother and faithful friend. May her memories serve to remind us of the profound meaning of a life given in service to God and family.

□ 2115

FAST TRACK TRADE

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. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to talk about trade, Fast Track, and what it's doing to this country.

As a former millworker that worked over 28 years at Great Northern Paper Company, I know firsthand that the trade deals are crippling manufacturing in the State of Maine. We have lost over 23 percent of our manufacturing base alone since NAFTA came into effect.

But it's more than just losing jobs. You're losing the identity and the community as well. We had certain labor market areas in the State of Maine that had over 33 percent unemployment rate. A lot of small businesses went under because the anchor of the community went under, it filed bankruptcy. The high school, senior class, was not sure whether they would be able to graduate from high school because the mill paid about 80 percent of the tax base. They hadn't paid their taxes, and the accreditation was in jeopardy. Alcoholism, divorce rates, people were filing bankruptcy because of trade.

You can go anywhere pretty much in the Second Congressional District in the State of Maine, and you'll see a lot of empty factories that are no longer there. You'll see factories but you will not see the number of vehicles in the mill yard because of machines being shut down.

It's because of our failed trade policy. We have to change the trade policy. We have to make sure that when Fast Track is up at the end of this month, that we not renew Fast Track. I think it's incumbent on each Member of Congress to look at these trade deals and have the ability to amend the trade deals. I don't think we should be a rubber stamp to the United States trade representatives, and that's what we are, rubber stamps: Either vote "yes" or "no," and that's wrong.

I have two colleagues here this evening who have really taken on this trade issue. They know firsthand from their own district what trade means to their constituencies. They know what it's done to the United States of America, as a whole. We have lost over 3 million jobs. We have to do better. We must do better.

I think the last election, when a lot of candidates were talking about trade, they are ready, the American people

are ready for a new direction. It's my hope that this Congress will give a new direction, will change that flawed trade policy, the flawed trade model.

I would like to recognize Congresswoman LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ from the west coast of California, who has started the House Trade Working Group that also Congresswoman BETTY SUTTON has been very active on, and it's an issue that is very important to all of us here in our constituency.

I recognize the Congresswoman from California.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Thank you, Congressman MICHAUD, and I also thank BETTY SUTTON for being here this evening to talk about the President's Trade Promotion Authority and its effect on working families. Mr. MICHAUD and I cochair the House working group, and we have been working very hard this year to emphasize the impact that our current failed policy has on average households.

We are here because we believe that our trade policies should ensure a fair shake for American working families, not just for those who sit in corporate board rooms. We have already spoken many times in this House about the flaws in the new trade deal recently announced by the administration. This new deal, which applies to the Bush negotiated Free Trade Agreements with Peru and Panama, is an improvement over past FTAs, but it still doesn't give American families much to be excited about, quite honestly.

Despite additional labor and environmental provisions, these agreements are based on the NAFTA trade model, the same failed NAFTA model that has hurt the American family for the past decade, the same NAFTA trade model that didn't bring about the jobs or the prosperity that we were promised, the same NAFTA model that didn't stop the immigration flow from Mexico, the same NAFTA model that hasn't been able to assure that our trading partners uphold the strong labor and environmental standards that we do here in the United States, thus putting our workers at a competitive disadvantage.

If the long-sought-after labor and environmental protections the administration promises to include in the Peru and Panama FTAs are no stronger than those that we were promised in NAFTA or its cousin CAFTA, they are little more than hollow promises. Yet the Free-Trade-At-All-Costs lobby asks the American people to have faith that the administration has really turned over a new leaf. They are asking us to trust that enforceable labor and environmental standards will be included in the text of the Peru and Panama agreements. But even if these agreements are the best written, fairest trade agreements possible, so long as they rely on this administration to enforce the labor and environmental standards they contain, they are not worth the paper that they are written on.

This administration has failed to protect workers here in the U.S. The BP

Texas City explosion, the Sago mine disaster and the 9/11 first responders and cleanup workers who have developed serious breathing ailments, these are just the most notorious examples of this administration's lack of dedication to provide even the most basic protection to workers: the right to work in a safe environment. Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says these new worker and environmental protections can't be enforced.

Now, if that isn't telling, I don't know what it is. They flatly came out and said they are not enforceable. This President has lost our trust, and with it any argument that he has to renew his trade promotion authority. The administration's track record does not demonstrate a commitment to the working families of America.

Free trade was supposed to create economic opportunity for everyone, for big businesses, as well as small businesses, working families at home and abroad, but that, quite frankly, hasn't been the case. The truth of the matter is that the NAFTA free trade model favors the wealthiest at the expense of small businesses, workers, families, and ultimately communities, like the communities Mr. MICHAUD was talking about that are dependent upon mill-work for their life blood.

More than a decade after NAFTA and NAFTA-styled replicas, it's clear that the promise of economic prosperity has yet to arrive. Our trade deficit has ballooned into the tens of millions of dollars. Real wages for American families are down, and our manufacturing base is falling apart.

We need an administration committed to protecting the rights of workers, and until we get one we cannot grant this administration an extension of Fast Track authority. The American people deserve better. They deserve a commitment to trade that expands their opportunities rather than diminishes them.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help our working families get back on track to economic prosperity.

I urge them to oppose the Fast Track renewal, and I want to thank, again, my two colleagues for their leadership on this issue, because they have been trying to carry this message to those who have been unwilling to hear it.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments, and I hope that the American people are listening, because this is extremely important. We are heading into what I call a perfect storm. We have the largest budgetary deficit in our history, with over 45 percent owned by foreigners. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, almost 7 percent of the GDP.

