

That means more Americans, more American jobs are exported, more American job losses, and that is bad news not just for manufacturing and the people that own those companies; it is bad news for American workers, it is bad news for our communities, it is bad news for our schools and our families.

And if we really want to talk about American values, then we ought to be talking about what these trade agreements do to our children, do to our families, what they do to the school systems, what they do to police and fire protection, school districts, police districts and fire districts; and cities lose more and more tax revenue.

The fact is the promises of the Central American Free Trade Agreement are again the same as they were under NAFTA, the same as they were under China trade, the same as they were under the legislation setting up the World Trade Organization. But what we see time and time again is more trade deficit, more hemorrhaging of American jobs.

Now, when they talk about CAFTA, the six countries in Central America that this trade agreement involves with the United States under that, the entire economies of these six countries are equal to the economy of Columbus, Ohio or the State of Kansas, or Orlando, Florida. Their buying power is such in those countries, those six countries, as poor as they are, and as small as they are, they simply do not have the buying power to buy American products. Guatemalans and Nicaraguans and the people in Honduras and Costa Rica and El Salvador simply do not have the money to buy cars manufactured in Ohio, or steel made in West Virginia. They do not have the purchasing power to buy textiles and apparel from Georgia, South Carolina, from North Carolina.

They do not have the money or the purchasing power or the income to buy software from Seattle or high-tech products from California. Madam Speaker, what this trade agreement is about is what all of these trade agreements are about: they are about cheap labor, no environmental regulation, weak worker safety laws. We need to vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

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

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

NO EARMARKS IN HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the House Appropriations Committee floated a trial balloon in some of the newspapers that cover Congress. They indicated that they might allow earmarks into this year's appropriation bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Not surprisingly, the announcement has elicited little reaction outside the Beltway where Americans pay little attention to the arcane ins and outs of congressional appropriation bills.

The same cannot be said for K Street where lobbyists can barely contain their glee at the prospect of another appropriations bill to fill with earmarks. By opening up the door to earmarks in the homeland security appropriations bill, we are opening a Pandora's box of government waste, pork-barrel spending, and weakened homeland security.

In the 2 years since its inception, the Homeland Security appropriations bill has been free of earmarks. House leaders have recognized that something as important as the bill funding national security agencies ought to be absent of earmarks.

□ 2230

I am puzzled as to why we now suddenly believe that earmarking homeland security funds is an acceptable practice. There are a number of reasons why earmarks would corrupt the homeland security appropriations process, but unquestionably the most serious is that it would jeopardize our national security.

A few months ago defense analysts complained, the news that earmarks in the defense appropriations bill had put the lives of our troops at risk. They argue that congressional earmarks had drained the pot of available money for supplies like body armor or Humvee armor for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. You can be sure that earmarking homeland security funds will have the same effect.

The Congress created the Department of Homeland Security to assess domestic threats to our country and address them. Now, after only 2 years of funding the department, Congress believes it knows how best to allocate these funds. Congressional oversight of this department is vital and that is why congressional earmarking is so dangerous.

Homeland security earmarks are also sure to slip down the pork barrel slope so many other appropriations bills have gone down. It will not be long before Members are inserting earmarks for projects with only a modest relevance to homeland security. A first responders hall of fame project, for example, or a port security museum. The possibilities are as endless as appropriators' imaginations.

Anyone who believes that such a scenario is a stretch needs only to give a cursory look at the more than 4,000 earmarks in this year's transportation bill. Members will be hard pressed to

vote against a bill intended to protect our national security even if it is over budget or stuffed with pork. For that reason, lobbyists will view it as a must-pass vehicle for earmarks.

Adding earmarks to the homeland security appropriations bill is clearly bad policy, but I also believe that for Republicans it is bad politics as well. The earmarking process was abused by the Democrats, but I am sad to say that during Republican control of Congress we have made it much worse. It is no wonder that the Republican Party, the party of fiscal constraint since the New Deal, has seen public trust in its ability to balance the books evaporate.

For the most part, Americans no longer believe that Republicans are more fiscally prudent than Democrats. I cannot say that I blame them. Every Republican who values serving in the majority should be troubled by this trend.

Further, I worry that by opening up the homeland security bill to earmarks, we would let public distrust of our handling of fiscal issues spill over into national security. While it may be hard to tell the difference between Republicans and Democrats on spending, there is still a very real difference when it comes to national security. It would be a shame to let our growing appetite for earmarks jeopardize our ability to lead on national security.

