

But the Democrats in Congress haven't been dealing with trade in a vacuum. We've been promoting this innovation agenda for some time. We have had legislation on the floor to try to enhance further fields of study in those crucial fields of math, science, engineering, technology, those fields that will enable our students and workers to be innovative and creative and develop into high-paying jobs that we hope to see here in the United States.

We've been moving that legislation forward, working with our Senate counterparts. We're trying to increase research investment in the National Institutes of Health, for instance, so we can be at the cutting edge of medical and scientific breakthroughs. All this is interwoven into the economic agenda the Democrats have been standing for that the New Democratic Coalition has been a big part of in helping to formulate that agenda.

That's, I think, the direction we need, and I think the American people want to hear that type of message and see that type of agenda. Our concern is there's a lot of economic anxiety throughout the country, and they want to know what their role is going to be in this global marketplace. Perhaps more importantly, they want to know what kind of future their children have to look forward to.

The Democrats for the first time have been able to get legislation to the floor that speaks to those needs, that starts speaking to those anxieties. Will it solve all those problems? No, but I think it's the best hope that we have to make sure that our country is well positioned to stay competitive globally.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I know we're concluding our hour, but I just think that's a great note, as New Democrats, for us to end on.

It is important for us to move forward on these trade agreements. I think all of us would say this is a major breakthrough for the Democrats to see this kind of labor and environmental standards and kind of enforcement and commitment to do that.

But the real question is, this is just a piece of the puzzle. This is only one part of it, and we're committed to a much broader agenda of making sure our young people are prepared for the future, that some of our slightly older people also have the enormous opportunities for new directions for them as well, and that our businesses can be competitive.

So we've a lot of work to do to making sure that our tax policy and our trade policy and our education and health care policies and energy policies all contribute to making sure that America has that economic capacity and opportunity for all of our people.

Mr. CUELLAR. Let me just make two points to conclude.

First one, let's talk about the Constitution. Why are these trade agreements different? Why are they going to be different; whether it's Peru, Colombia, Panama or Korea, why are they

going to be different? First of all, in the past, the President pretty much negotiated the agreement, and it was an up-or-down deal. This time, the Congress, through our leadership, through the New Democrats, we're asserting ourselves through the commerce clause. That is, we have the right to assert ourselves to make sure that we're part of the process so we can set up the framework. And this is why these trade agreements from now are going to have a different type of framework, because Congress is getting involved in the development of that trade policy, number one.

Number two, I will conclude with this. In 2005, the U.S. exports to the rest of the world totaled \$1.2 trillion. Think about that, \$1.2 trillion. Jobs have been created all across the country not only by big companies, but also by the medium and small companies.

Second of all, jobs that are directly linked to the export of goods pay 13 to 18 percent more than the other U.S. jobs. I have seen this personally in my hometown where we have this trading community. It works, and we have to stay engaged, and this is why this new framework that the New Democrats have developed along with our leadership will provide the pathway for new agreements in the future.

And thank you again for all the work that y'all have done.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Let me conclude with this.

Number one, I want to just compliment Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN. They have done a great job. I mean, it's something the Democrats have been asking for since the 1990s, I've been in Congress, to make sure it's been included in every trade bill. They've done a fantastic job to make sure that we protect environmental rights and labor rights, et cetera.

We care about those individuals that we know are going to be hurt, because in any agreement there are people that get hurt, and when we talk about we've got to do a real comprehensive program so people can be retrained and go back to work.

□ 2100

Now that's even more than just trade agreements, because, you know, if you check it out, really, more people have lost their jobs through efficiency and technology. Think about it.

How many people does it take to produce a car today than it did yesterday. When you need a telephone operator, does anyone pick up? It's technology that picks up the telephone. You know, EZPass, and all the conveniences that we currently have. We better do a better job.

I think that Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN have put that in that we will do a better job, and retraining Americans who are hurt, not only because of trade, but who are out of the job for any reason, whether it's technology or because of a trade agreement.

As Democrats, we are focused on that. We can do that. We can do good

by our folks at home, but we also can do good by the people abroad so that we can be the leaders of the Nation. We are the world's only super power.