We cannot sustain those types of deficits and maintain our Superpower status here in this country.

With that, I recognize the gentlewoman from Ohio, who is a freshman Member, who is very, very knowledge-

able on trade issues, a labor attorney, and has done a phenomenal job working with the freshman class, bringing the freshman class the materials that they need to talk about trade for those who needed the materials.

I really appreciate your willingness to step out there your freshman year to really talk about trade. You understand the problems that trade has caused your State in Ohio, and we look forward to hearing your remarks this evening, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you so much, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Both of you, your leadership is a shining example for all of us. As you point out, this is a moment of supreme importance when it comes to the trade policy of this country.

Last November, the American people cast their votes for new leaders with the hope that we would replace our broken trade system with one that will truly allow for fair competition, because we know that if given a fair playing field, we will excel in the global marketplace.

The first step, as both of you so rightfully point out, has to be that Congress must stop ceding its constitutional authority and responsibility over trade to the President. The lack of oversight and accountability, giving the President what's been called Fast Track authority, the damage that Fast Track authority has wrought on the United States trade policy has led to devastating consequences, some of which you have already heard about throughout this country. It certainly has had a devastating impact on the area that I represent. We have lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs in Ohio since 2000.

That means that people's futures have been seriously put at risk. There are kids out there today who won't be able to go to college because of the jobs that their parents lost due to Fast Track, and the bad trade deals that resulted under Fast Track. There are people out there who won't have health care for their families because of the bad policy that has resulted under Fast Track.

For them and for every American who has been hurt by the Bush administration's harmful trade policies, we must, we must let Fast Track expire permanently at the end of this month. Now, we all know that the United States' Constitution gives responsibility for trade to the Congress, and there was a reason for that.

Our forefathers knew that they needed to keep that issue and control over that issue at a level that is closely connected to the people who are being represented. That's why Congress had that authority.

Unfortunately, with Fast Track, the problem is the administration negotiates the deals, signs them, determines all the terms, and then weighs it before Congress, and you have to vote "yes" or "no." You have no input on what the constraints are. You have no

say or ability to fix what is wrong with the deals as they come through. That is just not a path we should continue down.

As has been mentioned, Fast Track has enabled the passage of trade deals like NAFTA and CAFTA, and of course the WTO, the World Trade Organization, all of that has accelerated as our leader here has pointed out, it's all accelerated a trade in jobs crisis. It's marked by an \$800 billion trade deficit, and more and more people are feeling this across the country.

In fact, I actually have a letter here that was sent to our leaders in both the House and the Senate from organizations, organizations like American Medical Students Association, The Change to Win Coalition, Communication Workers of America, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, hundreds, hundreds of organizations, national, State organizations; a wide variety of people, church organizations, all who oppose us extending Fast Track authority to the administration, because they know that the resulting trade deals are devastating to our communities, our businesses, our workers, our farmers and our country.

So it is with honor that I stand beside my two esteemed colleagues here tonight to talk a little bit about this with them and with all of you at home who care, I know, deeply about us changing the direction on our trade policy.

The good news is there are things that we could be doing, and that we should be doing to stop leaving our companies and our workers at a disadvantage.

□ 2130

And so I'm looking forward to exploring that with you both tonight.

And at this point, Mr. MICHAUD, I yield back.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. You're absolutely right when you talk about Fast Track, and we'll get into that a little bit more, because I know Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ has to go to another meeting, and I know she's been to Colombia a couple of times, so I'll be interested in hearing what she has to say about her trips to Colombia.

But before she does, before I yield time, I'd actually like to give a quote. And it's not very often I quote Pat Buchanan. But I saw this quote and I thought it was worth quoting. It says, "The trade deficit is a malignant tumor in the intestines of the U.S. economy." That's absolutely right. We have to start dealing with our trade deficit. And one way, one of the issues we have got to deal with is, as you mentioned Congresswoman SUTTON, is not to renew Fast Track, which is extremely important. Let Congress do our job that we're elected to do, representing our constituents.

I did have a chance to actually meet the President of Colombia a couple of weeks ago. I had an interesting con-

versation and asked several questions about the brutality and the murders that are happening in Colombia with trade unionists, and I'm looking forward to his response to some of the questions that I have.

But right now, I'd like to yield to the Congresswoman from California, who actually had a couple of trips over to Colombia. If you'd kindly let us know what happened and what we can do.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Sure. About 2 weeks ago I returned from Colombia, and it was my second visit in just 7 months. Colombia is one of the countries that President Bush negotiated a free trade agreement with without really seeking the advice of those Members of Congress who have been vocal opponents to the NAFTA trade model which he based this agreement on.

And I have to say at the outset, Colombia is a beautiful country. It's people are a warm people. We were well received there. And so I want to be very clear that I am for expanding trade with countries around the world, but in a way that is fair and balanced to both our workers here in the United States and also the workers in the countries that we seek to engage in trade with.

Just for the record, Colombia has a horrible record on human rights and labor rights violations. In Colombia, more trade labor unionists were killed there last year than in all the countries of the world combined. So it has an abysmal record with respect to violence towards people who try to organize workers to help lift them out of poverty. And nobody really wants to talk about that dirty little secret of Colombia's, because they want to talk about how much better things are in the first 6 months of this year.

