

Declaring that we would pull out at a date certain, I think, would be counter-productive. It would be a like giving a playbook to an opponent, as a coach, something you would not do. You would not give insurgents a date certain, where they can wait and say, well, this is the time when a certain amount of troops will be gone and we can go therefore begin to attack, and certainly encourage terrorists.

A young captain in Kuwait told me this. He said, if we pull out prematurely, three things will happen. Number 1, the 1,700 soldiers that we have had killed there will have died in vain, and we will have to tell their families that. Number 2, tens of thousands of Iraqis will be killed in the ensuing conflict, and we promised them, we gave them our word that this would not happen, that we would not pull out prematurely.

And, thirdly, we would have encouraged terrorists around the world. And so it seems to me that the course that we are pursuing, while not perfect, makes some sense, and we definitely do have an exit strategy.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at the White House news conference early this month, President Bush called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement this summer. Earlier this month, the most powerful Republican in Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), promised a vote by July 4. Well, actually last year he promised a vote during 2004. Then he promised by Memorial Day that we would vote on CAFTA. Now, I think he means it this time, now he is saying we are going to vote on CAFTA by July 4.

As Congress waits for the next CAFTA vote countdown to begin, while we wait and wait and wait, many of us who have been speaking out, on both sides of the aisle, dozens of Republicans and dozens of Democrats have a message to the President and to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

President Bush signed CAFTA almost 13 months ago. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration, Morocco, Chile, Singapore, Australia, has been voted on within 60 days of the President's signing the agreement. But CAFTA has been 13 months. It has languished in Congress for more than a year without a vote because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends Republicans and Democrats.

It offends small business people and farmers and ranchers. It offends Central American workers and American workers. It offends advocates for food safety and the environment. Just look at what has happened with our trade policy, and the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. DELAY) and the President want more of the same.

Look at what has happened to our trade policy in the last dozen years. The year that I came to Congress, the same year that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) came to Congress, we were elected in 1992, that year the U.S. had a \$38 billion trade deficit, meaning we imported \$38 billion more than we exported. 12 years later, a dozen years later, last year, our trade deficit went from \$38 billion 12 years later to \$618 billion.

It is hard to argue that our trade policy is working when the deficit goes from \$38 billion and balloons to \$618 billion in just a dozen years.

But, it is more than just some numbers, Mr. Speaker, on a trade deficit, it is also job loss. In the last 6 years, manufacturing jobs alone, the States in red have lost 20 percent or more of their manufacturing base. Michigan has lost 210,000 manufacturing jobs, Illinois, 224, Ohio 216, Pennsylvania 199, New Jersey over 100,000 Alabama and Mississippi together, 130,000 jobs.

The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent of their manufacturing jobs. Texas, 201,000. California 354,000. It is pretty clear our trade policy is not working, Mr. Speaker. Opponents to CAFTA know that it is an extension of the North American Free Trade Agreement, a dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA, for all intents and purposes.

It did not work then, it is not working now. It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement in front of Congress, the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans. The President promises, we will manufacture more products and export them abroad. The President promises it will raise the standard of living in the countries of our trading partners, and the developing countries.

Yet, with every trade agreement their promises fall by the wayside in favor of big business interests, not small business interests, big business interests that sends U.S. jobs overseas and exploit cheap labor abroad.

Ben Franklin said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. We hear the same promises on the same kind of trade agreements, and we get the same negative results. In the face of overwhelming bipartisan opposition, Republican leadership and the administration have tried every trick in the book to pass this CAFTA and they failed.

Now, they have opened the bank. Desperate after failing to gin up support for the agreement based on its merits, CAFTA supporters are now attempting to buy votes with their fantastic promises. If history is an example, Members should beware of these promises. Fewer than 20 percent, 14 out of 92 trade promises from the administration in the last dozens years, 14 out of 92 trade promises, less than 20 percent, were ever realized.

The White House will make all kinds of promises to Members on both sides

of the aisle, but do not be suckers, it is going to happen again and again and again. Instead of wasting with toothless side deals, Ambassador Portman should renegotiate a trade deal, a CAFTA that will pass Congress.

Republicans and Democrats, labor and business, farmers and ranchers, religious leaders in Central America, religious leaders in the United States, environmental and human rights organizations in all seven countries are speaking with one voice: Defeat this CAFTA and renegotiate a CAFTA that lifts up workers in both countries.

Mr. Speaker, a worker in the United States averages about \$38,000 a year in wages. The Dominican Republic about \$6,000, Honduras about \$2,600, Nicaragua 2,300. A Nicaraguan worker who earns \$2,300 a year cannot buy cars made in Ohio, cannot buy prescription drugs manufactured in New Jersey, cannot buy textiles and apparel from North Carolina, cannot buy software from Seattle, cannot buy prime cut beef from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is about outsourcing jobs to El Salvador, exploiting cheap labor in Guatemala. When the world's poorest people can buy American products, not just make them, then you know our trade policy will finally have succeeded.

IRAQ AND GUANTANAMO

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about two issues, Iraq and Guantanamo, to talking about war and prisons. We have heard a lot about both in the last few months. And I think it is incumbent upon us to understand the situation.

We hear about Iraq and the situation in Iraq. And I was fortunate on January 30 to be in Iraq, along with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), two Members of Congress on Election Day to see a nation born, a new nation with a democracy. The cynics said it would never happen. They said the Iraqi people were not smart enough to have a democracy, they did not know what it was like.

Yet 60 percent of those people went out and voted, defiant of the tyranny, of the terrorists. Almost 60 of them were murdered either going to or from the polls, but yet they went and voted. Almost 300 others were injured going to and from the polls, but yet they voted. The timetable for that country to have a democracy is a short one, almost 2 years. But we forget that our own country took 13 years, from the beginning of the war for independence and the setting of the Constitution of the United States. It took us a long time.

