

common sense of the American people. For some reason, our colleagues in the Senate may have never logged on to Etoys.com to find out that products recalled less than 1 year ago because of dangerous lead content targeted children between the ages of 9 and 12.

Mr. Speaker, we should not allow toy manufacturers to stop protecting American children once they hit the second grade.

Mr. Speaker, legislation of this type has now been under consideration in the Congress for almost a year. We passed this very legislation in December. We went to conference on this bill over 4 weeks ago. As we work tonight, it is only 4 months until the Christmas shopping season goes into high gear. Likewise, Hanukkah begins 4 days before Christmas.

Time is quickly running out to send a very clear signal by this Congress in this month that lead standards in toys will not just be a recommendation of major retailers, but will have the force of law and will apply to products for children age 12 and down.

In my view, this is a commonsense, bipartisan issue that the House should insist on as it rapidly concludes its conference. We should maximize protections for our Nation's children.

In this effort, I want to thank Will Carty from Mr. BARTON's staff for helping us out on this; Brian Diffell from Mr. BLUNT's staff for this important motion today; and my key staffers, Richard Goldberg and Patrick Magnuson, for their assistance and work on this effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense motion to instruct, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MELANCON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I happened to talk to my 2-year-old grandson, Jackson, in his home in south Louisiana. He is just 2 so we didn't talk a lot of details about his pap and what his pap was going to be doing tonight. But I thought it fitting to call him before speaking in favor of this motion to instruct.

For the next couple of years, he will play with just about anything put in front of him. He will clap blocks together, chip paint off of model cars, and I will bet chew on anything that is handy. We owe it to him, his mother, his dad, his grandmothers, his other grandfather, and to me, to do what we can to make certain the toys he plays with won't make him sick. It's that simple. We have that responsibility, and I believe this underlying bill gets us closer to fulfilling it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this bipartisan bill. It passed out of the committee 51-0 and passed the House 407-0. It bans lead beyond the tiniest amounts in products intended for kids 12 and under. That is an important age, as kids are exposed to so many different toys and products as they grow up. I believe the House bill takes this into account, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is a good one. I thank my friend from Illinois for offering it. I urge that the House support the motion to instruct offered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. His State has gone through enough, and I am glad for the attention and time he has spent on this issue.

I think most Americans know with regard to Thomas and other faulty products from China, we have known about this problem for a year, and that the House of Representatives has passed completely bipartisan legislation on this subject 7 months ago. We have been in conference for 4 weeks now.

Quite frankly, our colleagues in the Senate made a mistake by making the protections cover only toys from zero to age 7. We risk having a situation in which parents who do not follow the rigid declarations of what is available on the labeling on the box may make a mistake, and we do not offer protections under the Senate bill; or, that older brothers and sisters may have toys available which clearly fall outside the Senate definition but would come clearly inside the House definition. That is why I think this is a very important motion to instruct.

I think this calls attention to this issue for a piece of legislation which should be rapidly finished to send a clear signal to the holiday-buying public. I think it gently corrects our colleagues in the other body that they made a mistake and they should back down to the House's position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

USE IT OR LOSE IT HOAX

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

Ms. FOXX. I am here on the floor tonight to set the record straight about

false claims that Democrats are peddling as a "use it or lose it" hoax. With American families and small businesses continuing to feel the pain at the pump, House Democrats have begun offering a series of hollow bills that will do nothing to reduce gas prices.

Today's bill, purportedly meant to address price gouging, serves no purpose other than to provide political cover to Democrats who continue to divide the will of the American people who are calling on Congress to increase the supply of American energy. In fact, today's bill is a reshaped version of a similar price gouging bill passed by the House last year.

Still to come in this week's series of no energy bills, the Democrats' "use it or lose it" hoax, with no facts to back up their desperate rhetoric, Democratic leaders continue to make misleading and inaccurate claims with the hope of confusing the American people.