The statistics do show that there is an improvement. I will grant them that, and I applaud that. But it still means that about 99 percent of the murders that happened last year have gone unsolved, and nobody has been brought to justice for that.

And the reason why trade labor unionists are targeted is because they speak out on behalf of people who are living in poverty, who are earning wages that don't allow them to support themselves or a family. They're working in dangerous working conditions.

And I have to say, on the trip that I just most recently returned from, we really weren't given a lot of time to go and actually talk to the workers themselves about their experience. We were basically told by the government that things are getting better and things were improving.

Interestingly enough, the first trip that I took to Colombia last November, I met with labor organizations, civil rights groups and advocates, and I met with the workers themselves who told me, "don't be fooled by the rosy picture that our government has painted. It's very dangerous here in Colombia to speak up if you are working in dangerous working conditions. It's very

dangerous in Colombia to speak up if you'd like to see your wages rise so that you can support yourself."

And, in fact, there is a very big informal labor sector in Colombia which isn't even subject to basic standards like a minimum wage. There's no minimum wage for these folks. There are no contributions made on behalf of them for the hours that they work into any kind of Social Security or pension system. And there are no workplace safety standards. A lot of these workers work in some of the biggest industries that they're pushing the free trade agreement because they say that they need to expand these industries, one of which being the textile industry, which is notorious for their workers that are part of the informal sector that don't have contracts, that don't have any basic rights.

And basically, in Colombia, when I bring up the point that there's this promise made to lift all these people out of poverty, but when they have to compete against U.S. goods, some of which will be subsidized, like many of our agricultural products, who is going to suffer the most? Who's going to bear the cost? Because they tell me, oh, yes, there are some transitional costs associated with moving towards this new free trade agreement, but they're transitional costs; they won't be forever, and not everybody's going to be affected.

But let me tell you who will be affected by those transitional costs: rural, poor, indigenous people and largely women who are heads of households. They are the ones that will suffer the most, not to mention American workers who will have to compete in industry with Colombia, where they have no minimum wage, no minimum work day, so they can work workers 16 hours a day if they want, and no safe working conditions.

And there's just, quite frankly, no way that American workers, who demand a certain level of respect and dignity at the workplace, are going to be able to compete in industries where those are the conditions that Colombian workers are working in.

Knowing all of this, did President Bush negotiate with Colombia a free trade agreement that would try to address those very basic labor standards? No. He based the Colombian free trade on the NAFTA model. They didn't even put in basic rights that are respected around the world as international standards for human and labor rights. He just said, hey, the marketplace is going to take care of it. We're going to move forward. This is the trade agreement, and Congress, because of Fast Track authority, you can't change it; you can't make it better; you can't amend it. It's either yes or no; you vote in favor of this. And if that's the choice that I'm given, my vote is no because it doesn't even try to address the problem with the labor standards and the violence in Colombia.

I say, hey, I'm willing to give Colombia the benefit of the doubt. If you can

show to me over a certain length of time, minimum of 2 years, that, yeah, you've gone after these people that have targeted labor unionists, and yeah, you've moved people out of the informal sector into the formal sector where people have basic standards, I'm willing to give Colombia an opportunity. But I'm not willing to enter into a trade agreement with them based on empty promises of how much better things are going to be.

All we heard when we were there, 90 percent of what we heard was how much better Colombia was at human rights and how much better they were at trying to find those responsible for killing trade labor unionists. But while we were there, one of the biggest scandals that has hit Colombia in recent months is the scandal of paramilitary groups that are linked to elected members of their congress, elected governors, some of whom were hand picked, and cabinet members, some of whom were handpicked by President Uribe himself. And these paramilitary groups have been responsible for killing people, for massacres of villages of people. And currently, 14 elected officials sit in jail because they've been tied to these paramilitary groups. And there are as many as two dozen more that are under investigation.

But we're supposed to trust President Uribe that they're going to bring these people to justice and that labor rights and human rights are going to be better in Colombia. I say, show me, and then we'll sit down and negotiate. But I thought it might be interesting to just inform you guys a little bit about what the flavor of that trip was.

And like I said, I think the Colombian people are wonderful people. I think we need to open up new markets. But we need to do it in a way that's fair and balanced for our workers here, so we don't continue to hemorrhage manufacturing jobs, and for the workers in these countries, which corporations will exploit.

And with that, I will yield back to Mr. MICHAUD.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ. You're absolutely right, and that's one of the problems with Fast Track and why this Congress should not renew Fast Track. Even if we did have a say in these trade deals, as you mentioned, particularly with Colombia, I'm not sure that even if we had the ILO standards in the agreement that that would help as far as the murders and the assassinations that are going on in Colombia. I've met with several elected officials on different occasions from Colombia, and they're scared for their lives. There's one senator that actually sleeps no more than two nights in a row in the same bed because he's been threatened with his life.

And we've been told, or I've been told in those meetings that they want to set an example, the paramilitary, and they force some of the other labor folks to go out there with actually, they told

me that they actually beheaded a trade unionist. And that's wrong. So no matter what we do on trade deals, like you, Congresswoman, I want to see results before I agree with any trade deal with Colombia at all. We have to get back to changing that model.

I'm very pleased actually to see another colleague from the great State of Ohio who has taken a great leadership role since he's been here on trade but also has introduced major legislation that will help deal with one of the components when you look at the flawed trade model. And he's also a member of the 30-plus caucus now, I guess, something caucus, congressman TIM RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. And I appreciate, I caught bits and pieces of the debate here, and I think you all have illustrated points that need to be made, and we need to keep making them here if we're going to have any headway.