Mr. KIND. I also want to commend JIM MCCREERY, who is ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Republican colleagues on Ways and Means who are also embracing this template to go forward on trade agreements. But as Chairman RANGEL reminded all of us today in caucus, this new template doesn't commit any single member on future trade agreements. We will still have the opportunity to review them when the President formally submits them for our consideration. We will see if they are the best deal struck for our Nation and for our constituents' best interest.

I think now, with this agreement, the template is finally shaping up to where we can get wider bipartisan support. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done. We can't hold this out as the silver bullet to the challenges that our workers are experiencing day in and day out, but trade is going to be an important part of our economic equation, whether we like it or not, because of the effects of global warming and the ease of transporting goods and products, services, across borders, all that is breaking down.

The question is, whether we roll up in a fetal position and pretend it's not happening and try to pursue neo-isolationist policies, or whether we embrace this change and try to make the changes that we have to, to be in the best position to stay competitive.

That's really, I think, what the discussion will be about in the coming weeks when we start analyzing these trade agreements coming forward. I want to thank my colleagues for taking some time this evening to discuss a very important issue on the floor. Hopefully, we will have some more discussions in the future.

Mr. CROWLEY. Let me close by just saying thank you, thank you to the gentlelady of Ohio for chairing this hour of debate, as well as all my colleagues for being here this evening and participating in this free-flowing discussion on this new template.

This new template, as we go forward, it really is a new day in terms of trade negotiations, and the relationship between the minority and the majority here in the House of Representatives, the comity that has now been brought back, I think, to the Ways and Means Committee, to the House in some respects. Hopefully, this can be an example of other things we can work on in the future on behalf of all of our constituents, again, Democrat, Republican, Independent and the like, to move the agenda of America forward.

I want to thank each of my colleagues for participating this evening.

PATRIOTISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SUTTON). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, for some, patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. For others, it means dissent against a government's abuse of the people's rights.

I have never met a politician in Washington or any American, for that matter, who chose to be called unpatriotic. Nor have I met anyone who did not believe he wholeheartedly supported our troops, wherever they may be.

What I have heard all too frequently from the various individuals are sharp accusations that, because their political opponents disagree with them on the need for foreign military entanglements, they were unpatriotic, un-American evildoers deserving contempt.

The original American patriots were those individuals brave enough to resist with force the oppressive power of King George. I accept the definition of patriotism as that effort to resist oppressive state power.

The true patriot is motivated by a sense of responsibility and out of self-interest for himself, his family, and the future of his country to resist government abuse of power. He rejects the notion that patriotism means obedience to the state. Resistance need not be violent, but the civil disobedience that might be required involves confrontation with the state and invites possible imprisonment.

Peaceful, nonviolent revolutions against tyranny have been every bit as successful as those involving military confrontation. Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., achieved great political successes by practicing nonviolence, and yet they suffered physically at the hands of the state. But whether the resistance against government tyrants is nonviolent or physically violent, the effort to overthrow state oppression qualifies as true patriotism.

True patriotism today has gotten a bad name, at least from the government and the press. Those who now challenge the unconstitutional methods of imposing an income tax on us, or force us to use a monetary system designed to serve the rich at the expense of the poor are routinely condemned. These American patriots are sadly looked down upon by many. They are never praised as champions of liberty as Gandhi and Martin Luther King have been.

Liberals, who withhold their taxes as a protest against war, are vilified as well, especially by conservatives. Unquestioned loyalty to the state is especially demanded in times of war. Lack of support for a war policy is said to be unpatriotic. Arguments against a particular policy that endorses a war, once it is started, are always said to be endangering the troops in the field. This, they blatantly claim, is unpatriotic, and all dissent must stop. Yet, it is dis-

sent from government policies that defines the true patriot and champion of liberty.

It is conveniently ignored that the only authentic way to best support the troops is to keep them out of danger's undeclared no-win wars that are politically inspired. Sending troops off to war for reasons that are not truly related to national security and, for that matter, may even damage our security, is hardly a way to patriotically support the troops.

