

to do their job. But yet they are there and they are willing to do their job, and they are proud to be American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, bless their families, bless the job that they are doing for this world to bring peace. I ask God for the families that have lost loved ones, that they be remembered with our blessings and prayers.

With that I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

FAILED TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a one-sided plan to benefit multinational corporations at the expense of the United States and Central American workers, small farmers, and small business people. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration has been ratified by Congress within 60 days of its signing.

But CAFTA has languished in Congress for nearly 1 year. Why? Because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends both Republicans and Democrats. Just look at what has happened with our trade policy. In 1992, the year I first ran for Congress, was elected later that year, that year our trade deficit, meaning the amount of dollars we imported versus exported, our trade deficit was \$38 billion in 1992. Last year in 2004, it was \$618 billion. It is hard to argue our trade policy is working when the deficit goes from \$38 billion to \$618 billion in just 12 years.

Opponents to the Central American Free Trade Agreement know it is an extension of NAFTA, which clearly did not work for our country. It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans, more manufacturing done in the United States, it will mean more economic prosperity and profits for U.S. companies. It will mean a rising standard of living in the developing world; it will mean more involvement, a higher standard of living in the developing world, and more workers working.

□ 1945

But it never works that way. So now they are trying this year because our trade policy clearly is not working, those promises every year, every trade agreement, never pan out.

This year the administration is tying the Central American Free Trade Agreement, saying it is not just going to ensure growth, it is going to help democracy in the developing world. Both Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld have said CAFTA will help in

the war on terror, but 10 years of the North American Free Trade Agreement has done nothing to improve border security between Mexico and the United States, so that argument simply does not sell.

So they tried something else. Last week the U.S. Chamber of Commerce flew six Central American presidents around our country hoping they might be able to sell CAFTA. They went to Albuquerque, they went to Los Angeles, they went to Cincinnati, Ohio, in my State, trying to convince the media, trying to convince the public, trying to convince Members of Congress that CAFTA was a good idea.

Again they failed. The Costa Rican president after the trip announced his country would not ratify CAFTA unless an independent commission could determine the agreement will not hurt the working poor in his country.

The most powerful Republican in the House, Majority Leader TOM DELAY, even promised a vote on CAFTA by Memorial Day to try to drum up support in Congress. As you can see by this calendar, we are barely a week away from that deadline, the deadline to vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, set by Majority Leader Tom DeLay, the most powerful Republican in this Chamber. Echoed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, BILL THOMAS, they said there would be a vote by the end of this month. That is the 1-year anniversary of CAFTA. Remember, every other trade agreement was voted on within 2 months. This one has been a year. As you can see by the calendar, it has simply not happened. That is again because of the failures of NAFTA.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined more than 150 business groups and labor organizations saying vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Last week, more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the U.S. Capitol delivered the same message, vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, because Republicans and Democrats, labor and business, know what the administration refuses to admit, that CAFTA is about one thing. It is not about more manufacturing in the United States. It is not about creating jobs in the United States. It is one thing only. It is access to cheap Central American labor.

That is why CAFTA, like NAFTA, is not a trade agreement, it is an outsourcing agreement. It will move more American jobs offshore. It will mean more profits for large businesses and more hurt for small businesses, more hurt for small farmers. Congress must throw out this dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA and negotiate a trade agreement that will lift up workers in Central America.

When students such as those I met with today at Longfellow Elementary School in Lorain, Ohio, are guaranteed good-paying jobs when they graduate

from high school, then we will know finally our trade policy is working.

JUDICIAL NOMINEES

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time in the life of America. Our colleagues in the United States Senate are imminently approaching a crossroads that will forever impact the future of this Republic. They will choose the road that will restore the constitutional balance of power that our Founding Fathers so carefully constructed, or they will travel down that path that rewards a shameless behavior that has deliberately injured this delicate balance by transferring the executive power of judicial appointment to the legislative minority.

The Constitution's advice and consent has been twisted into mockery by the Senate minority. Men and women of outstanding character have come forth as judicial nominees to be undeservedly maligned, smeared, ridiculed and then left in nominations limbo indefinitely by this unprecedented, unconstitutional and outrageous judicial filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, this is a show of disregard and contempt for the world's flagship of freedom and toward her people and toward the time-honored principles of the United States Senate. We will recapture the civility that once presided over judicial appointments or we will forever surrender what Abraham Lincoln called "the angels of our better nature" to this bitterly partisan tactic that threatens the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States to appoint good, decent and honorable men and women to the Federal judiciary.

Advice and consent is clearly written in the United States Constitution. This judicial filibuster to prevent a fair up-or-down vote is neither advice nor consent and, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the United States Constitution. Never before 2003, in 214 years of U.S. Senate deliberations, has any judicial nomination supported by the majority of the Senate been denied a fair up-or-down vote. Yet the minority would have the public believe that the majority is the one trying to change the rules here, calling it the nuclear option. It is the Senate minority, Mr. Speaker, that has launched this unprecedented, quote, nuclear option by devastating the constitutionally required just consideration of judicial nominees duly appointed by the President of the United States.

What the majority seeks is the constitutional option that is totally in keeping with 214 years of the rules, traditions and dignity of the United States Senate. Senate Democrats have strongly and arrogantly and openly

threatened to shut down the operations of the government if Republicans insist on the constitutional option. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is far better to let the Democrats shut down this government temporarily than it is to allow them to shut down this Republic permanently.