And I remember sitting in the meeting with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) where the politicians were talking about this trade unionist who was trying to organize a plant, and the next day or two days later, he's beheaded. Now, we think labor politics are tough in the United States, which they are, but I don't think they come anywhere close to that level.

And it is a pleasure for me to be here with my partner in Summit County, Ohio, Akron, Ms. SUTTON.

I just want to make a broad point and then talk a little bit about a bill that I have introduced with DUNCAN HUNTER on currency. And the first point I want to make, and I think everything that you were talking about is saying, we need to represent our values here in the United States of America, not just here when we hear about family values, and we need to have values and we all agree with that. But put it in our actions. And I think that's what we want to do, and the trade agreements that we sign consistently, I think, go against it. And when you look at what the results are, and Sojourners had a great magazine; I may have sent it to some of you.

Two percent of the world owns more wealth than the other 98 percent. Now, that's unbelievable. Two percent of the world own more wealth than the other 98 percent combined. That signals to us that the models that you were talking about, Mr. Speaker, are not sufficient for shared growth for all people.

And we're not saying that if you go out and you start a company and you take a risk and you take out a loan, that you shouldn't be able to make money. God bless you. Make all you want. But recognize that you're a part of a bigger system here that we're all a part of that, investments in education, the minimum wage which we finally were able to get passed, college tuition; all of these things matter, health care in the grand scheme of things. And what we want to do is start exporting some of these values that we hold dear.

And when you say, well, you can make something in China and there are

no labor laws, no environmental laws, no this, well, what's the alternative? We go back to those days? And I've been to China. You may have, too. Dumping waste in the rivers, like we had a problem up in Cleveland a few decades ago where the Cuyahoga River caught on fire. Now we don't want to go back to those days, where thousands and thousands of kids got asthma because we didn't have clean air regulations. We don't want to go back to those days.

So we are now in a unique period in history, because in the United States, we're the consumer. We're the ones buying right now. Now, that may not be the case 10 years from now, but we are now, and so let's leverage our power as consumers to make some of these changes.

And I hope that what we're doing here tonight, and Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. SUTTON, what we're doing here tonight is going to help push those things along.

The China currency bill that we have introduced here basically tries to get China to comply with international law. And international law says you're not allowed to subsidize your goods.

Well, China is subsidizing their currency, which is kind of a little more complicated than a government saying, okay, you make this widget, we're going to fund you; we're going to subsidize you so you can sell it cheaper in another country.

What China's doing with their currency is basically subsidizing it so that every product that they send the United States is between 25 and 40 percent cheaper.

I have a company in my district called Wheatland Tube. And it's also in Mr. ALTMIRE's district in Western Pennsylvania. They make tubing. The final product that arrives on the shores of the United States from China is the same price as Wheatland Tube's raw materials before they even start the process. That's the kind of advantage China's getting with their currency.

And I know you all are supportive of this bill, and I think it's something that we can, not talking just about trade, but this is something that I think free traders and fair traders and Democrats and Republicans and people from all over the country are agreeing on. And I know Mr. LEVIN and Mr. RANGEL want to move on a bill that does something with China, and I hope that this is a component of that, and I'm confident it will be.

□ 2145

But those are the kind of things that we need to stand up and talk about. And if we don't, no one will, because there is a certain amount of people that will benefit from the current system, and they are the ones who want to keep it just the way it is. But it is important for us to come here, 700,000 constituents, 700,000 constituents, 700,000 constituents, it adds up if we unify and organize and do what I think

made all the great social movements in the country great, was organization, traditionally the Democratic Party, the unions, the churches.

And I will make one final point that I know I have made to you guys already. It is so important for us to bring in the church communities. I am Catholic, and I think the Catholic Church has an obligation. They speak out on so many issues that I think have less relevance than this issue on average people's day-to-day lives. And I hope that they step up and talk about this issue with the same passion that we hear them speak out on a lot, and the evangelicals we just need to pull.

Sojourners Magazine with Jim Wallace did a terrific job a couple of issues ago. But if this does not become a moral, value-centered movement, we are going to continue to struggle. We have the environmentalists and we have the trade unionists, and we have some of us in the Democratic Party. But if we don't pull in the church community, I think we are going to continue to fail.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Mr. RYAN. And you are absolutely right. This is more than jobs and the economy. It is a moral issue. And as I mentioned earlier about some of the problems that I have even seen in my district, my hometown, when the mills shut down because of unfair trade deals, it is a moral issue. And I hope that the churches do get involved in this issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know that our friend from Minnesota is here, but I just want to tell one story because I heard it a few weeks ago from my cousin in who worked for Delphi Packard.

The plant used to be 15,000 and now they are down to maybe 1,000 because of the global economy, trade deals, China, the whole nine yards. He worked there for probably 10 years, and many people worked there for 30 and made a great living. He is now taking the machines off the ground, taking the bolts out of the ground, helping move these machines, and they are shipping them to China. Now, let's talk about some dignity. This guy is taking out the machines and shipping the machines and his job off to China.

