

means a strong economy evidenced by balanced trade accounts, not deficits. A strong America means keeping and creating good jobs, with living wages and benefits like healthcare. And a strong America means trade relationships that bring strength to our economy and our trading partners', not a race to the bottom or human rights violations.

America ought to be fighting for opening the closed markets of the world, like Japan's and China's, not putting our heads in the sand while our competitors levy non-tariff barriers against America's goods and services. If we are not trading with a free country with a free market and free people, we are not trading freely at all. We are paying these countries to continue unfair economic and political practices at the cost of our own prosperity and standard of living.

We ought to be fighting for America's middle class, not outsourcing their jobs to China, India, and Mexico. We should not oppose free trade; we should support free trade among free people.

[From the New York Times, June 7, 2008]

EUROPE FEARS A POST-BUSH UNILATERALISM,  
THIS TIME ON TRADE  
(By Eduardo Porter)

The Democrats' vocal hostility to trade is starting to scare many of America's best friends. As Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton have bashed China and a variety of free trade agreements, allies who have been yearning for an end to President Bush's in-your-face unilateralism are worried that a Democratic president may be just as undiplomatic, and unreasonable, when it comes to economic protectionism.

"It is very irresponsible, in my view, to pretend to people that we can disengage from international trade," Peter Mandelstam, the European trade commissioner, warned in a May interview with the BBC.

It would be a mistake to brush all this off as mere campaign posturing. The United States remains as open to trade as its European allies, and in some areas it has even fewer restrictions. But the question is, for how long?

Despite economists' assurances about trade's many benefits, American workers increasingly view globalization as a losing battle against China's cheap labor and a very personal threat to their wages and jobs. According to a poll this spring by The New York Times and CBS News, 68 percent of Americans favor putting restrictions on free trade to protect domestic industries. That is the highest share since they began asking the question in the 1980s, and 12 percentage points more than in 2000.

Workers in other rich nations feel less threatened. Only 14 percent of Americans surveyed last year by the Pew Global Attitudes Project said increasing trade was "very good" for the country. That's less than half the share in Canada, Germany or Sweden. Even among the French, who tend to see capitalism as gauche and occasionally drive tractors into their local McDonalds, 22 percent said more trade was very good.

The issue isn't the amount of trade. European countries actually trade much more than the United States. But their citizens appear to be more comfortable with the idea because their governments provide a stronger safety net to catch workers undercut by foreign competition and redistribute the gains from trade more equitably.

In the United States, public spending on social programs, from unemployment insurance to health care, amounts to about 17 percent of the overall economy. This is about half the level in Germany and less than al-

most every other rich nation. America's meager social safety net and its winner-take-all distribution of riches means workers have less to gain from trade's benefits and more to lose from any disruption.

Most economists agree that trade plays a small role in the deteriorating fortunes of less educated American workers. But as their wages have sagged, their pensions have shrunk and their health insurance has disappeared, trade has become the scapegoat. Politicians, especially but not solely from the Democratic Party, have been eager to capitalize on those anxieties.

Just this week, Democrats in the House and Senate proposed a bill that would require the president to submit plans to renegotiate all current trade agreements—before Congress considered any pending agreements and before the president negotiated any new ones. In April, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi decided to change the rules guiding approval of free trade agreements to stall the approval of one with Colombia.

The United States has an enormous stake in maintaining an open global economy. Trade means export markets for American products, as well as cheap imports for American companies and consumers. Foreign competition helps spur productivity, which has driven the spectacular increase in American living standards since World War II.

Before this country stumbles into a trade war, all political leaders would benefit from a careful examination of how other wealthy democracies have found ways to cushion economic blows on the most vulnerable and make trade more palatable to their workers.

More generous social policies are a far better choice than protectionism.

#### THE PRICE OF GASOLINE

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. Madam Speaker, if you went out to a gas station this morning or tomorrow morning and you asked anybody pumping gasoline what the number one issue is, they would tell you without a doubt it is the price of gasoline because it is having an impact on their food and on every other commodity that they deal with.

The American people want gasoline prices and energy prices to come down. And the thing that really amazes me about my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, is they won't listen to the American people. Eighty percent of the American people, according to recent polls say that if we have the resources here in America, we should drill for them right here. Obviously, everybody is concerned about the environment, but we can drill for oil in the ANWR and off the continental shelf and use coal shale to create a tremendous amount of gasoline and energy in this country without even relying on the foreign sources. The problem is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not listen to the American people.

Now I was watching Sean Hannity on Hannity and Colmes the other night, and Mr. Hannity said he couldn't figure out why the Republicans weren't talking about this and making this a big issue.

□ 1815

And if he were here tonight, I would say, "Sean, we are doing it. We are screaming from the top of this Capitol that we ought to drill in the ANWR, we ought to drill off the Continental Shelf. We have a 500 year supply of natural gas. But the Democrats on the other side will not listen to the American people, and the price of gasoline goes up and up and up and the price of energy goes up and up and up."

I understand that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to go to new forms of energy that are environmentally safe, and I think everybody in this body wants that.

But while we are transitioning to the new technologies, we still have to live. We still have to have heating oil. We still have to have gasoline. We still have to have energy. And the way we can get it and not depend on foreign resources is by drilling in the ANWR, drilling off the Continental Shelf, using coal shale and using natural gas. But the environmentalist lobby, and my colleagues will never admit to this on the other side of the aisle, but the environmentalist lobby has them by throat, and as a result they will not yield to the America people's will that we drill here in this country to reduce the price of energy.