Yet we expect more of the Iraqi people. And they are performing that. And I was honored to be there to see those people, to tell me personally that they appreciated American and America's

youth sacrificing so this nation could be a free nation.

I saw that they are concerned for American troops, the morale of the American troops. The concern that the Iraqi people had was that we would cut and run and leave before the job was done, before the Iraqi people were able to control their own country. But we will not cut and run, we will finish the job. It is not the way we do things in America, to run from a fight, liberating a country that wishes to be free.

And now we hear talk about Guantanamo Bay, the situation. Let me tell you something. Mr. Speaker, I have been to jails, I have been to prisons. I was a judge for 22 years, I was a prosecutor for 8. I have seen numerous jails, numerous prisons in the State of Texas and our Federal prisons. I know what jails are like. I know what prisons are like. And to compare Guantanamo Bay to a Nazi concentration camp, to the Soviet gulags is outrageous, it is an affront to those millions of people who died in those concentration camps.

My dad served in World War II. And as a teenager, he saw those concentration camps. He helped liberate them with other Americans. Recently I had the chance to see some of those concentration camps some 50 years later. And to say that Guantanamo Bay is like a concentration camp minimizes the death that occurred in those concentration camps in Germany. And it is an insult to these people that died there.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that those people who talk and criticize our situation in Iraq, that they go to Iraq. I went there for that very purpose, to see our troops. And I think it is important that those people who criticize Guantanamo Bay, that they go to Guantanamo Bay and see that jail there.

That is why I am recommending and offering that we go there as Members of Congress, we go as soon as we can to see the situation firsthand. We need to understand that the people in Guantanamo Bay are terrorists. We talk about them being prisoners of war, but to be protected under the Geneva Convention, Mr. Speaker, a person must have a commander, they must wear a uniform, they must not take and have concealed weapons. They must kill civilians or the innocent.

And the terrorists that are in that jail down in Guantanamo Bay are not protected by the Geneva Convention because they violate these rules, these rules. And yet we hear of all of the bad things that are occurring.

□ 2015

I think it is incumbent to see the situation firsthand and make our own determination because it is important that we not cut and run from this situation in Guantanamo Bay any more than we cut and run from Iraq.

CAFTA HURTS WOMEN OF THE AMERICAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, many people do not think of trade agreements as an issue particular to women. But a briefing I held last week along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) made clear how disproportionately the proposed CAFTA agreement will negatively affect women.

We tend to forget about women in forgotten places like the sweat shop zones in Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Costa Rica. But let me tell some of their stories.

One worker, woman in Guatemala describes the way supervisors treat workers in the maquiladora, the sweat shop where she works. She says, "Sometimes the supervisor grabs a piece of cloth you're working on and throws it in your face. Once when a supervisor did that to me, I finally grabbed the piece from him and threw it back in his face. I did not cry. If I had cried, I wouldn't have been able to answer him. Instead, I told him that he needed to start respecting the women that worked for him. I could have accepted it if he had just said the piece was no good, but to throw it in my face, I won't stand for that."

How about the thousands of women who work in the banana packing plants? Who speaks for them?

For the treatment that the woman in the textile company received, she earns \$68 every 2 weeks including over time and bonuses, working many more than 8 hours a day. She goes on to say, "The trousers we make cost about \$39.50 each. In 2 weeks we earn enough to buy 2 pairs. But do you know how many pants we have to produce every day? Our quota is between 400 and 700 trousers per day."

Another worker describes efforts to organize a union to represent women. She says, "The company used to fire workers without any cause. They did not always pay the workers their full salaries and there were lots of other problems, so the secretary-general said it would be a good idea to place an injunction. That's when the company started to intimidate the workers. The situation got really bad . . . when someone shot at one girl while she was buying tortillas and hit her in the ear. From then on everyone was afraid and did not want to continue fighting" for an organization to represent the women, an actual union.

Last year, a U.S. union official organizing in El Salvador was killed. No independent trade unions have been registered there in 4 years. In Guate-

mala only two collective bargaining agreements exist among more than 200 textile factories.

Now, U.S. Trade Ambassador Portman claims that poor enforcement is the only problem with Central America's labor regimes, not inadequate laws. Yet there are dozens of serious deficiencies in Central American labor laws. CAFTA does not require compliance with international labor standards like the freedom to associate and to bargain collectively, nor does it protect women against outright discrimination. And CAFTA offers no protection against weakening, gutting, or eliminating existing laws in the future.

We need trade that serves women and workers in all of our countries, not agreements that force women into these awful conditions and places a downward pressure on the wages and working conditions that women in America have fought so very hard for from the very beginning in the mid-1930s, women like my own mother who was the first member of my family ever to earn a living wage when she struggled for the formation of the first union at an auto parts plant in our community.

We do not want CAFTA to roll back standards for women of this hemisphere and this continent. Women of the Americas should not stand for it. CAFTA would devastate family farmers just like it did in Mexico under NAFTA when over a million and a half peasants were forced off their land and forced to migrate somewhere just to try to find a better way of life. And they end up working in these sweat shop zones or fleeing across our border, working under the table, not having a decent labor agreement under which their lives, and indeed their livelihoods, can be guaranteed.

Already over 60 percent of the workers in Central America in their factories, in the banana packing houses are women. They work in very low-skill, low-wage jobs with absolutely few labor protections. CAFTA would do very little to protect their labor rights in the sweat shops in which they spend the majority of their young years.

Women have reported forced pregnancy testing, sexual harassment, and even physical abuse in this sector where women assemble clothing, pack bananas, and try to eke out a living for themselves and their families.

I want to thank STITCH, a small organization that supports the voices of these women being heard here in the Congress of the United States.

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.)