That is where we are at. And we have got some work to do. We are not saying build fences and don't compete. But investments in education, what we talked about early on with stem cells and alternative energy, let's create the new wave of jobs that need to be created for our people to work. It is not just trade and exporting. It is making investments in the U.S. and creating new jobs.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much. That is a very good point that you mentioned because the very mill

that I worked at, we had six paper machines. Four are no longer there. They were unbolted and shipped overseas. So that is absolutely right. People might not think they are going to unpack the machinery and move them overseas. It has happened. I have seen it happen, and it will continue to happen unless we change the flawed trade model that we have been operating. And part of that component that is absolutely right is the currency manipulation with China that we have to address.

And as Mr. RYAN had mentioned, we have Mr. ELLISON here, who is also another freshman Member of the freshman class who is very interested in the trade issue. So I yield to Mr. ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman MICHAUD, Congresswoman SUTTON, Congressman RYAN, and also Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ, who left us, because you all have been carrying the banner of trade all night, fair trade.

And I think that before I jump into my remarks that I pulled together for tonight, I just want to say this: We are talking about trade, Mr. Speaker, within the context of two decades of flat wages for working people. When you look at real wages, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about flat real wages for working people. We are talking about a system of health care where we leave 47 million people out of it and so many other people carrying an increasing burden on their jobs just to be able to afford the health care that their job does provide. It is within this context that I want to talk about trade tonight within flat wages, within increasing health care costs, within the context of increasing and mounting consumer debt.

The average American, when you take their mortgage out of the equation, has about \$13,000 worth of consumer debt to carry around. And that is talking about your credit cards and everything else. So we have got consumer debt, increasing health care costs, and flat wages. And now we are going to talk about trade, trade that has sapped our jobs.

If you look at NAFTA, NAFTA alone I want to talk about tonight. NAFTA was sold as a way to make sure that workers both in Mexico and in America would benefit. But has that really happened? Has that really happened?

What has really happened is the opposite. We have seen 3 million jobs lost, 30,000 in Minnesota alone. NAFTA, by permitting its heavily subsidized U.S. corn and other agricultural business products to compete with the small Mexican farmers, has driven the Mexican farmer off the land due to low price imports of U.S. corn and other agricultural products. Some 2 million Mexicans have been forced out of agriculture, and many of those that remain are living in desperate poverty. These people are among those who cross the border to feed their families.

NAFTA service sector rules allow big firms like Wal-Mart to enter the Mexi-

can market and begin selling low price goods made by ultra-cheap labor in China to displace locally based shoe, toy, and candy firms. These estimated 28,000 small- and medium-sized Mexican businesses have been eliminated. Wages along the Mexican border have actually been driven down by about 25 percent since NAFTA. The Mexican border has actually been driven down since NAFTA, reported a Carnegie Endowment study. An oversupply of workers, combined with a crushing of union-organized drives as government policy, has resulted in sweatshop pay, running sweatshops along the border, where wages typically run 60 cents to \$1 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned what is going on with Mexico because I think it is so important from the standpoint of the American worker, the American worker who is trying to put food on the table, hold jobs here in our country, it is critically important. We are talking about, as I said, flat wages, rising health care costs, increasing consumer debt. And it is so important to understand that this immigration debate we are having is heavily informed by what? Trade. Our trade policy is increasing the pain not only on American workers but on workers abroad. As we fight back and forth, to and fro, about what we should we do, more border security, higher walls, fences. We have all these raging debates around here around these issues. What we have literally done through this NAFTA trade policy and other trade policies like it is wiped out an economy in another country and not just pulled people here through higher wages but pushed them here by elimination of their economies in Mexico.

So, Mr. Speaker, I bring these points to the floor tonight so that we can have more informed debate so that when people say, hey, look, why are these folks making such a big deal about fair trade policy, it is important to know that the middle class is being pinched and squeezed. And so often even here in Congress, we are being told that the problem is some immigrant, when in reality the problem, I believe, is heavily subsidized agri-businesses and our trade policy, which allows us to dump cheap, low-cost corn into countries like Mexico, which wipes out their farm economy and drives workers there over here so that they can make a living.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that we understand these issues and we get these issues on the table as we debate them because it is hypocritical, in my opinion, to talk about spending \$700 million, or however much we are going to spend on a fence, and not adjust our trade policies. We can't build a fence high enough if we keep on destroying the farm economy in Mexico and dumping cheap commodity prices there. We have to fix our trade policy. We have to fix a trade policy that benefits American workers and workers around the world too, Mr. Speaker.

So I didn't come here to say a whole lot more than that, Mr. Speaker. I want to get this issue of trade policy in the debate as we talk about immigration policy, and I want to talk about trade policy within the context of the squeeze the middle-class people are feeling every day.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ELLISON brought up a very good point. There has been a lot of discussion over the past month about immigration, particularly in the Senate. We will be having our discussions here in the House. And that is part of the component when you look at trade. It is not a simple issue. And Mr. ELLISON hit the nail right on head. If you look at immigration, what is happening, they are coming across the border because they want a job. They want a good job so they can provide for their family like any one of us would be doing for our family, provide for our family.

I was reading an article, actually, "Since NAFTA, Winners and Losers." I will just read a part of this article. It says: "As a bonus," talking about NAFTA, "the predicted increase in jobs and prosperity in Mexico under NAFTA was expected to reduce illegal immigration. In 1994, when NAFTA was put into effect, then-Attorney General Janet Reno predicted that illegal immigration would fall by two-thirds within 6 years."

And I want to quote the former Attorney General Janet Reno: "NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible."

I want to repeat that again. This is the former Attorney General Janet Reno: "NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible."