Now, I believe this will be an issue in the fall campaign. I know everybody is talking about OBAMA and MCCAIN and the presidential race. But the people who are in this country are really concerned about getting to and from work and paying their bills. I would just like to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, go to any gas station tonight, go to any gas station tomorrow, and ask anybody pumping gas this question: Do you think we ought to drill for our own oil? Do you think we should depend less on foreign resources like Saudi Arabia or Venezuela? And 80 percent of them will look you right in the eye and say, you bet. I want the price of gasoline to go down.

My Democrat colleagues, I want you to listen to them, because they are going to get more and more angry with you because you will not listen. We could bring the price of gasoline down immediately if we say we are going to drill in ANWR, drill off the Continental Shelf, because our competitors around the world are going to say, "oh, my gosh, there is going to be competition," and you will see the price of gasoline and oil per barrel go down.

So, tonight, once again I will just say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, please, please listen to the American people. They want to drill in the ANWR. They want an environmentally safe way to drill in the ANWR, and we have it. They want to drill off the Continental Shelf. They want us to drill for our own oil and our own natural resources, and they don't

want to depend on Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Mexico or anyplace else. And we should listen to them. We should listen to them.

So if Sean Hannity were here tonight, I would say, "Sean, we are listening to you. We have heard you. We are screaming from the top this Capitol, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't listening right now."

But if we keep this up and the American people listen, and I think they will, they are going to hold my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, they are going to hold them responsible for the cost of energy.

So I would just like to say to you, the election is coming up and everything looks pretty good for your side of the aisle, but you better do something about energy, because the American people want something done and they want it done quickly.

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

(Mr. WEINER 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 Georgia (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia 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 (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### DON'T ALLOW PERMANENT BASES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished Speaker, and I thank her for her leadership.

We will in just a few minutes begin to talk about a very serious issue on universal access to health care, so I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are still in a very troubling conflict in Iraq. We are still spending billions and billions and billions of dollars. Even in the last few days I have seen the loss of young sons, young brothers, young men in my own community. We have buried a number of our fallen soldiers in the Houston, Harris County and South Texas metroplex.

We recognize that we are a nation that is willing to send her very best, her very brightest, to the front lines of

Iraq and Afghanistan and places around the world to defend the honor, but yet the need for freedom and democracy. But this is a war that the American people over and over again, 60 to 70 percent have said we must bring our troops home. The American people have said enough is enough.

We honor those who have fallen. We honored them in this memorial week. I was in Aviano, Italy, and celebrated there at the Air Force base with the young men and women, the fallen, who fell on foreign soil. It was my honor and my privilege to be there, and I will do so wherever there is the opportunity to say thank you to those that live injured, for those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. We will never dishonor their service.

So I claim that today we can call the actions in Iraq, albeit my opposition to the offense or the invasion of Iraq by this country, we can call it a military success. We can call it a military success and bring our soldiers home.

What disturbs me, Madam Speaker, is that this Nation, this administration, is negotiating for foreign bases on Iraq soil, U.S. bases on the soil of Iraq, when over and over again this Congress has voted against maintaining long-term bases, U.S. bases, in Iraq. We have said it clearly. We have said it over and over again.

So I raise the question as to why is the administration engaging in negotiations for permanent military bases without the engagement and the affirmation of this Congress that has said to the administration that we do not want permanent military bases and neither do the people of the United States?

Now, I recognize that we have the responsibility of transition as the new administration comes in. I am believing that the new administration that will come in to be President of the United States will be the administration that will oppose this war and that will begin to bring our troops home.

But if, for example, we were concerned about transition, let me simply say, we are aware that we have a Central Command in the region. It is an active Central Command. It will be headed by General Petraeus for the next couple of months.

There is no reason why when that region is in need that under the Central Command the appropriate military operation can be dispatched, if necessary, to the region, to Iraq and to other places around. It seems to be a smack in the face of Congress that has over and over again said that it is time to bring our troops home, that we cannot spend millions and millions and billions more of dollars in Iraq.

It is time for Iraq to secure its own security, to defend itself, to build its own military bases. And, yes, we are quite happy to continue to train those Iraqi soldiers, which I visited with in the last couple of months. I was there. I saw them. They are committed and dedicated, the Iraqi soldiers. Their gen-

erals are committed and dedicated. Give them the opportunity to finance their own bases, to finance the military. But enough is enough. I believe the American people have spoken.

So I say to the administration, we will not tolerate permanent bases on the soil. And I want to thank the Progressive Caucus with the leadership of Congresswoman WOOLSEY and Congresswoman LEE, the Out of Iraq Caucus with Congresswoman WATERS, both of which I am a member of. We have worked on this. We have heard from the American people. We have heard testimony.

Frankly, this is an insult to the Members of the United States Congress, when we know that there are alternatives to ensuring the safety and security of the region, and we also know that the American people have spoken.

I stand with the American people. The needs are great. We must use this money for other reasons, bringing our soldiers home, training them, creating a green economy, making sure that we have the education we should and the health care that we should. It is time now to bring our troops home, and certainly it is time now to end this frivolous debate about permanent bases in Iraq.

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

(Mr. BURGESS 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### SUNSET MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, as many times before, I stand before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

Madam Speaker, it is now June 10, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, but before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more children, defenseless unborn, were killed by abortion on demand. And that is just today, Madam Speaker. That is more than the number of innocent lives that this Nation lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,923 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them,