

Madam Speaker, as we move to create legislation that focuses on clean energy jobs, we must remember the important role that energy efficiency has to play.

CLEAN ENERGY JOBS

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, later this week or next week, the House Energy and Commerce Committee will advance President Obama's clean energy jobs program, and we will do that by maximizing the job creation potential of renewable clean energy and energy efficiency.

I saw the enormous potential of job creation this weekend in Seattle, Washington, where I went to the MacDonald-Miller Company, a company that installs highly efficient energy efficiency heating and cooling systems, where they have found they can reduce energy usage by 12 percent simply by putting in a system that will adjust the energy depending on what the temperature is outside.

Now if we could get huge efficiency measures like that and put hundreds of people to work, like they are doing at MacDonald-Miller, we're going to find that we can grow our economy while solving global climate change as well.

The energy bill we will do will require 15 percent clean energy and 5 percent efficiency. That's a vision for the future. We're going to pass President Obama's clean energy jobs plan. That's a good thing for the U.S. economy.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WE MUST CREATE, NOT DESTROY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The recent news from Afghanistan is particularly troubling. American bombs killed Afghan civilians last week. Of course our troops are doing what they can to avoid civilian casualties, but bombs have a large footprint, and innocent people are being killed and injured along with the enemy.

Last week's incident has angered the people of Afghanistan, as it would, and some are demanding the withdrawal of American troops from their country. Anti-American sentiment is spreading.

This terrible tragedy, Madam Speaker, proves once again that war is not the way to win hearts and minds, and it proves that violence is the least ef-

fective way to achieve our national security goals and to keep our country safe.

That's why I've called upon President Obama to change our mission in Afghanistan. Instead of military solutions, I've asked him to focus on reconciliation, on economic development, humanitarian aid and diplomatic efforts.

President Obama is under a great deal of pressure to expand our military involvement in Afghanistan, but I also know that he is a man of peace, not war. So I'm hopeful that he will begin to rely more and more on peaceful solutions to the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan as well before things get out of hand.

The President has already taken some important steps towards peace. He is encouraging civilians and military reservists to go to Afghanistan and to Pakistan to help with development projects.

He's also announced that he will go to Egypt next month to deliver a speech to the Muslim world. This will be an important opportunity for the President to hold out the hand of friendship and to spread good will.

The speech in Egypt will be the second time that President Obama has spoken directly to the Muslim people because last month he addressed the Turkish Parliament where he declared, and I quote him, "The United States is not and will never be at war with Islam." He promised to "seek broader engagement with the Muslim people based on mutual interests and mutual respect."

He then quoted an old Turkish proverb that says, "You cannot put out fire with flames." And he said, "The future must belong to those who create, not those who destroy."

I agree with the end of destruction wholeheartedly. That's why I propose a comprehensive new national security plan called the SMART Security Platform for the 21st Century. Instead of violence and destruction, it emphasizes diplomacy, international cooperation, conflict prevention and nuclear non-proliferation.

This SMART Security Platform would eliminate the root causes of violence by supporting democracy building, global health, better educational opportunities, particularly for girls and women, and development aid and debt relief for countries.

It calls for a broad range of policies to stop the spread of conventional, biological, chemical and nuclear weapons. It would deny hundreds of billions of dollars every year to irresponsible regimes by ending our Nation's addiction to foreign oil. And it strengthens international intelligence and law enforcement so we can track down and stop individuals involved in violence while still respecting human and civil rights.

These are the steps that will put America back on the moral high ground, where we will be in a much better position to lead the world toward peace.

Madam Speaker, the Turkish proverb is right. You cannot put out fire with flames. That's what we learned in Iraq, and that's what we're learning again in Afghanistan.

It's time for a new strategy that recognizes that creating, not destroying, is the best way to make our future safe and to make the future of our children safe and the future of our world as well.

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

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

SINALOA DRUG CARTEL WANTS OLD WEST SHOOT-OUT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, according to the Los Angeles Times, the Mexican Attorney General's office has informed U.S. authorities that the Sinaloa drug cartel of Mexico has been ordered by its leader Joaquin "El Chapo" Guzman, also known as Shorty, to use guns and shoot it out, if necessary, with American law enforcement. This has been ordered by the drug kingpin to protect his drugs from seizure and capture by U.S. authorities.

Law enforcement officials in Arizona have received two alerts that the Guzman smugglers have been told to, quote, use their weapons to defend their loads at all costs.

The threat of escalated violence is for several reasons. One, El Chapo no longer can afford to lose drugs because of his connections and partnerships with Colombian drug cartels that are making greater demands on him for successful smuggling into the United States. Also, El Chapo is competing with rival drug cartels and attempting to take their business, their territory and their drugs. Thus, he wants to make sure his smugglers outgun the competition old west style.

Another reason for more violence is the drug smugglers no longer will get paid unless they deliver the goods to a U.S. destination. Therefore, they are becoming more trigger happy.

A few weeks ago a shoot-out between two drug smuggling groups took place on a road leading to Phoenix, Arizona. The criminals were trying to hijack each other's loads.

United States Border Patrol in Tucson has stated that confrontation between law enforcement and suspected traffickers has grown more violent. The L.A. Times reports weapons-related assaults against U.S. border agents rose 24 percent last year as compared to 2007.

Besides using weapons, the criminals throw rocks at our Border Patrol and ram their vehicles into agent vehicles.

Recently, again, according to the Times, agents stopped a vehicle in Douglas, Arizona, and drug traffickers on the Mexican side of the border laid down suppressive gunfire to pin the U.S. border agents down, which allowed the smugglers to retreat to the Mexican side of the border with their drugs intact.

The Tucson sector alone reports about 25 assaults a month on border patrol agents.