Who are the true patriots, those who conform or those who protest against wars without purpose? How can it be said that blind support for a war, no matter how misdirected the policy, is the duty of a patriot?

Randolph Bourne said that, "War is the health of the state." With war, he argued, the state thrives. Those who believe in the powerful state see war as an opportunity. Those who mistrust the people and the market for solving problems have no trouble promoting a "war psychology" to justify the expansive role of the state. This includes the role the Federal Government plays in our lives, as well as in our economic transactions.

Certainly, the neoconservative belief that we have a moral obligation to spread American values worldwide through force justifies the conditions of war in order to rally support at home for the heavy hand of government. It is through this policy, it should surprise no one, that our liberties are undermined. The economy becomes overextended, and our involvement worldwide becomes prohibited. Out of fear of being labeled unpatriotic, most of the citizens become compliant and accept the argument that some loss of liberty is required to fight the war in order to remain safe.

This is a bad trade-off, in my estimation, especially when done in the name of patriotism. Loyalty to the state and to autocratic leaders is substituted for true patriotism, that is, a willingness to challenge the state and defend the country, the people and the culture. The more difficult the times, the stronger the admonition comes that the leaders be not criticized.

Because the crisis atmosphere of war supports the growth of the state, any problem invites an answer by declaring war, even on social and economic issues. This elicits patriotism in support of various government solutions, while enhancing the power of the state. Faith in government coercion and a lack of understanding of how free societies operate encourages big government liberals and big government conservatives to manufacture a war psychology to demand political loyalty for domestic policy just as is required in foreign affairs.

The long-term cost in dollars spent and liberties lost is neglected as immediate needs are emphasized. It is for this reason that we have multiple perpetual wars going on simultaneously. Thus, the war on drugs, the war

against gun ownership, the war against poverty, the war against illiteracy, the war against terrorism, as well as our foreign military entanglements are endless.

All this effort promotes the growth of statism at the expense of liberty. A government designed for a free society should do the opposite, prevent the growth of statism and preserve liberty.

Once a war of any sort is declared, the message is sent out not to object or you will be declared unpatriotic. Yet, we must not forget that the true patriot is the one who protests in spite of the consequences. Condemnation or ostracism or even imprisonment may result.

Nonviolent protesters of the Tax Code are frequently imprisoned, whether they are protesting the code's unconstitutionality or the war that the tax revenues are funding. Resisters to the military draft or even to Selective Service registration are threatened and imprisoned for challenging this threat to liberty.

Statism depends on the idea that the government owns us and citizens must obey. Confiscating the fruits of our labor through the income tax is crucial to the health of the state. The draft, or even the mere existence of the Selective Service, emphasizes that we will march off to war at the state's pleasure.

A free society rejects all notions of involuntary servitude, whether by draft or the confiscation of the fruits of our labor through the personal income tax. A more sophisticated and less well-known technique for enhancing the state is the manipulation and transfer of wealth through the fiat monetary system operated by the secretive Federal Reserve.

Protesters against this unconstitutional system of paper money are considered unpatriotic criminals and at times are imprisoned for their beliefs. The fact that, according to the Constitution, only gold and silver are legal tender and paper money outlawed matters little. The principle of patriotism is turned on its head. Whether it's with regard to the defense of welfare spending at home, confiscatory income tax, or an immoral monetary system or support for a war fought under false pretense without a legal declaration, the defenders of liberty and the Constitution are portrayed as unpatriotic, while those who support these programs are seen as the patriots.

If there is a war going on, supporting the state's effort to win the war is expected at all costs, no dissent. The real problem is that those who love the state too often advocate policies that lead to military action. At home, they are quite willing to produce a crisis atmosphere and claim a war is needed to solve the problem. Under these conditions, the people are more willing to bear the burden of paying for the war and to carelessly sacrifice liberties which they are told is necessary.

The last 6 years have been quite beneficial to the health of the state, which

comes at the expense of personal liberty. Every enhanced unconstitutional power of the state can only be achieved at the expense of individual liberty. Even though in every war in which we have been engaged civil liberties have suffered, some have been restored after the war ended, but never completely. That has resulted in a steady erosion of our liberties over the past 200 years. Our government was originally designed to protect our liberties, but it has now, instead, become the usurper of those liberties.

