



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2007

No. 67

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, abide with our lawmakers. Make them so aware of Your presence that the faithful may be blessed, the sad may be comforted, the depressed may be encouraged, the ungrateful may give thanks, and the perplexed may understand. May companionship with You enable our Senators to be guided by Your providence.

Speak to the successful and keep them from pride. Speak to those who are too self-confident and keep them from falling. Speak to those who are so sure of their position that they are certain that everyone else is wrong. Lord, keep them from intolerance. From day to day, guard us from anything that brings shame, so that in the eventide of life, when our task is done, we may see the smile of Your approval. We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this morning there will be an hour of morning business, with the first half controlled by the majority and the second half controlled by the Republicans. Following morning business, we will resume consideration of S. 761. Under an agreement entered last night, once we get back on the bill, there will be 30 minutes of debate with respect to the Sununu amendment, which is numbered 938, which strikes a section of the bill seeking to strengthen science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education at all school levels. We expect the amendment will be voted on at a little after 11 this morning. My understanding is once we dispose of the Sununu amendment, then the Sanders amendment remains pending.

Mr. President, let me say to everyone, I have not had the opportunity to speak to the Republican leader today, but it would be my intention that we would be in recess from 4 until 5:30 for the briefings by General Petraeus, General Pace, and others up in room 407. But it would be my intention to finish this bill after that.

It is my understanding there are some Coburn amendments—he has three of them—and we would like to get votes scheduled on those. If there are other amendments, let's bring them forward. But we will not get the bill from the House on the supplemental until tonight, anyway. We are not going to be able to do anything on it tonight. I think it would be a good step forward if we can finish this bill tonight. That means we would work on it until late in the evening and finish this bill. That is my intention. I hope there are no efforts to delay this bill. If, in fact, that is the case, as I have said before, we would just back off the bill. If we cannot pass, on a bipartisan basis, legislation that has more than 50 cosponsors, I think it is not a good day for us. We should be able to show the American people there are some things we can do on a bipartisan basis.

I remind all Members that there will be a briefing today, as I have indicated, in 407 beginning at 4 p.m.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the majority and the final 30 minutes under the control of the Republicans.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week our colleague, Senator BYRON DORGAN, chairman of the Commerce

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5013

Committee's Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce, Trade, and Tourism, held the first in a series of hearings on our U.S. trade policy. I was proud to join Chairman DORGAN as we asked the pivotal question on the minds of workers and small business owners across the country: Is free trade working? Is it working for American communities? Is it working for our families? Is it working for our workers?

For the majority of Americans and people worldwide, the answer is a resounding no. For a privileged few, yes, this model of trade has increased the bottom lines. But the economic values embodied by this free-trade model are skewed toward a very select few in our Nation. Not only is our trade policy not working, it is worsening the problem of income equality across the Nation.

From 1946 to 1973, economic opportunities for poor and working families in this country grew. As you can see, that income, people's income—they are divided into five groups—the lowest income, 20 percent, the middle groups, and then the wealthiest 20 percent.

Between 1947 and 1973 in this country, the 20 percent lowest income workers actually saw their income rise the fastest. From 1947 to 1973, that was a time of strong economic growth. It was a time of actual trade surpluses during those years. It was a time of fairly stable energy prices—all of that.

The lesson here: Families that worked hard, that played by the rules, had a real chance of getting ahead.

Then the next, from 1973 to 2000, that economic opportunity began to flatten out for those families. We saw, in those years, from 1973 to 2000—1973 was the year we went from a trade surplus to a trade deficit. That was only one of the reasons. The lowest income workers saw their income grow by the least. People whose income was in the top 20 percent saw their income grow the fastest.

If we had a third chart here, income since 2000, since 2000, income has gone up only for the wealthiest 20 percent in this country.

When Secretary Paulson came to the Banking Committee and spoke to us, he bragged about 3½ percent economic growth for this country—a good thing. The problem is, profits are up, productivity is up, but workers are not sharing in the wealth they create. Profits are up, executive salaries are up, and almost everybody else's income in this country has been pretty stagnant.

Our economic house is not in order. It is not in order nationally, and it is not anywhere where it needs to be in my State of Ohio. When I first ran for Congress in 1992, our trade deficit was \$38 billion. Our trade deficit figures for 2006 topped \$800 billion. That is from \$38 billion to \$200 billion from 1992 to 2006. Our trade deficit with China went from low double figures in 1992 to well over \$200 billion—an increase of almost 20 times in those 15 years or so. In fact, since 1982, we have accumulated trade

deficits of \$4.3 trillion. The aggregate trade deficit from 1982 to the present day is \$4.3 trillion. That is money which eventually will have to be paid. Put another way, we have produced 4.3 trillion fewer manufactured goods, in most cases, than we have purchased. Put another way, to understand what \$4.3 trillion of wealth transferred out of our country means, if you had \$4.3 trillion and you spent \$1,000 every second of every minute of every hour of every day, to spend that \$4.3 trillion trade debt, it would take you 131 years.

