

an apology, and it continues. It continues as a repeated pattern that is repeating itself right now with the Karl Rove affair.

Democrats are right to be incensed that the President's chief adviser is alleged to have revealed Valerie Plame as a CIA operative, purportedly publicizing this information to get back at Plame's husband, Joe Wilson, for disagreeing with the Bush administration's assessment that Saddam Hussein was, to quote Vice President CHENEY's flawed analysis, reconstituting his nuclear weapons program.

Maybe my memory is failing me, but I do not recall any Republicans calling on Karl Rove to apologize for cold-heartedly revealing the identity of a CIA operative as part of a political vendetta to get back at her husband. Nor has the Vice President apologized for his mistake about Iraq's nonexistent nuclear weapons program which led us into war.

The personally destructive behavior that Republicans have engaged in to protect Karl Rove and another high ranking Bush administration official, Vice President CHENEY's chief of staff, Scooter Libby, actually might be their way to change the subject to avoid any question about the merits of the Iraq war and how it has been so poorly managed.

Why do they want to avoid that discussion? Because the American people have completely lost confidence in the administration's Iraq policy. Where, for example, is the apology for the deaths of more than 1,700 Americans? Not only is there no apology, Secretary Rumsfeld could not be bothered to personally sign condolence letters to their families.

Where is the apology for sending young men and women to war without the proper protective armor on their bodies and on their vehicles?

Where is the apology for pinching pennies on veterans health benefits when these brave soldiers return home?

Where is the apology for the immoral doctrine of this preemptive war?

And where is the apology for the gross deceptions used to justify it, for the missing weapons of mass destruction, for the cooked intelligence, for the phony al Qaeda-Saddam link?

Where is the apology for wasting more than \$200 billion for taxpayer money on this mistake, and for the poor leadership that led to torture of prisoners and prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib in Guantanamo?

Where is the apology for committing our troops and our Nation to this mission without a postwar plan to secure the peace?

Where is the apology for the arrogance that squandered America's international goodwill and damaged our relationships with our closest allies?

And finally, where is the apology for revealing the identity of a good man's wife just because he disagreed with the administration on policy grounds?

There is something wrong with our moral compass if we have to apologize

for speaking bluntly, while our leaders can commit the biggest foreign policy blunder since Vietnam and get away without apology or accountability. To tell the truth, an apology would not be enough for everything they have done. An apology, after all, is just more words.

It is time for action. It is time for accountability and it is time for Karl Rove's security clearance to be revoked. It is time for a tangible admission that the Iraq war was immorally conceived and has been incompetently managed. It is time for an end of the politics of personal destruction and an end of destructive national policies.

If the President wants to earn back the Nation's trust he needs to end this shameful, shameful chapter in our Nation's history, and without apology he needs to bring our troops home.

CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor tonight to talk about CAFTA, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, that I think is the wrong agreement for the American people and particularly the workers of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start with a quote by Ross Perot. This was during the presidential elections of 1992, at least the debates. And Mr. Perot said, you implement that NAFTA, the Mexican trade agreement where they pay people a dollar an hour, have no health care, no retirement, no pollution controls, and you are going to hear a giant sucking noise of jobs being pulled out of this country right at a time when we need the tax base to pay the debt.

Well, I would like to say to Mr. Perot that times have not changed. We need that tax base right now.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you a little bit about NAFTA. I was not here in the Congress when that was debated and when it was passed and became the law of the land. Before NAFTA we ran a trade surplus with Mexico. Now the U.S. runs a \$45 billion annual trade deficit with Mexico. My State of North Carolina has lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs since 1993. The United States of America has lost over 2.5 million manufacturing jobs.

The number of Mexican illegal aliens in the United States has grown from 1.3 million, and that was in 1992, the year before NAFTA was signed into law, to over 5.9 million in the year 2004. That is a 350 percent increase. 350 percent increase. CAFTA will continue these trends. 85 percent of the language in CAFTA is identical to the language in NAFTA.

Let us talk about Trade Promotion Authority, which I did not vote for by the way. America's, since August of 2002, annual trade deficit grew by \$195

billion to \$217 billion, and of that \$150 billion with China.