Following are some of the most prevalent examples. Myth. If the American people want increased production of American energy, Congress must force energy companies to use their leased Federal lands to produce oil or lose those leases.

Here's the fact. Use it or lose it is already the law of the land. As a matter of fact, in a bipartisan vote, Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and Natural Resources Committee Chairman RAHALL each voted for it in 1992. Under the law, Federal energy leaseholders already must produce oil or natural gas within 5 to 10 years after drilling on the land begins, and the Secretary of the Interior has the power to cancel the lease if the energy company fails to comply.

If Representatives PELOSI, HOYER, and RAHALL all had voted for "use it or lose it" 16 years ago, then why are they so insistent on forcing another vote on the exact same concept this year? Could it be because they have no meaningful plan of their own to bring down gas prices?

Another myth. Oil companies are sitting on 68 million acres of Federal lands without drilling for oil or gas on any of it. This is another false claim, which has become one of the Democrats' top talking points, but they can't back it up with any facts.

Energy companies already are actively exploring their currently leased lands to find oil or gas. Once they determine that oil or gas is present, only then can they actually begin drilling. The entire process can take years.

As the Independent American Association of Petroleum Geologists noted in a letter to House leaders yesterday, oil and natural gas exploration is not simple and it is not easy. It requires geological ingenuity, advanced technologies, and the time to do the job right.

□ 2145

It also requires access to areas where exploration ideas can be tested. The

greater the number of areas available for exploration, the higher the chance of finding oil and natural gas traps. In other words, energy companies cannot be expected to drill on every acre of land every single day, and the Democrats know it.

Another myth: 4.8 million barrels of oil per day and 44.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day may be "extrapolated" from the oil companies' unused federally-leased lands. In fact, no Democrat, not Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, Democratic Caucus Chairman RAHM EMANUEL, and not Natural Resources Committee Chairman NICK RAHALL can explain where they got those figures. In fact, Democrats have refused to respond to a written request from Natural Resources Committee Republicans for this information. Did they just make it up?

Mr. Speaker, we know that what will help this problem and our country, the "Pelosi premium," which has driven up gas prices to over \$4 a gallon, is to increase the supply. We must increase the supply in order to meet the demand. The Democrats act as though they have repealed the law of supply and demand, the most basic law of economics. They can do a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, but they can't repeal the law of supply and demand. What they have to face up to is the fact that we need additional supply.

Republicans have offered common-sense solutions to this issue. We have many plans and many bills out there that would increase the supply and relieve the burden on working Americans. Democrats need to understand that. They need to stop trying to fool the American people with their hoaxes on use-it-or-lose-it, and help us put together a plan to bring greater supply to the American people and give them some relief.

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.)

NAFTA AND ITS EFFECT ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, campaigning for President in Canada, of all places, criticized opponents of NAFTA, the godfather of all troubled trade agreements. Incredibly, the Senator said, "Since NAFTA was concluded, it has contributed to strong job growth and flourishing trade." He didn't say where. He then said, "Since the agreement was signed, the U.S. has added 25 million jobs and Canada more than 4 million."

Wherever is he getting his data? Most Americans know this so-called free trade agreement is anything but free. We know it has created huge job losses and trade deficits, and we know the harm it has caused in this country and across our continent.

NAFTA has created a gaping net hemorrhage of jobs, lost jobs and wealth for our country. I beg Senator MCCAIN to look at the discipline of the numbers. Look at the trade accounts. They don't lie.

Since NAFTA's passage in 1993, our country has suffered \$1 trillion of NAFTA trade loss, amassing a huge deficit with both Mexico and Canada. The figures get worse every single year. NAFTA has not only cost our country over 1 million lost jobs, we would have added even more economic growth and jobs if we had not allowed all these jobs and production lines to be outsourced.

Robert Scott of the Economic Policy Institute points out that "growing trade deficits with Mexico and Canada have pushed more than 1 million U.S. workers out of higher wage jobs and into lower wage positions in non-trade related industries. Thus, the displacement of 1 million jobs from traded to non-traded goods industries reduced wage payments to U.S. workers by \$7.6 billion in 2004 alone." Those are staggering figures.