In this critical struggle for the future of this Republic, one of two things will occur. Either the time-honored and tested provision of advice and consent, written in the Constitution, will prevail or unprecedented judicial filibuster and obstructionism will take its place and become the tragic legacy of these days.

Mr. Speaker, I should not have to remind my Republican colleagues that the people who have entrusted us with this majority have spoken with resounding voice on the issue of judicial nominations. They hear it and I hear it everywhere I go. The people of America have a profound sense of fair play and they are tired of some of their United States Senators cowering behind a distorted version of the true and impeccable auspices of the United States Senate. The people want their Senators to have the courage to take a stand on judicial nominations. The people want a fair up-or-down vote on judges, Mr. Speaker, and they will remember those who have the courage to do so and, sir, they will remember those who did not.

The people understand how important this really is. They understand that it is truly about the Constitution itself, and they innately embrace the core message of those magnificent words by Daniel Webster when he said, "Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution, and to the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world."

Mr. Speaker, the stakes could not be higher and this Republic truly hangs in the balance. We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to pass this miracle of the American constitutional Republic on to future generations that are yet to be. We owe it to the American people, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to those future generations and we owe it to that vision of human freedom that our forefathers risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to entrust to us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail.

INNOVATION CRISIS IS A HOMELAND SECURITY ISSUE

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, this week we are considering legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security. These are necessary, important pieces of legislation, two bills we are taking up, that will help protect our

homeland from terrorist threats and make the type of investments we need to make in areas of our airports, ports, roads, chemical facilities and nuclear facilities. Overall the homeland security bill funding will increase by 4 percent.

But while we are focused on defending ourselves from terrorists here in the United States and fighting terrorists in Iraq, one has to wonder whether we are not missing some other threats that are looming on the horizon that America must protect themselves. Friday in the New York Times, Tom Friedman mentioned that the University of Illinois recently tied for 17th place in the world finals of a major computer competition. That is the university that also helped develop the Internet.

Seventeenth was the best of any U.S. university and the worst we have done in 29 years of the competition. Who was number one? Shanghai, China. Second place and third place were won, respectively, by Moscow State University and St. Petersburg Institute of Fine Mechanics and Optics. The last time an American university won the competition was 1997. I do not think I have to remind anyone here that the modern computer and the field of computer science was invented here in the United States, and yet the best we can do is 17th. But it is not just in computers and the computer competition that America's place in the world has fallen.

Last year, the Chinese produced 160,000 more engineers than we did. Nearly 40 percent of all the U.S. jobs in a science or technology field that require a Ph.D. are filled by foreigners, up from 25 percent in just 15 years. We now rank below 13 other countries, including Japan, South Korea and Germany, in the percentage of 24-year-olds with a college degree in science and engineering. That is down from third place just 25 years ago.

And according to the National Science Teachers Association, just 26 percent of recent high school graduates scored high enough on their ACT science test to have a good chance of completing a first-year college science course.

I say all this because it is about the foundation and this competition and this area that is going to lay the groundwork for whether America keeps its economic and competitive edge with the rest of the world. What would you think if that was the type of threat that you saw coming to the United States? What type of preparation would you do? We know what we are doing on homeland security. We created a new department. We are increasing its funding. What do we do as it relates to this type of falling down and declining percentages of Americans leading in the area of science and technology?

The recent budget we passed here cuts basic research by 13 percent. It cuts applied research by 15 percent. Investments in research facilities and

equipment are cut by 68 percent. We have to rely on Russians to service the International Space Station because we are cutting basic research funding at NASA by 7 percent. We are cutting the funding for the Department of Education. State grants for innovative education programs were cut by \$100 million. Funding for the improvement of postsecondary education was gutted by \$140 million.

These are not the type of priorities that understand the threat to the United States economic future and the type of global economy and global competition this country is facing. We are living on past times and on borrowed time in the area of science and technology, but that is not how the Chinese, Indians, Japanese, Germans and others across Europe are facing this competition.

America did well in 17th place. It can do better. The way it does better is it makes the type of investments in our universities. It allows the people in our high schools and in our colleges to understand the priorities. Unfortunately the budget we voted on did not reflect America's future and investment in its future. What it says is that as we deal with the terrorist threat of homeland security and increasing the funding by 4 percent, increasing our defense budget, making cuts in basic research and basic funding, and I did not add into that area, in the National Institutes of Health for the first time in over 15 years that budget was held without an increase, which basically means a cut.

These are not the type of investments of a major economy, the leader in the global economy, that builds and plans for the future. These are the cuts of an economy and an administration that does not see its vision for America's future as bright and as strong as the past and it is clearly not putting its money toward that investment. It is high time that we understand that as we take up these two pieces of legislation this week on homeland security, we understand there are other threats to the United States, ones that are looming on the horizon and coming to shore, and that is in the area of technology and competing against the Chinese and the Indians and we are not having a budget that reflects the types of investments we need to do.

CONGRATULATING WINFRED ORRELL

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor 30 years of service by Cobb County history teacher Winfred "Windy" Orrell, who is retiring from teaching this Friday, May 20. With admirable dedication, Mr. Orrell served his students not only in the classroom but also on the field as a coach for the football, baseball, track and cross-country teams at Campbell and Cobb County High Schools.