

And yet, Madam Speaker, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibilities as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection that we should have given them.

It seems so sad, Madam Speaker, that this sunset memorial may be the only public remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this Chamber. So, as small a gesture as it might be, I would respectfully ask this moment for a moment of silence for those lost little Americans.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who hears this sunset memorial tonight will finally realize that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that 12,831 days killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered, and that all too soon, each of us will walk through these Chambers for the very last time. And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene at yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of the innocent unborn. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and constitutional duty to protect the least of these, our tiny American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is March 10, 2008, Madam Speaker, 12,831 days since *Roe v. Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children. This, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

JOBS POST BIGGEST DROP IN 5 YEARS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, since 2000, our Nation has lost over 3,400,000 more manufacturing jobs. In fact, the job creation record of the Bush administration is the worst since the Hoover administration.

The figures released by the U.S. Department of Labor last week posted the largest job loss in 5 years. The report was much weaker than expected, and, strangely, the unemployment rate declined because there were fewer people in the workforce. CNN's Moneyline re-

ported that employers made their deepest cuts in staffing in almost 5 years in February. There was a net loss of 63,000 more jobs, which is the biggest decline since March 2003, and weaker than the revised 22,000 job loss reported for January. The job loss was widespread, reaching beyond the battered construction industry, which lost 39,000 jobs, and manufacturing, where job losses hit 52,000.

Retailers cut 34,000 jobs while business and professional service cut 20,000 jobs. Temporary staffing firms cut nearly 28,000 jobs off their payrolls, another warning sign of employers pulling back, and hotels cut about 4,000 jobs, a sign that discretionary consumer spending could be on the wane. Overall, the private sector cut over 101,000 jobs according to the CNN Moneyline report.

The widening recession in almost every sector, not just the goods-producing sector, is extraordinarily important. I wish to place those numbers in the RECORD and say, Madam Speaker, America needs to create more real wealth here at home and stop borrowing prosperity and piling on more debt. We need to create jobs leading to energy independence in this country. We need to do more than just sort of flash our hand at that and be serious about it.

We need new transportation systems in our country. We need new bridges in the ground. We need people to be employed, those who now are idle labor, in helping to build back our economy from coast to coast.

A real stimulus package would lead our Nation to invest here at home, not just to borrow more from abroad. These numbers are serious omens. They're warning signs to those who have responsibility here in Washington to do more than manipulate interest rates. They would engage this Congress in an effort to build forward again in those sectors that would leave future generations real wealth, the kind of wealth that our ancestors left us: libraries, schools, highways, bridges, new energy systems, clean water systems, new transportation systems, new high-speed rail, new air control towers; the kind of wealth that can't be outsourced that belongs to the American people for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I place in the RECORD the figures from the CNN Moneyline report about what happened with the biggest job loss in 5 years in this past quarter.

JOBS POST BIGGEST DROP IN 5 YEARS

(By Chris Isidore)

NEW YORK.—Employers made their deepest cut in staffing in almost five years in February, according to a closely watched government report Friday that showed the labor market far weaker than expected, fueling already building recession fears.

There was a net loss of 63,000 jobs, according to the Labor Department, which is the biggest decline since March 2003 and weaker than the revised 22,000 job loss reported for January. Economists surveyed by Briefing.com had forecast a gain of 25,000 jobs in the most recent reading.

The job loss was widespread, reaching beyond the battered construction sector, which lost 39,000 and manufacturing, where job losses hit 52,000. Retailers cut 34,000 jobs, while business and professional services cut 20,000 jobs.

Temporary staffing firms cut nearly 28,000 jobs off their payrolls, another warning sign of employers pulling back, and hotels cut about 4,000 jobs, a sign that discretionary consumer spending could be on the wane.

Overall the private sector cut 101,000 jobs, with only a gain in government employment limiting losses.

Despite the job loss, the unemployment improved to 4.8% from the 4.9% reading in January. Economists had forecast the unemployment rate would rise to 5%. The rate fell because of a big jump in the number of people that the government counted as no longer in the labor force.

The labor market has weakened significantly in recent months, prompting fears of recession along with a \$170 billion economic stimulus package and a series of interest rate cuts from the Federal Reserve.

The Fed is next set to meet March 18 to consider what to do with interest rates. Friday's report would seem to suggest more rate cuts are on the way, despite the improved unemployment rate.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL WAR POWERS RESOLUTION OF 2007

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. Madam Speaker, this Thursday, March 13, 2008, the International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight Subcommittee will conduct a hearing on "War Powers for the 21st Century: The Congressional Perspective." I would like to thank Chairman BILL DELAHUNT and Ranking Member DANA ROHRBACHER for scheduling this hearing. It is my understanding that Chairman DELAHUNT and Ranking Member ROHRBACHER also plan to hold two additional war powers hearings during the month of April.

I am extremely grateful for their interest in this very important issue. Along with former Congressmen David Skaggs and Mickey Edwards, who are cochairmen of the Constitutional Projects War Powers Initiative, this Thursday I will testify on the legislation I introduced in October of 2007, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, H.J. Res. 53.

Too many times this Congress has abdicated its constitutional duty by allowing Presidents to overstep their executive authority. Our Constitution states that while the Commander-in-Chief has the power to conduct wars, only Congress has the power to authorize war.

It is for this reason that in 1999 I joined 16 of my colleagues in Congress to file a suit against President Clinton for unconstitutionally conducting offensive military attacks against Yugoslavia without obtaining a declaration of war or other explicit authorizations from Congress.

Now, as threats to international peace and security continue to evolve, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, H.J. Res. 53, rededicates Congress to its primary constitutional role of deciding when to use force abroad.