We have lost more than 3 million manufacturing jobs across the country. Those are jobs which pay an average of 31 percent more than service sector jobs. Service sector jobs, the ones that NAFTA and the World Trade Organization proponents said would replace manufacturing jobs, they also are tradable and they are also moving offshore at a swift pace.

The trade policies we have set in Washington and negotiated across the globe have a direct impact on places such as Toledo and Hamilton, OH, Cleveland and Steubenville, and Lima, OH, as well as in Mexico and Korea and Bangladesh.

We must shrink income equality, grow our business community, and create good-paying jobs. We must establish trade policy that builds our economic security, not undermines it. Job loss does not just affect the worker or even just the worker's family. Job loss, especially job loss in the thousands, obviously devastates communities, layoffs of police and fire and teachers and all of that. It hurts local business owners, the drugstore, the grocery store, the neighborhood restaurant.

This model of trade is also not winning us more friends abroad. Last month, tens of thousands of workers in Korea took to the streets protesting a pending free-trade agreement with the United States, similar to the tens of thousands of protesters against the Central American Free Trade Agreement in our country and in the six countries in Central America.

Much has been written and said about the waning enthusiasm for the free trade area of the Americas, throughout Latin America, most notably because of what NAFTA has done to Mexico's rural population, with a million and a half small farmers' livelihoods devastated. It almost toppled the favored Presidential candidate in Mexico last year, as the challenger talked about NAFTA's negative impact on Mexico and who came within a hair of winning. In Brazil, in Bolivia, in Ecuador, and elsewhere, leaders are responding to the demand for a very different, more equitable trading system, not one modeled after the North American Free Trade Agreement.

A few years ago, I traveled to McAllen, TX, where I crossed the border with a couple of friends into Reynosa, Mexico. I met a husband and wife who worked for General Electric Mexico, 3 miles from the United

States, and lived in a shack about 15 feet by 15 feet, no running water, no electricity, dirt floors. When it rained hard, the floors turned to mud. Behind their little shack was a ditch maybe 4 feet wide, human and industrial waste flowing through that ditch. The American Medical Association said it is the most toxic place in the Western Hemisphere.

As you walked through their neighborhood, you could tell where the people living in each of those shacks worked because their homes were constructed from the packing material, the boxes and the wooden crates and the pieces of cardboard and all, the packing material from the company for which they worked.

You could go nearby to an auto plant, nearby to these homes in this neighborhood, 3, 4 miles from the United States of America. The auto plant looked just like an auto plant in Lordstown, OH, or just like the auto plant in Avon Lake or just like the auto plant at Twinsburg, OH. The auto plant was modern, the technology was up to date, the floors were clean, the workers were productive, and the workers were working hard. The only difference between the Mexican auto plant and the American auto plant is the Mexican auto plant did not have a parking lot because the workers are not paid enough to buy the cars they make.

You could go halfway around the world to a Motorola plant in Malaysia, and the workers are not paid enough to buy the cell phones they make, or come back to our hemisphere, to Costa Rica, to a Disney plant, and the workers are not making enough at the Disney plant to buy the toys for their children. You can go back halfway around the world to a Nike plant in China, and the workers are not making enough to buy the shoes they make in their jobs.

Only when workers share in the wealth they create will we know our trade policy is working. American workers are more and more productive every year, an explosion in productivity in this country, yet workers' wages are flat, as we see, especially the bottom 60 or 80 percent, and especially since 2000, where our trade policy is having a depressing impact on wages.

Two years ago, thousands of workers in Central America took to the streets protesting that failed trade policy. CAFTA still has not been implemented in Costa Rica because it is so controversial. In fact, this week in Costa Rica, there will be a public referendum on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

This shift in thinking about free trade, both in the Senate and the House, in this country among the public and abroad, presents all of us today with an opportunity, the challenge we face, which grows in urgency as to how we trade and take part in our global economy without continuing to destroy, to undermine the middle class. The current system is not sustainable.

Those of us who support free trade—not fair trade but support free trade—we want trade, we want plenty of it, but under new rules. We want legitimate fair trade. It is considered protectionist by some to fight for labor and environmental standards, but they consider it free trade to protect drug company patents and Hollywood DVDs. If we can protect intellectual property rights with enforceable provisions in trade agreements, as we should, we absolutely can do the same for labor standards and environmental protections and food safety standards.

I am pleased to say this Congress is already hard at work in building a better trade policy. Senator DORGAN and I have introduced antisweatshop legislation. We need more fair trade to build the middle class and lift up American workers. There will be more of those proposals in the future. It is not a matter of if we trade but how we trade and who benefits from that trade. Thank you, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here to speak on the floor today because American lives, American security, and America's future are on the line in Iraq. The American people know it. They sent a clear message last November. The Iraq Study Group has told us. They gave us honest assessments and recommendations to move forward in Iraq.

Generals have spoken out. General Casey told us in January:

The longer we in the U.S. Forces continue to bear the main burden of Iraq's security, it lengthens the time that the government of Iraq has to make the hard decisions about reconciliation and dealing with the militias.

