



Maine Fair Trade Campaign

*Working together for fair trade
and a just, sustainable and democratic
global economy*

PO Box 2493, South Portland, ME 04116 •

• www.maineairtrade.org

The representatives we elect to the United States Senate and to Congress make decisions about how we negotiate international trade agreements and get to vote on what is negotiated.

The Maine Fair Trade Campaign sent questionnaires on trade issues to all the major party candidates in Maine for Federal office, as well as to Senator Angus King who is not up for election but whose views on the issues are relevant to discussion. The questionnaires were sent by certified mail. We also sent follow-up emails to the candidates who had received questionnaires and did not respond within a short time.

Neither Senator King nor either candidate for the Senate responded.

In the First Congressional District, Chellie Pingree responded but Isaac Misiuk did not. Chellie Pingree's responses are below.

In the Second Congressional District, Emily Cain responded but Bruce Poliquin did not. Emily Cain's responses are below.

On the following pages you will find the questionnaire, with the candidates' responses in the tables following each of the nine questions. Additional information referenced in the questions is included at the end.

Candidate Questionnaire for Federal Office

The Maine Fair Trade Campaign is a coalition of labor, environmental, farming and social justice organizations across the state of Maine. Our unique cross-sector alliance works together to leverage power to make change in the economy. Information about our coalition and its mission can be found on our website:

www.maineairtrade.org

We are interested in knowing what you think about a variety of issues regarding international trade policy. Answers to the following questions will be used to educate voters, highlight trade issues and create voter guides. The Maine Fair Trade Campaign does not endorse candidates although some of our coalition partners do.

Views on Free Trade Agreements

1. How would you describe the overall effect of NAFTA on the U.S. economy?

Circle one: **Severely Damaging** **Damaging** **No Effect** **Somewhat Positive** **Positive**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Damaging	Severely Damaging
	NAFTA has caused more than a million jobs to leave the United States and move overseas and it has strengthened big corporations and highly paid executives at the expense of average Americans. Each year we have watched mills close in Maine, a result of NAFTA and NAFTA-style trade agreements that put workers and the environment last. While a few pocket industries have benefited, industries in Maine like pulp and paper have been strangled by the unfair competition.

2. If implemented, the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) would become the largest U.S. Free Trade Agreement ever, dwarfing NAFTA in its size and scope. Would you support or oppose the TPP if it failed to include binding standards based on the core International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions? (see attached documentation for more information on ILO Conventions)

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Oppose	Oppose
	We must ensure that all trade agreements contain binding labor standards and that the U.S. enforces those standards once trade agreements have been signed. These standards protect U.S. workers as well as workers abroad, so that nations do not accelerate a race to the bottom in workplace safety as companies

	compete for jobs.
--	-------------------

3. Do you support or oppose including “investor-state” dispute resolution within trade agreements? In its current form, the terms of “investor-state” dispute resolution allowing foreign corporations to challenge U.S. laws, regulations and court decisions in private tribunals that circumvent the U.S. judicial system? (see attached documentation for more information on “investor-state” dispute resolution)

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1 st CD – Chellie Pingree	2 nd CD – Emily Cain
Oppose	Oppose
	I am concerned that the current investor-state dispute resolution language in our trade agreements makes it possible for local and state laws to be overridden by foreign corporations. Control over our natural resources, like our water, should absolutely be local.

4. Do you support or oppose provisions in the TPP making it easier to lengthen drug patents, thereby delaying availability of generic medications?

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1 st CD – Chellie Pingree	2 nd CD – Emily Cain
Oppose	Oppose
	We should not allow drug companies to make huge profits on patented medicines at the expense of seniors on fixed incomes or taxpayers who fund Medicare and Medicaid.

Views on "Fast Track" Trade Promotion Authority

5. Would you support or oppose a request by the President to reestablish "fast track" trade promotion authority (or "smart track" trade promotion authority if it closely resembles fast track)? (see attached documentation for more information on "fast track" trade promotion)

Please Circle One: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Oppose	Oppose
	I oppose Fast Track. It's lazy legislating and it prevents members of Congress from reading and carefully considering trade deals before they're signed.

6. If elected, would you support or oppose strengthening Congress's role in determining trade policy by instituting a system that includes criteria set by Congress to determine appropriate negotiating partners, binding obligations regarding what must and must not be in future trade agreements, and the right for Congress to vote before an agreement is signed?