That loss packs a wallop by any measure. I will place in the RECORD a list of just some of the factories that have outsourced production and relocated to Mexico. They go from A to Z: Allied Signal, Amana, Maytag, you can go all the way down the list, Medtronics, Stanley Works, Zenith. I will place the entire list in the RECORD.

Now, it is interesting where Senator MCCAIN was making his speech. He had not just outsourced himself to Canada to make the speech, he spoke before the Economic Club of Canada, a business organization whose membership cheered his remarks. And they should. They alone have made out handsomely under this lopsided trade agreement.

Listen to what the leader of the New Democratic Party in Canada, Parliamentarian Jack Layton, has to say about what is going on in Canada. In a recent letter to Senator OBAMA, Leader Layton stated clearly: "Despite the fact that most Canadians are working longer hours, 80 percent of families have lost ground or stagnated in both earnings and after tax returns compared to the previous generation. Real wages have not increased in Canada for more than 30 years. Yet the share of corporate profits in our Canadian economy is at its highest point since 1961."

Thoughtful leaders in Canada disagree with Senator MCCAIN. They know the income washout that can come from ill-cast trade agreements. He should pay attention to their views.

Before NAFTA, the United States had a trade surplus with Mexico of over \$1 billion a year. Jobs were increasing in our country. Today, since NAFTA's

passage, the U.S. has racked up an astounding \$452.3 billion deficit with Mexico and an even larger \$606 billion trade deficit with Canada. At a minimum, our Nation should seek balance and reciprocity, not deficits with these nations.

In Mexico, its civil society has been pleading with us to correct the abuses of NAFTA. Former Mexican Parliamentarian Victor Suarez pleads, "We want good trade, not free trade." He should know well. The Mexican countryside has been devastated as the result of NAFTA as over 2 million poor farm families have been thrown off their land, uprooted in the most cruel of ways. A visible sign of their plight here is their illegal immigration to our Nation out of sheer desperation.

A group of farmers in Mexico calling themselves "The Countryside Can't Take It Anymore" literally rode their horses down to the Mexican Parliament to draw attention to the washout of livelihoods of their country men and women.

When NAFTA was first debated, many Members here tried to amend the agreement to avoid these negative consequences on people and communities. Senator MCCAIN didn't lift a finger to help. Senator OBAMA was not a Senator then.

America should advance trade agreements that produce jobs, balances and surplus, not deficits. Deficits are not good, in your checkbook or in America's accounts. Trade should lift all boats, not create a race to the bottom. Good trade means fair trade for all, not "gotcha" trade. Good trade means good jobs, living wages, the right to bargain the worth of your labor by contract, a sustainable environment, and sovereign food rights for all people.

For a rich Nation like America, I think good trade also means a conscience for the poorest people on this continent, not exploitation. NAFTA has produced none of this. It has produced negatives. It is time America voted for positives.

A Mexican worker observed to me, on one of my several trips there, that their futures were put at even more risk as these global companies work them for pennies an hour, always threatening to move elsewhere. The worker said to me: "Poor countries are like crabs in a bucket. Every time one country starts to climb up out of the bucket, another one pulls it back down."

NAFTA has produced none of this. It has produced negatives for the vast majority, and vast wealth for a few.

For Senator MCCAIN and any others who do not know which outsourced firms have contributed to America's growing trade deficits on this continent with accompanying job and benefit losses, let me place them in the RECORD:

COMPANIES RELOCATED TO MEXICO SINCE NAFTA

20th Century Plastics; 3 Day Blinds; AalFs Manufacturing; Acer Peripherals; Advance Transformer; Alcoa Fujikura; Allied Signal; Amana; American Olean Tile; American Standard; Ametek; AMP; Amphenol; Anchor Glass Container; Anvil Knitwear; Autoliv