In 1793, James Madison said, "... The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature ... the executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war."

The Framers of our Constitution sought to decentralize the war powers of the United States and construct a balance between the political branches.

□ 1945

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 aimed to clarify the intent of the constitutional Framers and to ensure that Congress and the President share in the decision-making process in the event of armed conflict. Yet, since the enactment of the resolution, time and again Presidents have maintained that the resolution's consultation, reporting, and congressional authorization requirements are unconstitutional obstacles to executive authority.

By more fully clarifying the war powers of the President and the Congress, the legislation I've introduced, H.J. Res. 53, the Constitutional War Powers Resolution, improves upon the War Powers Resolution of 1973 in a number of ways. It clearly spells out the powers that the Congress and the President must exercise collectively, as well as the defensive measures the Commander in Chief may exercise without congressional approval. It also provides a more robust reporting requirement that would enable Congress to be more informed and to have greater oversight. And it protects and preserves the checks and balances the Framers intended in the decision to bring our Nation into war.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to congressional hearings on this critical issue. The time for Congress to meet its constitutional duty is long overdue.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would like to ask God to continue to bless our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to ask God to continue to bless the families of our men and women in uniform.

ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as the two Democratic contenders duke it out in the Presidential campaign, there's one issue that they both seem very eager to be identified with. And it's very unfortunate, it's the issue of economic isolationism. This kind of policy is as dangerous as it is inconsistent with their own rhetoric.

Both Democratic contenders like to talk about the need to enhance our Na-

tion's image and increase our leadership in the international community. They talk about diplomacy and soft power, and then they turn around and insist we try to withdraw from the worldwide marketplace and cede our global economic leadership. It has even been suggested by them that we go back on a 14-year deal with our two closest neighbors, including our neighbor to the north who has been such a key political ally.

Perhaps this outlandish rhetoric is delivered with a wink and a nod. Perhaps it's merely an attempt to score a few political points without any intention to actually dismantle the deep economic and political ties that we share with our trading partners in this hemisphere. Frankly, I hope that that is the case. But either way, Madam Speaker, this is very dangerous rhetoric.

NAFTA has long been addressed by those running for office as though it were an unmitigated disaster; no one seems to want to touch it with a 10-foot pole. After all, everyone knows that NAFTA has hurt our economy and cost us millions of jobs. Right? Wrong. In 1994, when Bill Clinton sent NAFTA to the Congress, the gross domestic product in this country was \$6.9 trillion. Today, we have a \$14.1 trillion economy. In other words, we have more than doubled the size of our economy in the NAFTA-era. When adjusted for inflation, the numbers are still very striking, with 50 percent growth since 1994. During the same period, 25 million jobs have been created, while our labor force has grown by 18 million.

Fourteen years of NAFTA have seen our economy grow considerably while more Americans are working than ever before and new jobs have abounded. To put it bluntly, anyone who says that NAFTA has destroyed our economy is flat out wrong. Not only has the predicted "giant sucking sound" that we heard about during the NAFTA debate not come to pass, but the precise opposite has taken place.

But, Madam Speaker, NAFTA is just one component of the complex relationships that entail our global engagement, where the economic and the political are inextricably entwined, and nowhere is this role more critical than in our own neighborhood. We have spent years and countless resources promoting democracy in this hemisphere. The rise of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela and his cohorts throughout the region have demonstrated that authoritarianism in our backyard is still a reality. As he sends troops to the border he shares with our friend and ally, Colombia, we are reminded that tyranny in our hemisphere still poses very grave threats.

NAFTA, CAFTA, the Peru Free Trade Agreement, and the proposed agreements with Colombia and Panama build upon the twin pillars of liberty: democratic governments and free markets. They enhance our economic strength with new opportunities and

give us greater leverage to ensure that we have peaceful and prosperous neighbors. And we know that peace and prosperity, Madam Speaker, go hand in hand.

We simply cannot disengage economically without disengaging politically. Engagement through trade is our source of strength and our leadership, and we would disengage to our peril. Those who regard our leadership in the international community so casually that they would trash it for political gain threaten not only our own prosperity, but our ability to play a positive role in this hemisphere and around the globe as we seek to grow our economies and to grow the economies of our neighbors.

U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, to urge the Speaker of this House to bring the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement to this House floor for a vote.

And let me tell you this: this agreement is good for the State that I represent. It's good for Colombia. It's good for the United States. It's good for Illinois farmers. It's good for Illinois workers. And it's good for Illinois manufacturing.

And I would note that in my district I have 8,000 Caterpillar workers, union Caterpillar workers who are manufacturing workers. And under this agreement, I note under the U.S.-Colombia Trade Agreement that our machinery exports see their tariffs imposed on Illinois-made construction equipment eliminated on day one. Now, you think about it, mining equipment used in Colombia is \$1 million equipment, that's a \$100,000 tax on U.S.-made products eliminated on day one.

Currently, Illinois exports \$214 million to Colombia, and that's just the beginning. According to the International Trade Commission, Illinois is a big winner. Pork products will increase 72 percent, according to their economic analysis. Corn and soybeans will see increased sales to Colombia. Fabricated metal products, processed foods, and chemicals will all see increases. And, again, it's expected that machinery, manufactured machinery, like products made by John Deere and Navistar and Caterpillar, will increase 15 percent.

Agriculture. The leaders of agriculture will tell you the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement is the best for agriculture in the history of all trade negotiations. And let's not forget that 80 percent of U.S. exports are currently taxed when they enter Colombia, and they will become duty free immediately. That will allow us to