And that is absolutely right. We have seen what is happening since NAFTA. The same flawed model is in existence. It is going to take a real active role of the freshmen class and Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle who really want to make a difference. A new direction, that is what we need, a new direction.

We need a new trade model. Part of that trade model will go to what Congressman RYAN had mentioned when you look at the China currency manipulation, when you look at the value-added taxes, legislation that has just been introduced, bipartisan legislation dealing with a value-added tax that we have to look at that accounts for a big portion of our trade deficit. In the United States, 94 percent of all U.S. exports and imports with trade deal with countries that have a value-added tax. That is hurting this country.

And for those of you who do not know what the value-added tax is, actually, for the countries who export their products to the United States, they actually have been rebating those companies the value-added tax to a tune of \$217 billion in 2006. Plus if the

United States wants to export their product over there, they are actually taxed to a tune of \$110 billion. This has to change. This has to change.

And when you talk about Fast Track, actually during the several discussions about reauthorizing Fast Track in 1974, 1988, and 2002, Congress actually encouraged the USTR to change the value-added tax so we can be put on a level playing field. We have got to change the rules. This is one of the components that we can deal with in changing that rule.

I yield to Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MICHAUD, again, your leadership is inspiring.

And, Mr. ELLISON, thank you for being down here. You have been a tremendous leader on these issues, and your points about immigration and the complexity and the links between these subjects is well taken and important to recognize because, as you point out, Mr. MICHAUD, with the numbers about the value-added tax, the VAT tax, there is nothing free about that. When they call it "free trade," you kind of think you are going to get something good back in return, and it just hasn't been working.

And the reality is when you read the quote by the former Attorney General, at that point the issue was theoretical. It was hypothetical. We didn't know for a fact actually what would happen. We thought. We had our ideas. We had our suspicions. But it is no longer theoretical. We know how this trade model has failed, and it doesn't make sense for us to continue down that same path.

□ 2200

You know, we had some talk here this evening about some of the trade deals that are still pending under the Fast Track authority that the administration still maintains. And a couple of those were mentioned in passing, including the pending deals with Peru and Panama, and of course Colombia and Korea. And recently, the administration and some congressional leaders actually announced that the labor and environmental standards were going to be included in the Peru and Panama agreements. However, right after that announcement, reports indicated that those standards may be put into side letters, where we've seen them go and not be enforced. And we also heard those who represent the multinational interests who are benefitting under our current broken trade policy boast that the standards will not be enforceable. Those are concerning developments.

And I guess it is also important to note that, even if the standards are ultimately in the core of the FTAs, experience tells us that they will not be enforced. In 2000, Congress passed the Free Trade Agreement with Jordan, and it had those labor and environmental standards in it. As a result, it received broad support. Actually, some

of those who believe in fair trade and are committed to it voted for it because of those standards. But you know, alas, despite documented violation upon documented violation, those standards have not been enforced.

So getting back to sort of the points that you have all been making, rather than continuing to pass more free trade agreements that won't be enforced and will result in the consequences we've seen under the broken trade system, which means more lost jobs, a bigger trade deficit, more of the negative consequences, not just in this country, but it's out of whack all over; rather than doing that, it makes sense for us to focus on things like that of Mr. RYAN's bill that will help to fix our broken system.

You know, Congress should focus on replacing policies that reward businesses for outsourcing jobs with incentives and should focus on sensible tax policies and would help businesses and workers make it in America.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SUTTON. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Under the current model that we have, who is the entity responsible for enforcing trade provisions such as labor or environmental standards? Whose job is it to police those standards?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, the greatest level of enforcement actually begins and rests most directly with the administration.

Mr. ELLISON. So has the administration been an advocate, protector of the rights of workers in America, much less right around the world?

Ms. SUTTON. The gentleman asks a good question. No. No. The answer is no. And I think that that's an important point. And our colleague, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, made a very important point, too, about how this administration feels about human rights and workers' rights because she talked about the fact that they negotiated, this administration, an agreement with Colombia, where the murder of labor organizers and human rights violations are routine. And I think the fact that they are willing to enter into that agreement without being extremely diligent on correcting that tells us all we need to know about what this administration thinks about the need to enforce and deal with labor rights, labor standards and human rights. So I think that is very concerning.

If we deal with things, though, like currency manipulation and we deal with things like making sure that products that are produced elsewhere are safe for consumption here, because again, there are costs associated with safety. We have seen a lot of bad repercussions in recent days about products coming from outside of this country here. In fact, today, just today in USA Today was an article that dealt with lead in children's jewelry and how it

was hurting our kids, and China refusing to agree to changing that practice.

I yield back to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MICHAUD. Actually, I would like to follow up, Mr. ELLISON, if I might, because I have in front of me, actually, testimony of the Assistant U.S. Trade Representative, Ms. Moore, who attended our hearing in the Small Business Committee on June 13. And I will paraphrase. It says, "Our work aims to increase exports by expanding market access for American goods, creating a level playing field." She also mentions, and it gets right to your point, "In addition, we enforce agreements and resolve trade problems using a wide variety of tools." That is clearly not what's happening.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. ELLISON. A wide variety of tools. I would be curious to know what some of those tools might be. Are we talking about tickling somebody with a feather, or what kind of tools are we talking about? Are we dragging somebody into a tribunal and getting sanctions on them, or are we just talking about something else?

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, if you are tickling them with a feather, it's probably a feather made in China.