Please Circle One: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Support	Support
	Congress has not played a strong enough role in trade agreements negotiations, and as a result Maine people have not had a chance to weigh in on deals until the negotiations have already been completed.

Views on Public Procurement

7. If elected, would you support or oppose future trade policies that fail to explicitly allow for the United States, as well as states and municipalities, to adopt "Buy America" or "Buy Local" government procurement preferences?

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Oppose	Oppose
	"Buy American" policies have been a part of federal law since the 1930's, and I support provisions in future trade agreements that would continue to put a priority on American-made goods for federal procurement.

Views on Trade and the Environment

8. If elected, would you support including binding provisions to trade agreements that would prohibit trade of products harvested or exported in violation of state or national laws that protect wildlife, forest or marine resources?

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Support	Support
	While I would need to see the specifics of any legislation on this issue, in principle I believe that we should fight to preserve and protect our environment and that laws made at the local, state, or federal level should be respected.

Views on Consumer Safety

9. If elected, would you support or oppose requiring that imported food, toys and other products only be allowed to enter U.S. markets if they meet U.S. safety standards?

Please circle one: **Support** **Oppose**

Additional Comments:

RESPONSES	
1st CD – Chellie Pingree	2nd CD – Emily Cain
Support	Support
	U.S. consumers deserve to know that the products they use are safe, especially when it comes to food products and children’s toys. I would support common sense legislation to ensure that imports are held to the same safety standards as U.S.-made products.

These answers represent my beliefs, are part of the public record and may be used by the Maine Fair Trade Campaign to keep members and the public informed about trade issues.

Signature

Date

Thank you for your willingness to complete this questionnaire. We would like to act as a resource of information to you and your campaign, and look forward to working with you over the period of your candidacy, and thereafter.

REFERENCED DOCUMENTATION

Q2: International Labour Organization Conventions:

<http://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/conventions-and-recommendations/lang--en/index.htm>

Q3: Investor-State Dispute Resolution:

The World Bank's International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes has been given the authority to set the rules for dispute resolution regarding international trade agreements. Under these rules, foreign corporations are empowered to sue governments in closed foreign tribunals outside of domestic courts directly for cash compensation. If a corporation wins, the taxpayers of the "losing" FTA nation must foot the bill. If a company believes that a FTA government has violated these new investor rights and protections, it can initiate a binding dispute resolution process for monetary damages before a trade tribunal, offering none of the basic due process or openness guarantees afforded in national courts. These so-called "investor-to-state" cases are litigated in the special international arbitration bodies of the World Bank and the United Nations, which are closed to public participation, observation and input. A three-person panel composed of professional arbitrators listens to arguments in the case, with powers to award an unlimited amount of taxpayer dollars to corporations whose NAFTA investor privileges and rights they judge to have been impacted. Almost any government action, including non-discriminatory regulatory measures – local zoning laws, state court rulings, forestry laws, toxics bans have and can be challenged before trade tribunals bereft of due process guarantees or sovereign immunity shields. (<http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=3147>)

Please see the Maine Citizen Policy Commission's recent letter to United State Trade Representative Ron Kirk, on the issue of investor-state dispute resolution:

<http://www.maine.gov/legis/opla/ctpcletmarch132012.pdf>

Q5: Fast Track Authority:

Fast Track was a U.S. procedure established in the 1970s by President Nixon for negotiating trade agreements that concentrated power in the president's hands. It delegated to the executive branch Congress' exclusive constitutional authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations." In particular, Fast Track allowed the executive branch to select countries for, set the substance of, and then negotiate and sign trade agreements — all before Congress had a vote on the matter. Under Fast Track, normal congressional committee processes were circumvented and the executive branch was empowered to write lengthy implementing legislation for each pact on its own. These executive-authored bills altered wide swaths of U.S. law to conform domestic policy to each agreement's requirements. Moreover, Fast Track was unique in that it empowered the executive branch to force a congressional vote on such implementing legislation and the related agreement within a set amount of time. This system has been used to ram through Congress trade pacts that do not enjoy public support. Fast Track renewal was last slipped through Congress at midnight in 2002 by only two votes. On June 30, 2007, the current

grant of Fast Track, now called “Trade Promotion Authority” by its supporters, expired. Fast Track is not needed to approve trade agreements, a fact proven by the dozens of trade agreements that have been passed without its use. Fast Track unnecessarily creates a situation where negotiators cannot be held accountable by the public, and legislators are denied their constitutional authority to set the terms of trade agreements.

<http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=3147>)