We currently live in the most difficult of times for guarding against an expanding central government with a steady erosion of our freedoms. We are continually being reminded that 9/11 has changed everything.

Unfortunately, the policy that needed most to be changed, that is our policy of foreign interventionism, has only been expanded. There is no pretense any longer that a policy of humility in foreign affairs, without being the world's policemen and engaging in nation building, is worthy of consideration.

□ 2115

We now live in a post-9/11 America where our government is going to make us safe no matter what it takes. We are expected to grin and bear it and adjust to every loss of our liberties in the name of patriotism and security.

Though the majority of Americans initially welcomed the declared effort to make us safe, and we are willing to sacrifice for the cause, more and more Americans are now becoming concerned about civil liberties being needlessly and dangerously sacrificed.

The problem is that the Iraq war continues to drag on, and a real danger of it spreading exists. There is no evidence that a truce will soon be signed in Iraq or in the war on terror or the war on drugs. Victory is not even definable. If Congress is incapable of declaring an official war, it is impossible to know when it will end. We have been fully forewarned that the world conflict in which we are now engaged will last a long, long time.

The war mentality and the pervasive fear of an unidentified enemy allows for a steady erosion of our liberties, and, with this, our respect for self-reliance and confidence is lost. Just think of the self-sacrifice and the humiliation we go through at the airport screening process on a routine basis. Though there is no scientific evidence of any likelihood of liquids and gels being mixed on an airplane to make a bomb, billions of dollars are wasted throwing away toothpaste and hair spray, and searching old women in wheelchairs.

Our enemies say, boo, and we jump, we panic, and then we punish ourselves. We are worse than a child being afraid of the dark. But in a way, the fear of indefinable terrorism is based on our inability to admit the truth about why there is a desire by a small

number of angry radical Islamists to kill Americans. It is certainly not because they are jealous of our wealth and freedoms.

We fail to realize that the extremists, willing to sacrifice their own lives to kill their enemies, do so out of a sense of weakness and desperation over real and perceived attacks on their way of life, their religion, their country, and their natural resources. Without the conventional diplomatic or military means to retaliate against these attacks, and an unwillingness of their own government to address the issue, they resort to the desperation tactic of suicide terrorism. Their anger toward their own governments, which they believe are coconspirators with the American Government, is equal to or greater than that directed toward us.

These errors in judgment in understanding the motive of the enemy and the constant fear that is generated have brought us to this crisis where our civil liberties and privacy are being steadily eroded in the name of preserving national security.

We may be the economic and the military giant of the world, but the effort to stop this war on our liberties here at home in the name of patriotism is being lost.

The erosion of our personal liberties started long before 9/11, but 9/11 accelerated the process. There are many things that motivate those who pursue this course, both well-intentioned and malevolent, but it would not happen if the people remained vigilant, understood the importance of individual rights, and were unpersuaded that a need for security justifies the sacrifice for liberty, even if it is just now and then.

The true patriot challenges the state when the state embarks on enhancing its power at the expense of the individual. Without a better understanding and a greater determination to rein in the state, the rights of Americans that resulted from the revolutionary break from the British and the writing of the Constitution will disappear.

The record since September 11th is dismal. Respect for liberty has rapidly deteriorated. Many of the new laws passed after 9/11 had, in fact, been proposed long before that attack. The political atmosphere after that attack simply made it more possible to pass such legislation. The fear generated by 9/11 became an opportunity for those seeking to promote the power of the state domestically, just as it served to falsely justify the long plan for invasion of Iraq.

The war mentality was generated by the Iraq war in combination with the constant drumbeat of fear at home. Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, who is now likely residing in Pakistan, our supposed ally, are ignored, as our troops fight and die in Iraq and are made easier targets for the terrorists in their backyard. While our leaders constantly use the mess we created to further justify the erosion of our con-

stitutional rights here at home, we forget about our own borders and support the inexorable move toward global government, hardly a good plan for America.