Just how far Republicans have strayed for limited government orthodoxy was apparent recently when a current Member of this body ran for reelection a decade after he had first been in this body. He told of being approached by legions of lobbyists and local officials, each wanting to know how he would proceed to help them get earmarks for local projects. But I am a Republican, was his response. We know, was their retort.

What a sad commentary this is on our party.

I was elected to Congress with aspirations higher than groveling from crumbs that fall from appropriators' tables. I suspect that this is the case with each of my colleagues. Yet, we are quickly approaching a point where that would simply be an apt description of our jobs.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reverse course. To do so, we need to shoot down this trial balloon. The last thing we need to do is open up the \$32 billion fund, the Homeland Security bill to pork barrel spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. ANDREWS

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I pay tribute to a close personal friend, a mentor, a dedicated public servant and a respected attorney, Robert E. "Bob" Andrews of Gainesville, Georgia.

Bob was many things to many people: a devoted husband who was always concerned about Katherine's welfare; a proud father whose home and office were decorated with pictures of his children; a decorated war hero who remained a patriot in the defense of freedom; a skilled attorney whose advice and counsel were sought by many; a legislator who brought leadership and insight to the Georgia General Assembly. But, above all, he was a caring and compassionate southern gentleman.

Bob Andrews was a man of faith. His faith in God was the earnest money for his blessings of family, friends and health. His faith in himself was the manifestation of a purpose-centered life.

Bob liked to laugh. He could always tell a funny story from his early years as a practicing attorney when the courtroom was the focal point for community entertainment. It was in that environment that he honed his skills in cross-examination and oral argument.

Bob was a true student of the law, who loved and respected its discipline. His library table was always piled high with appellate reports that reflected his meticulous attention to the details of his profession. He valued knowledge, political dialogue and common courtesy.

Bob Andrews was a kind person. In a profession that is often noted for its viciousness, Bob was an attorney whose most severe rebuke of someone would come when he would wrinkle up his nose and simply say, "He just should not have done that."

As the passage of years and declining of health took its toll on his mobility, he never lost his sharp mind, except on one occasion when I visited him for a second time at the hospital. I commented that this was a different room than on my prior visit. Bob laughed and said that all hospital rooms looked the same to him.

I am thankful that he did not have to spend more time there.

The psalmist described a blessed man, in part, is one who is like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth fruit in his season. Bob Andrews was a blessed man who, in turn, blessed us as he shared the fruits of his labor and allowed us to learn and grow in the shade of his branches.

If God allows lawyers into heaven, and I believe he does, Bob Andrews is there regaling the saints with his exploits and humorous commentary on his passage through this life; and God must be smiling as he listens to a good man who did his best.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENERGY PLAN FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, what a day we have had here in the House. We have talked about energy policy. And having an energy bill come to the floor of this House is something that we have waited for for quite a period of time.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and our colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. As we have had this occur today, it has been quite an effort. Our Energy Committee, last week we talked about it earlier in the week and we talked about it the past week. We had about a third of the Democrats in the House join us in voting that bill out of committee last week. They did it because it is a good bill. And they did it because it is time for us to have an energy bill, and it is the right step in the right way at this point in time.

I know that we have some across the aisle, many who are going to follow the liberal leadership there and walk in lockstep with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), but I think we are going to see more of the House Democrats join us to make this energy bill a reality for the American people.

I would like to remind my colleagues that over the last few weeks we have seen quite a bit of bipartisan support on some of our legislation. We had 122 Democrats vote with us on the continuity of government bill, 50 Democrats voted with us on the class action bill, 73 Democrats voted with the Republicans on bankruptcy reform, and 42 supported our repeal of the death tax and the REAL I.D. Act.

So we look forward tomorrow to having our Democrat colleagues from across the aisle join us as we move forward on our Nation's energy policy.

We have several Members who have joined us tonight to talk about energy and to talk about energy policy. One of those is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and I would like to yield some time to the gentleman to talk with us about the energy bill. I also want to thank the gentleman for the wonderful leadership that he has shown on this bill.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

I think this week and this day and tomorrow are probably two of the most important days to the youth of our country because we are discussing an energy bill, an energy bill that might just lay out what their future might be. If I had a youngster who was a sophomore in high school, a junior or maybe a senior, I would be very concerned about their future if we do not solve our energy problems.