General Abizaid told us in November:

I do not believe that more American troops right now is the solution to the problem.

Colin Powell has talked about it. He said:

I am not persuaded that another surge of troops into Baghdad for the purpose of suppressing this communitarian violence, this civil war, will work.

The numbers speak for themselves. More than 3,300 Americans have died in Iraq and nearly 25,000 have been wounded. A few days ago, 9 more U.S. soldiers were killed in a bombing, and 20 more U.S. troops and an Iraqi soldier were injured.

Americans have heard the military experts, they have heard the Iraq Study Group, they have seen the sacrifice of our troops and their families, and now they are demanding a change in course. But, sadly, the President refuses to listen. He is ignoring the military experts, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, and the American people.

It is clear the Iraqi civil war requires a political solution, not a military solution. Our servicemembers have done everything we have asked them to do.

They deserve better than to be stuck in the middle of a civil war.

Four years into this war—starting the fifth year—the President is still tossing around heated rhetoric while trying to convince the American people that Democrats do not support the troops. I reject that rhetoric, and I call on him to put politics aside and begin to put our troops first. We can all agree, it is long past time for that.

Now is the time to show our troops we support them with the funds and supplies and armor they need but that we also support them enough to change direction when the current course simply is not working.

Now is the time to show our troops we respect our military, and we refuse to decimate the world's finest fighting forces through extended deployments, limited time at home, and the destruction of valuable equipment in another country's civil war.

Now is the time to show our troops their lives mean more than an open-ended commitment to an Iraqi Government that has repeatedly failed to meet deadlines and take ownership for their own future.

Now is the time to show our troops we understand that America needs them, not in the middle of an Iraqi civil war but in places such as Afghanistan, where al-Qaida is growing in strength.

And now is the time to show our troops their Government is about more than promises and rhetoric. We must stand together to say we will meet the needs of our injured servicemembers and our veterans who have paid the price for this administration's failure to plan for the war and its aftermath.

Congress is moving forward now to pass a supplemental bill that shows our troops they come first. All the President has to do is sign on the dotted line. Unfortunately, because the Bush administration failed to plan and failed to understand the centuries' old tensions in this region, we now, more than ever, need a political and diplomatic solution in Iraq.

As the past 2 months have brutally revealed, the escalation is not working. The civil war has intensified and our troops are stuck in the middle of sectarian violence and find themselves the target of insurgent attacks. It is hard to argue that the situation on the ground—both for our troops and for Iraqis—has gotten better.

Last Wednesday, the New York Times reported:

Bombs ripped through the streets of Baghdad killing at least 171 people in the deadliest day in the capital since the American-led security plan for the city took effect two months ago.

Two days ago, the Boston Globe noted:

The deaths raised to 85 the number of U.S. servicemembers who died in Iraq in April, making it the deadliest month for American troops since December, when 112 died.

According to the Associated Press:

Outside the capital, 1,504 civilians were killed between Feb. 14 and Thursday, April 12

compared with 1,009 deaths during the two previous months.

It is time to transition our mission in Iraq from that of policing a civil war. Our troops are trained for combat, not for refereeing warring factions with a long and complex history. It is time to focus on strengthening America's security and bringing our troops home.

Transitioning the mission should center on three realistic and achievable goals for our military: Training and equipping Iraqi security forces, conducting targeted counterterrorism operations, and protecting our remaining U.S. forces and interests in Iraq.

The second part of the equation is a surge in diplomatic and political efforts. This is a necessary task the President has refused to undertake. America alone does not own the keys to Iraq's future. Iraq's neighbors must help as well. They should play a larger role in training the Iraqi military and police and in reconstruction. They should play a larger role in convincing Iraqis they must make compromises and take responsibility for their future. Without a targeted and serious regional effort to stabilize Iraq, the country's future will remain in question.

The cause of continued insecurity and destruction has not been our military, but, rather, the political and policy failures of a President who has hid in his bunker and stubbornly refused to pursue a strategy needed to bring stability to Iraq.

As we all saw vividly in November, the American people have lost patience with the President's go-it-alone strategy. It is simply wrongheaded to continue on with an open-ended commitment to an Iraqi Government that has repeatedly failed to meet deadlines and to take responsibility for their own country.

The supplemental bill we will send to the White House requires the President to send a report to Congress by July 1 of this year certifying whether Iraq is meeting responsible benchmarks. The American people deserve to know if the sacrifices made by our troops are being met by the Iraqi Government.

Specifically, the American people deserve to know if the Iraqi Government has given U.S. and Iraqi security forces the authority to pursue all extremists, including the Sunni insurgents and the Shia militias.

The American people deserve to know if Iraq is making substantial progress in delivering necessary Iraqi security forces for Baghdad and protecting those forces from political interference.

We deserve to know if Iraq is intensifying efforts to build balanced security forces throughout Iraq that provide evenhanded security for all Iraqis.

Specifically, we deserve to know if the Iraqi Government is making substantial progress in meeting reconciliation initiatives, including enacting laws to equitably share oil revenue