North Carolina has lost over 52,000 manufacturing jobs since TPA, Trade Promotion Authority, became the law of the land, and the United States of America has lost over 600,000 million manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, CAFTA is not the answer. It is not that we are opposed to a CAFTA agreement, but this CAFTA agreement is not good for the American people.

And let me give you just a little bit of an example of CAFTA and how it will impact those in Central America. It will not help to raise their income levels at all. It will not help them with health care, it will not help them with improving their livelihood, if you will. The average in Nicaragua is \$0.95 an hour. Guatemala is \$1 an hour. El Salvador is \$1.25 an hour. These countries have few labor laws, environmental standards, and CAFTA does nothing if at all to improve those.

CAFTA allows China to backdoor fabric into Central America where it can be assembled and shipped into the United States duty free. The last thing we need is to help China. We have outsourced 1.5 million jobs since 1989 to China.

Mr. Speaker, in the little bit of time I have left I want to give you from the Washington Post today an article. There were many here on the floor of the House that wanted to give permanent normal trade status to China. I was opposed to that, by the way.

Let me just read from the Washington Post and then I will close, Mr. Speaker. The trouble at Futai began the last day of May when workers received their monthly salary at about 4 p.m. For many the computer generated pay slip contained intolerable news.

□ 1945

“From \$60 to \$100 a month for weaving sweaters, their piecework pay had slumped to \$50 and \$40 and even lower, they said. That, the workers complained, was not enough compensation for 11-hour shifts and one day's rest a month, the day after payday.”

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem with these trade agreements. They are not good for the American people, and they are not good usually for the country that we reach these agreements with. And I hope that this House will continue to stand strong in a bipartisan way, Democrat and Republican, and stand in opposition to CAFTA; and if it is brought to the floor of the House in the next 10 days, I hope we will defeat it on behalf of the American worker who needs help from the United States Congress.

REASONS AGAINST CAFTA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish to suggest eight more reasons to vote “no” on CAFTA.

First of all, CAFTA continues the failed neo-liberal trade regimen that puts freedom last rather than first. CAFTA assumes, like NAFTA before it, that trade will bring freedom. But where contingent liberties do not really exist, such flawed trade approaches bring not freedom but exploitation and hardship on the majority of the people struggling to get into the middle class.

A “no” vote on CAFTA will result in its renegotiation to expand liberty, opportunity, and hope. Respect and dignity for workers, fresh water, clean air, treated sewage are rights that should belong to every human being. Surely our continent, our hemisphere deserves better than CAFTA.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is that it will outsource more U.S. jobs and worsen our burgeoning trade deficit. NAFTA’s supporters promised us millions of jobs, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) has stated, as well as a trade surplus for our country. Exactly the opposite has happened.

The U.S. has lost over 1 million jobs to Mexico and Canada resulting from NAFTA, and each year we have fallen into deeper and deeper trade deficit with those nations.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is it will fuel more illegal immigration. Just like NAFTA, millions of people will be uprooted from the rural countryside with no hope, no continental labor rights, and become an exploitable class of people used by the most unscrupulous traffickers on the continent.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is that Central American workers will continue to be subjected to sweatshop conditions because the enforcement provisions that exist in the Caribbean Basin Initiative, CBI, will not apply. Right now CAFTA countries are not robust democracies. But what the CBI does in the Caribbean is assures that trade rights are linked to access to the U.S. market and enforcement of labor provisions.