The accelerated attacks on liberty started quickly after 9/11. Within weeks, the PATRIOT Act was overwhelmingly passed by Congress. Though the final version was unavailable up to a few hours before the vote, no Member had sufficient time. Political fear of not doing something, even something harmful, drove the Members of Congress to not question the contents, and just voted for it. A little less freedom for a little more perceived safety was considered a fair trade-off, and the majority of Americans applauded.

The PATRIOT Act, though, severely eroded the system of checks and balances by giving the government the power to spy on law-abiding citizens without judicial supervision. The several provisions that undermine the liberties of all Americans include sneak-and-peek searches, a broadened and more vague definition of domestic terrorism, allowing the FBI access to libraries and bookstore records without search warrants or probable cause, easier FBI initiation of wiretaps and searches, as well as roving wiretaps, easier access to information on American citizens' use of the Internet, and easier access to e-mail and financial records of all American citizens.

The attack on privacy has not relented over the past 6 years. The Military Commissions Act is a particularly egregious piece of legislation and, if not repealed, will change America for the worse as the powers unconstitutionally granted to the executive branch are used and abused. This act grants excessive authority to use secretive military commissions outside of places where active hostilities are going on. The Military Commissions Act permits torture, arbitrary detention of American citizens as unlawful enemy combatants at the full discretion of the President and without the right of habeas corpus, and warrantless searches by the NSA. It also gives to the President the power to imprison individuals based on secret testimony.

Since 9/11, Presidential signing statements designating portions of legislation that the President does not intend to follow, though not legal under the Constitution, have enormously multiplied. Unconstitutional Executive Orders are numerous and mischievous and need to be curtailed.

Extraordinary rendition to secret prisons around the world have been widely engaged in, though obviously extralegal.

A growing concern in the post-9/11 environment is the Federal Government's list of potential terrorists based on secret evidence. Mistakes are made, and sometimes it is virtually impossible to get one's name removed even though the accused is totally innocent of any wrongdoing.

A national ID card is now in the process of being implemented. It is called the REAL ID card, and it is tied to our Social Security numbers and our State driver's license. If REAL ID is not stopped, it will become a national driver's license ID for all Americans. We will be required to carry our papers.

Some of the least noticed and least discussed changes in the law were the changes made to the Insurrection Act of 1807 and to posse comitatus by the Defense Authorization Act of 2007. These changes pose a threat to the survival of our Republic by giving the President the power to declare martial law for as little reason as to restore public order. The 1807 act severely restricted the President in his use of the military within the United States borders, and the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 strengthened these restrictions with strict oversight by Congress. The new law allows the President to circumvent the restrictions of both laws. The Insurrection Act has now become the "Enforcement of the Laws to Restore Public Order Act." This is hardly a title that suggests that the authors cared about or understood the nature of a constitutional Republic.

Now, martial law can be declared not just for insurrection, but also for natural disasters, public health reasons, terrorist attacks or incidents, or for the vague reason called "other conditions." The President can call up the National Guard without congressional approval or the Governors' approval, and even send these State Guard troops into other States.

The American Republic is in remnant status. The stage is set for our country eventually devolving into a military dictatorship, and few seem to care. These precedent-setting changes in the law are extremely dangerous and will change American jurisprudence forever if not revised. The beneficial results of our revolt against the King's abuses are about to be eliminated, and few Members of Congress and few Americans are aware of the seriousness of the situation. Complacency and fear drive our legislation without any serious objection by our elected leaders. Sadly, though, those few who do object to this self-evident trend away from personal liberty and empire building overseas are portrayed as unpatriotic and uncaring.

Though welfare and socialism always fails, opponents of them are said to lack compassion. Though opposition to totally unnecessary war should be the only moral position, the rhetoric is twisted to claim that patriots who oppose the war are not supporting the troops. The cliché "Support the Troops" is incessantly used as a substitute for the unacceptable notion of supporting the policy, no matter how flawed it may be.

Unsound policy can never help the troops. Keeping the troops out of harm's way and out of wars unrelated to our national security is the only real way of protecting the troops. With

this understanding, just who can claim the title of "patriot"?

