

with us, the Members of Congress, on behalf of their constituents, what does this mean for the lives of our soldiers? What does this mean for the number of those who have lost their lives already and their brothers and sisters may now be in the greater line of fire with people being armed, and armed with what?

What level of weaponry will they have, and how far will this weaponry be able to go, and what will they be able to do with it? It is obviously a challenge.

It is time to bring our soldiers home. If this is what we are doing, let's transfer the fight to the Iraqi national Army and the Iraqi police.

Let's bring our soldiers home.

REPORT ON H.R. 2643, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. KAPTUR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-187) on the bill (H.R. 2643) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

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

U.S. TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, it's a great pleasure that we are talking this evening about an issue very important to a lot of us in this Congress, and a lot of folks throughout the United States of America, and that issue is trade.

I would like to yield to a colleague of mine. We came in this Congress together, and she has been very active in the trade deal and has established with me the trade working group in this Congress, Congresswoman LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in addressing the House and the American people regarding U.S. trade policy and its effect on working families.

Let me start by saying, first of all, that I am committed to trade. That's

right, I think that trade is good for America and its working families. If we do it the right way, trade can increase the availability of raw materials for production. Trade can also open markets for American goods and can bring exciting new products to American consumers. While I recognize the benefits of trade, not all trade agreements are created equal.

On May 10, the administration and Members of this House announced a "new policy on trade." Well, it's about time. Democrats have been calling for a new direction in trade for years, and I am pleased that the administration has finally taken initial steps to improve its trade policy.

But, alas, it is too little, too late. This new trade policy is little more than a rehash of the same failed NAFTA model that has been hurting U.S. families for more than a decade. According to the administration, the new additions to the Peru and Panama agreements would add long-sought labor and environmental protections to the basic NAFTA framework.

Unfortunately, even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce says that these new worker and environmental protections can't be enforced. That's not very encouraging, is it? Supporting this new deal requires us to believe in two things: number one, the actual benefits of the NAFTA free trade model; and, number two, the promises of the Bush administration.

We are supposed to trust an administration that has demonstrated its commitment to anything but the truth. Having misled us on issues like domestic wire-tapping programs, the war in Iraq, global warming, and the firing of U.S. attorneys, it now seeks our trust. How are we supposed to trust a record like that?

We have also learned some very hard lessons after more than 10 years of free trade failures. As we hear more familiar promise about the new trade deal, let's look at some of the old ones. NAFTA was supposed to solve illegal integration by developing a robust economy in Mexico that would allow hard-working people to provide for their families and stay at home. Well, that didn't work.

CAFTA was supposed to include bold new safety and wage protections for workers, but these protections are disappointingly weak, allowing countries to downgrade their very own labor laws.

In the Oman Free Trade Agreement, the administration actually negotiated a deal with an opportunity that, as our own State Department reported, was experiencing a forced labor problem—forced labor. How are our workers supposed to compete with people who are forced to toil?

Free trade was supposed to increase economic opportunity for everybody, for big businesses, as well as working families at home and abroad. But it simply hasn't happened.

Too many communities have been left to rot because corporations shut

down U.S. plants to chase increasingly cheap labor and weak environmental protections abroad. After decades of living with NAFTA and its clones, real wages for American families are down. Our trade deficit is in the tens of billions of dollars, and our manufacturing base is falling apart.

The American worker is now more productive than ever, but that increased productivity has not led to a corresponding increase in wages. The truth is that the NAFTA free trade model is designed to favor the wealthiest few and corporate bottom lines at the expense of small businesses, workers, families and communities.

In the coming weeks, we will be asked to consider first two of the Bush administration's trade priorities, free trade agreements with Peru and Panama. Despite the long record of failed free trade agreements, the Bush administration and free traders are going to tell us that Peru and Panama agreements are less controversial than the administration's other priorities, free trade agreements with Colombia and Korea, and the renewal of the President's fast-track negotiating authority.

This is a sign of how bad Peru and Panama trade deals are. Their only redeeming value, it seems, is that they are not as bad as the deals with Korea and Colombia. But that argument misses the point. Every bad trade agreement passed, makes it easier for another bad trade agreement to slip by.

When they say "not that bad," we should say "not good enough." Let's keep our eyes on the ball.

The Peru and Panama free-trade agreements are slippery slopes to other bad deals. Passing these deals makes it easier for the Bush administration to push through the Korea free-trade agreement which would gut the American car industry.

□ 2000

It would make it easier for the White House to push through fast track authority, which gives the President a blank check to create additional agreements that gut our communities and our economy.

Passing the Peru and Panama Free Trade Agreements puts us on a slippery slope toward passing the Bush-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, a deeply flawed trade deal for working families in both countries.

I just returned from Colombia, and this was my second trip in 7 months. On these visits I talked with leaders from civil society, indigenous groups, organized labor and the political opposition.

Colombia is a great country with wonderful people, a vibrant culture and a growing economy. However, Colombia remains the most dangerous country in the world for worker advocates. Despite recent progress, the Colombian Government has still been unable to protect labor organizers from being attacked or killed over any specific