□ 1945

Madam Speaker, there seems to be an all-out border war between the drug cartels and the Mexican-U.S. law enforcement personnel. But not much is being said about this border war.

Madam Speaker, this border war is real. Our government should protect our Nation from these gun-toting drug smugglers. Our border protectors should be given enough personnel and equipment to fight these violent cartels, including being able to use the National Guard. Our border protectors should also know that our government will support them in their lawful protection of our border, and when a violent conflict occurs, be more concerned about our border protectors than the outlaw drug smugglers.

In other words, we must not let more agents suffer an unjust fate like Border Agents Ramos and Compean, who were persecuted and prosecuted for political reasons for shooting a drug smuggler they believed to be armed.

The violence on the border will continue to grow unless the likes of Joaquin "El Chapa"—"Shorty"—Guzman and his border bandits know the United States will not go away into the darkness of the desert night and simply surrender our border to them by silently doing nothing to prevent their unlawful invasion into the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA'S TRADE DEFICIT IS AGAIN ON THE RISE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today the United States announced that America's trade deficit is back on the rise. The 2008 annual trade deficit topped \$677 billion. That is three-quarters of \$1 trillion, knocking several points off of economic growth in our country, and yet in response to today's announcement of the growing deficit, U.S. Trade Representative KIRK said we need to work more on new and pending free trade agreements. But trade agreements based on the NAFTA job outsourcing model are what helped get us into this mess of rising unemployment and heavy borrowing in the first place.

Take Mexico, for example, which is the red on this chart. When NAFTA was signed back in 1993, the United States had a trade surplus with Mexico of \$1.3 billion. But in 2008, our deficit

with that country had surged to more than \$367 billion. This year, in only 3 months, we have already seen a \$9.7 billion deficit with Mexico.

Indeed, in every single year of NAFTA since 1993, more imports have come in here from Mexico than our exports there. The biggest U.S. export to Mexico has actually been our jobs. Good jobs.

In an article published in 1993 in Fortune Magazine, the self-proclaimed economic geniuses who urged NAFTA's passage, including Gary Hufbauer and economist Jeffrey Schott, said at that time that if that treaty passed, the United States would maintain, and I quote them, "an annual current account surplus with Mexico of about \$10 billion throughout the 1990s." Boy, were they wrong. Could they have been more wrong? Dead wrong. Consistently wrong.

Since NAFTA was enacted, the United States has accumulated more than \$1.2 trillion in trade deficits to both Mexico and Canada. The orange is the Canadian deficit. And this means lost jobs in our country and lost income to both Mexico and Canada. That \$1.2 trillion of lost wealth in this country could pay for better health care. It could pay for better roads and bridges. It could pay for a better-protected soldier abroad and for police forces here at home. But instead, we shift these dollars and hundreds of thousands of jobs across our borders every single year leaving our home communities devastated and costing our taxpayers ever more.

People ask: Why is President Obama spending money to try to re-engage our economy? And the answer is: What other choice does he have? Doing nothing in an economy with double-digit unemployment numbers is absolutely cruel. At a time when our home districts are straining to make ends meet, millions of people are facing foreclosure and pink slips are coming day after day, why would we want to send more of our jobs and dollars abroad working on new, and I quote the trade ambassador, "new and pending free trade agreements," as Ambassador Kirk suggests, instead of focusing our time and energy on remedying the broken banking and economic system of our country? We have to fix that. We have to fix the foreclosure crisis. And we have to create well-paying jobs right here in our own neighborhoods rather than weakening America further by shipping out more jobs and wealth abroad.

Congress needs to stop making it easier for U.S. jobs to go to these far-flung, slave-wage havens, as in China, in Mexico, and in Panama. And by the way, countries like Panama are corporate tax havens as well.

We need banking reform. We need help for homeowners. We need modern infrastructure, and we need lots more good jobs right here at home. Ambassador Kirk, won't you join us in the fight for America's economic pros-

perity? Why send more of our jobs away from our communities that need them most, particularly when you are staring in the face of reality, which is \$1.3 trillion of trade deficit since NAFTA's inception, both with Mexico and with Canada, and not a single year in the black? Invest in the United States. We can leave Panama and Mexico to another day. It is time to reclaim our wealth and bring it back home where it belongs.

I think the American people intuitively know something is really wrong, and they are trying to figure out why all this has happened. And I would say to some of the very institutions on Wall Street that have caused the deep harm to this economy, you are the very institutions that have helped to finance the outsourcing of these jobs.

H.R. 1701, THE PTSD/TBI GUARANTEED REVIEW FOR HEROES ACT

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. Madam Speaker, almost 2 million American servicemembers have served our Nation in Afghanistan and Iraq. Unfortunately, many are returning home with symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injuries. An April 2008 study by the RAND Corporation found that nearly 20 percent of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans had symptoms of PTSD or major depression.

The study also found that many servicemembers do not seek treatment for psychological illnesses because they fear it will harm their careers. Of those who do seek help for PTSD or major depression, only about half receive treatment that researchers consider minimally adequate for their illness. If our government and the military fail to address problems associated with PTSD, the situation will only grow worse in future years.

Tragically, the worst cases can result in a servicemember causing harm to themselves or others. Most recently, a United States Army sergeant who had done at least three tours in Iraq had been charged with murdering five of his fellow servicemembers at Camp Liberty in Baghdad. A defense official confirmed that the sergeant had been a patient at the stress treatment center where the shooting occurred. When some servicemembers suffering from PTSD or TBI are not properly treated, they end up self-medicating or experiencing other changes in behavior. This can lead to serious legal issues and a threat of separation from their service without benefits or treatment.

One marine stationed at Camp Lejeune, in my district, fell victim to this problem and has been pending involuntary administrative separation due to misconduct. His fitness report shows that he was an outstanding marine prior to his deployments. His medical board report states, and I quote