CAFTA backslides on this lock-tight trigger. It basically has some encouraging language to nations to enforce their labor laws which may be poor or non-existent, and no matter how weak, gives them a go-ahead and then sets aside money in the agreement to give to the very governments that are not enforcing those laws anyway.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is it hurts U.S. agriculture. In fact, CAFTA nations already are saturated with U.S. agricultural products which consume about 94 percent of their market, so there is not much room to grow there. And, more importantly, CAFTA provides that Brazilian ethanol and other imports, if processed inside of these Central American countries, and 35 percent of the processing occurs there, can be back-doored into the United States. So it will be the

same kind of back-dooring into the United States of products from these other countries that has happened with NAFTA, Mexico and Canada.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is it will regress democratic reform in CAFTA countries. CAFTA does nothing to advance democracy in the six nations that are a part of it. In fact, the civil societies in those countries are broadly opposed to CAFTA. Huge demonstrations against CAFTA have occurred in every one of those nations, and the manner in which this is being voted on in those countries is truly troublesome. Three countries have used emergency procedures, bringing up late at night, the public does not know what is happening. And in the other three countries it has not even been voted on. Not exactly a way to carry forward the idea of democratic liberties across the hemisphere.

Another reason to vote “no” on CAFTA is its lack of real environmental enforcement and our knowledge that with NAFTA drug trafficking has snubbed up right against the U.S. border at Juarez. When you have these trade agreements that do not have other contingent policies attached to them, what you end up doing is empowering some of the worst forces in the hemisphere.

Finally, CAFTA will hurt women workers disproportionately in societies where women’s rights are already marginalized. How would you like to be a woman in a textile plant in one of those countries? Or how about in a banana-packing shed? What do you think your future would look like? Sixty percent of those working in these sweatshop conditions are women workers with absolutely no labor protections. CAFTA is doing nothing to improve their standing in our hemisphere, and it will do nothing to obliterate the sweatshops that are so very much a part of their lives.

The combined purchasing powers of all of these Central American countries is the same as Columbus, Ohio or New Haven, Connecticut. They really do not have the kind wherewithal to purchase value-added products from our country.

So what is CAFTA really about? CAFTA is merely about expanding the NAFTA model to six other countries, providing more export platforms to the United States of goods, both agricultural and manufactured are back-doored into this country, and providing none of the advances in freedom, liberty, opportunity and hope that should be the hallmark of this country at home and abroad.

EGYPTIAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is poised to consider House Resolution 2601, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for

Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007. Among the many critical provisions in this bill is one relating to Egypt that I would like to discuss tonight.

Despite large amounts of bilateral U.S. assistance, Egypt has failed to modernize its economy, it has failed to end the influence of Islamic influence in the schools and in the media, and it has failed to improve the human rights situation in its homeland.

While Mr. Mubarak continues to pay lip service to holding participatory, multi-party elections, dissidents and those who voice their opposition to the government’s policies continue to be arrested, to be beaten, and otherwise punished for attempting to exercise their most basic fundamental human rights as human beings and Egyptian citizens.

In response, the underlying provisions in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, also known as the State Department Authorization Bill, shifts funds from military aid to economic assistance for the purpose of supporting Egyptian civil society and improving the quality of life of the Egyptian people.

The underlying provision transfers \$40 million in military aid for each of the next 3 years, a mere 3 percent of Egypt’s overall \$1.3 billion to economic assistance. Egypt faces no military threat. However, Egypt continues to procure jet fighters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, Apache helicopters, anti-aircraft missile batteries, surveillance aircraft, and other equipment under our Foreign Military Sales program, in addition to unconfirmed reports of Egyptian attempts to procure North Korean medium-range missiles, and these are serious questions regarding the purpose and rationale of an ongoing military build-up by the Egyptian Government.

In addition, after decades of promises and unfulfilled commitments to the United States, Egypt’s economic conditions remain dire. The underlying provision in the bill is hardly a major price to pay in order to send the message that Egypt needs to pay more attention to human rights and economic and social development. Not one penny is cut from the overall aid package. It is merely a shift in priorities.

The Hyde/Lantos/Ros-Lehtinen provision is in keeping with U.S. public diplomacy efforts by sending a clear message about U.S. priorities for Egypt’s future and the future for the Egyptian people. It builds good will with the people of the region by supporting educational, economic, and biological development, goals which contribute most effectively to Egypt’s internal stability.

This provision also supports the priorities of President Bush to bring freedom, democracy, and sound economies to the Middle East. He articulated here in this Chamber in the State of the Union earlier this year that the great and proud nation of Egypt, which showed the way toward peace in the