And I can tell you, the Trade Working Group has worked very closely with a variety of different groups, environmental groups, religious organizations, labor, business organizations, the United States Business and Industry Council, associations, small manufacturing businesses here in this country. And the United States Business and Industry Council has told me directly that the United States Trade Representative has turned away businesses when they've brought complaints to the USTR primarily because the dollar amount wasn't enough. And I can tell you personally that, as you know, I worked at the Great Northern Paper Company for a number of years, and when the company I worked for, when I was talking to the public relations before they filed bankruptcy, they actually went to the Department of Commerce and talked about trade and what it's doing, and the response that they got: Yup, you've got a great argument, but go spend over a million dollars and come back to us later on. Well, we couldn't hold on. They filed bankruptcy. They closed the doors at the time, and it is devastating. So they are not enforcing those agreements, and we continue to see a huge disparity in our trade policy.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, if we already start out with what is a trade policy that is lax, a trade policy with a model that is not inclined toward saving American jobs, and then they won't even enforce the rules that they do have, what will happen if we vote for a

trade policy for Peru and Panama that supposedly has these provisions in it, but they don't enforce them?

The fact is, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine and the gentlelady from Ohio what they think about a trade model which would give labor organizations, for example, the right to charge an infraction of a labor standard and to bring a country into court for violating a labor standard? What if the sole power for enforcing the labor agreement was not in the hands of a trade representative that was favorably inclined to multinational trade but not so much for American workers, but actually in the hands of a labor organization; how might that play out?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, the gentleman asks a good question. He makes, actually, a great point, because the reality here is that we clearly don't have an enforceable system. First of all, the rules aren't good to start with. They're inadequate, and we have talked a lot about how they're inadequate. But the reality is, this Congress could do a myriad of things, actually, to shape the rules. And they shouldn't be left up to just sort of an, oh, maybe if it's a certain dollar amount, maybe if it affects something I care about. No, it really should be guided by the infraction itself, the infraction of the law, the infraction of the rule.

So, one way would be possibly to go down the path that you're talking about. And there are other avenues that we might pursue also. But the point is, we really need to fix it because you heard our esteemed colleague from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) talking about how we are investing in new technologies. And we all agree with that, we are all supporters of innovation. But when you have a company that is subsidizing and giving a 40 percent advantage from the start, all of the new technology, all of the education and workforce training in the world, all the increased productivity will never allow us to overcome that 40 percent head start.

So, again, the points are well taken. Rather than focusing on trade deals that are going to just take us down the same path to lost jobs, why don't we fix those things and then create a system in which trade can flourish? Because I believe in trade.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SUTTON. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLISON. Should our trade model be driven by promotion of American economic activity, including jobs? Or should it be driven by profit margins of huge multinational companies that really have no allegiance other than the profit margin each quarter?

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, I think a trade model definitely should look at jobs and putting us on a fair level playing field.

If you look at this Congress, particularly with the freshman class that we currently have who has been out there,

very aggressively, talking about a new direction, we do need a new direction; we have to pause with all these trade deals that are currently going on. Even the former President, Bill Clinton, said we ought to pause on these trade deals to see what's happening.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. I would yield.

Mr. ELLISON. He ought to know.

Mr. MICHAUD. That's true. He's the one that brought us NAFTA. But these issues aren't Democratic issues or Republican issues. These are issues that are important to the United States, important to our long-term future, and we have to look at changing that model. And it can be done in a bipartisan manner. Congressman TIM RYAN, who was on the floor, is sponsoring legislation with a Republican Member of this body, DUNCAN HUNTER, on the currency manipulation. I am glad to see that a Presidential candidate is out there talking about trade, along with DENNIS KUCINICH, who is also talking about trade. We have the value-added tax, which is another piece of legislation which has strong bipartisan support, once again, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, Congressman WALTER JONES, myself and Congressman BILL PASCRELL.

So these issues are not Democratic issues or Republican issues. These issues are American issues. And we definitely have to be more aggressive. We have to change that trade model. And we have to sit down and pause, and sit down in a bipartisan manner, no backroom deals. We've seen what these backroom deals have done in the past, and they don't work. We have to work open so the public can see what is going on and the real effect that we currently are seeing with trade deals.

Ms. SUTTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHAUD. Yes.

Ms. SUTTON. You know, and to my colleague, Mr. ELLISON, your question, I think it bears sort of repeating. It is inexplicable, but the United States seems to be the only nation that does not find it acceptable to help our companies, to protect them, workers and communities, against unfair trade practices. And as a result, we are left at a disadvantage. All we are really asking for is that they have a fair shake. That's all we are asking for.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlelady yield? I agree. American workers are some of the best in the world, innovative, hard-working, no doubt about it, and given a fair chance, can compete with any workers or anyone around the world, but we just need a fair opportunity. So I think we need a new model, a new way of doing business that will protect American workers and also protect American small businesses, and other businesses that actually are in the business of helping America prosper and do well.

And before we wrap up, because I think we are probably getting close, I

just want to say briefly that I hope that people who feel so passionately about immigration will incorporate into their arguments the impact of trade policy on immigration.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. And I would like to close by once again quoting former Attorney General Janet Reno, and I quote, "NAFTA is our best hope for reducing illegal immigration in the long haul. If it fails, effective immigration control will become impossible."

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege to address you on the floor of the House on the House of Representatives. It is always a privilege.