Before the war in the Middle East spreads and becomes a world conflict for which we will be held responsible, or the liberties of all Americans become so suppressed we can no longer resist, much has to be done. Time is short, but our course of action should be clear. Resistance to illegal and unconstitutional usurpation of our rights is required. Each of us must choose which course of action we should take: education, conventional political action, or even peaceful civil disobedience to bring about necessary changes.

But let it not be said that we did nothing. Let not those who love the power of the welfare/warfare state label the dissenters of authoritarianism as unpatriotic or uncaring. Patriotism is more closely linked to dissent than it is to conformity and a blind desire for safety and security. Understanding the magnificent rewards of a free society makes us unashamed in its promotion, fully realizing that maximum wealth is created and the greatest chance for peace comes from a society respectful of individual liberty.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, a tsunami of illegal aliens is sweeping into our country, crowding our classrooms, closing our hospital emergency rooms, unleashing violent crime, and driving down wages.

This is not theory. It is a harsh, threatening reality borne out not by numerous academic studies, but by the life experiences of the American families from California to Georgia and from Iowa to New Jersey.

Our middle class is being destroyed. Our communities are not safe. Our social service infrastructure is collapsing. And, yes, it has everything to do with illegal immigration, illegal immigration which is out of control. And year after year, while our schools deteriorate and our jails fill and our hospital emergency rooms shut down, the elite in this country turns a blind eye to the disaster that is befalling the rest of us, their fellow Americans. The elites obscure the issue and maneuver to keep in place policies that reward illegal immigrants with jobs and benefits, and now, of course, being rewarded with citizenship.

This country, the upper class says, can't function without cheap labor.

□ 2130

Well, cheap to the captains of industry and the political elite, but painfully expensive to America's middle class. It's our kids whose education is being diminished, our families who are paying thousands more in health insur-

ance to make up for the hospital costs of giving free service to illegals. It's our neighborhoods who suffer from crime perpetuated by criminals transported here from other countries. And, yes, our livelihoods are being dragged down as wages are depressed and anchored down by a constant influx of immigrants, mostly illegal, some with H1B visas, willing to work at a pittance.

Big business, with its hold on the GOP, in an unholy alliance with the liberal left coalition that controls the Democratic Party, have been responsible for this invasion of our country, this attack on the well-being of our people. This coalition gives the jobs and passes out the benefits that lured tens of millions of illegals to our country. It's no accident. This predicament was predictable. It's been over 20 years of bad policy in the making. If you give jobs and benefits, the masses of people over there will do anything to get over here. And that's what we've been doing. Give it and they will come. Surprise, surprise.

Now the out-of-touch elite has introduced yet another piece of legislation, this so-called comprehensive reform bill that they claim will fix our illegal immigration crisis once and for all. Of course, this is a crisis they created. They are trumpeting the supposedly new enforcement measures and security measures that will be initiated in this bill, the border fence, new agents, new employer sanctions, if only we will swallow hard and give amnesty to those law-breakers who are already here.

Like Lucy holding out the football for Charlie Brown to kick, the bill is yet another effort to trick us. It's an illusion, a scam that will make things worse, not better.

The Senate legislation now being touted by Senator KENNEDY and a few Republican Senators immediately legalizes the status of 15 to 20 million illegals, while offering more border control, yes, fences and Border Patrol agents and such, as sweeteners aimed at getting us to accept this deal.

But we've already passed legislation addressing border security. It's already into law. It's already against the law, for example, to hire illegals. We've already mandated a stronger fence and more Border Patrol agents. So, in reality, this legislation isn't about those other things which they're trying to get us to support the legislation about; this is only about legalizing the status of 15 to 20 million illegals and then finding new ways to get more immigrants into our country. It has nothing to do with controlling the flow of illegals and controlling the flow of immigrants into our country, as much as it is expanding the number of immigrants, legal and illegal, coming into our country.

In such situations as we find ourselves in today with this legislation, it's fashionable on Capitol Hill to say "the devil is in the details". And this