And this time in our history reflects I think one of the most pivotal times that we've had. We are at war for one thing, and it is a pivotal moment within that war. And we are watching terrorists from overseas that have attacked the United States. And as we are watching our national security on that hand and as we are debating how we proceed to victory over al Qaeda and those terrorists on that end, at the same time our southern border is being flooded with just masses of illegal immigrants on a nightly basis. And to give, Mr. Speaker, some perspective on the scope of that problem, we have this testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, and I sat intensively through hearings and engaged in questions and actually testified myself for the better part of 5 years at this point, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, the testimony that we get from the Border Patrol, as far as the Border Patrol representatives for the profession and the Government, identifies that 2 years ago on the southern border, our Border Patrol and other immigration officers interdicted 1,155,000, I believe, illegal immigrants attempting to come across our border. Last year, it was 1,188,000. The number increases.

Now, one might argue that the effectiveness of our Border Patrol is reflected in the increase in the number of interdictions from about 1,155,000 to 1,188,000. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit also that that could very well be a reflection of increased numbers coming across our border. It is not possible to identify whether the Border Patrol is more effective or whether they simply have a larger mass of people.

But in any case, when questioned before Committee in testimony before Congress as to what percentage of the

illegal border crossers they were interdicting, the number fell between 25 percent and 33 percent. I believe the quote in the testimony was, "We think we catch between a fourth and a third of those who attempt to cross." Now, that is not a very good record when you consider that there are 1,188,000 illegals, and that could potentially represent a third of those that tried or a fourth of those who tried.

So, I simply take that math and put that number at 25 percent, which is the lower part of the number, and then round it up to put it into a perspective in between the 25 and 33 percent. If you take that number and do the calculation, you come to about 4.6 million, let me see, about 4.6 million attempts. If you look at the interdiction numbers it amounts to and round it down, 4 million coming across our southern border on an annual basis, and that divides out to be about 11,000 a night coming across our southern border; 11,000, Mr. Speaker, every night on average. I say "night," because during the day, the activity slows down. It doesn't stop. But at night it speeds up.

I have gone down and sat on the border in the dark, and without night vision goggles and without the aid that we have of our security personnel down there, but I just sat there and listened, sitting next to that cattle fence, that is not a very good cattle fence, about 5 barbed wires and steel posts that are stretched out to where the wires are separated in the middle so that the illegal traffic can simply bend down and step over through the fence.

I sat there and listened maybe 3 hours at a crack with a retired Border Patrol officer. I could see the shadows filtering through. I could hear the cars coming down on the Mexican side of the border. I could hear one of them dragging its muffler rattling as it drove down there. I could hear it stop by a big mesquite tree. I could hear the doors open. You hear people get out. You hear them drop their packs on the ground and the doors close kind of quietly, but the doors close. You can hear them pick things up in a hushed whisper and talk. Then they line up in single file, and they walk through the mesquite brush in the desert that 100 or 150 yards on down to our border and then file through the fence single file and go on up through the brush into the United States.

Some of them, I will concede, are coming here because they would like to find a job and they would like to find a better life. Some of them will send money back to their family. Some of them, that pack they drop on the ground and pick up again is the pack of illegal drugs that they will be carrying into the United States and delivering to a predetermined location, perhaps 25 miles up into the United States across the desert along the highway where a vehicle is scheduled to pull off on a turnoff and have those packs of illegal drugs tossed into the back of that truck. Maybe some of the illegals get

in the truck and go on up into the United States. Some of them turn around, walk back across the desert that 20 or 25 miles and go down and get another load.

This goes on every single night on our southern border, Mr. Speaker, every single night. That isn't all the drugs that come across our border, but that is one of the methods that they use. If we put a vehicle barrier in place, in some places we have them, that amounts to a 5-by-5 steel tubing that is welded on our steel posts, and these are a 5-by-5 steel piling that are set in the ground, and a 5-by-5 steel tubing that is welded on there at about bumper height of a vehicle, that vehicle barrier will slow down and actually stop vehicles from driving across the border, but it doesn't stop individuals from walking right through there and carrying their packs of illegal drugs.

The number that is most commonly represented by the Drug Enforcement Agency is \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across our southern border on an annual basis. That \$65 billion is, I believe, a street value. I don't know what it is worth at the border specifically. In fact, they don't know either. They have got some representations of the breakdown of who gets what share of the profit as it flows through the illegal drug cartels. But \$65 billion worth on the street is no small number.

That value in illegal drugs consumed by Americans destroys untold numbers of lives, an incalculable amount of human potential, and an innumerable number of children suffer because their father or mother or both are hooked on illegal drugs, methamphetamines, marijuana, heroin, cocaine, you name it, that comes across that border. Especially the methamphetamine that comes up into my part of the country, up the NAFTA Highway, as I heard some of my colleagues talking earlier, and the pain and the suffering and the death that has been dealt out by those illegal drugs, but pushed by \$65 billion worth, the street value in the United States.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the statement that we have a responsibility here in the United States to address the illegal drug consumption in this country. As long as we have the kind of demand that demands \$65 billion worth of illegal drugs on the streets, in noses and in the veins and in the systems of our American drug abusers, illegal drug abusers, there is always going to be somebody that seeks to meet that demand.

Right now, the most efficient system that is set up, the most competitive system that is set up, the system that has the distribution wired in, is the illegal drug lords that control our southern border and the families that control their segments, the drug cartel families that control the segments of our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, we can't solve this problem by addressing the border