

“While the Afghan Army has made some strides in recent years, the national police force has developed a reputation for drug abuse, illiteracy and desertion.”

“Earlier this month, The New York Times reported that up to 19 Afghan police officers from southwest of Kabul defected to the Taliban en masse, taking their guns with them and burning down their own station house.”

Just another part from that “60 Minutes”:

“What is certain is that the United States has spent 9 years and more than \$7 billion building and training the Afghan police force. “60 Minutes” wanted to find out what has become of that investment.”

I am going to paraphrase very quickly:

There has been very little success. The Afghan police are still 9 years behind in training, and we have already spent 9 years training them. I don't know how that adds up to anything positive.

I am going to save some of the other comments from the “60 Minutes” segment to use later on this week and to use, certainly, next year when we come back.

Mr. Speaker, I have signed over 9,747 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I do that every weekend so I can be reminded of my mistake of voting to give President Bush the authority to go into Iraq—a war we never had to fight. It was manipulated by those within the administration, and it never had to be; and, yes, we lost young men and women in that battle.

On Afghanistan, I have joined my colleagues on both the Democratic side and the Republican side to ask: What is the end point? What is the definition of “victory”? What are we trying to achieve? You can never get a straight answer. I don't care who gives you an answer; you don't know what the end point is.

So there we are, spending \$6 billion, \$7 billion a month in Afghanistan, but we can't fix the streets in America. We can't build schools in America; yet we have borrowed that \$6 billion, \$7 billion from our Chinese friends. We owe them the money while we spend it in a foreign country, and we can't even take care of our own people.

□ 1910

So, Mr. Speaker, again, the faces of these young marines—and they could be soldiers, they could be airmen, they could be Navy, but these young marines who died at 20 and 21, the only thing their parents can do in the years ahead, or their loved ones, is to show the face of a 21-year-old marine that died at 21 and will always be seen as a young man who gave his life for this country.

It's time for this Congress to come together and say to President Obama, We don't need 4 more years of spending

money—and more important than money is the blood of the American soldier and marine and serviceman that is dying for this country.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will, as I always do, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, to bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I will ask God to please give wisdom, strength and courage to President Obama, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for today and tomorrow's generation.

NEWBOLD-BUY AMERICAN

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the more I learn about the Department of Defense's procurement policies and the procurement policies of other agencies, the more angry I get, the more angry this Congress should get, and the more angry the American citizenry should get.

In my home State of Connecticut, we pioneered America's shipbuilding and aerospace industries. However, today, as more and more of U.S. taxpayer dollars go overseas to buy equipment and parts and machinery for the U.S. military, those shops, once bustling with workers, are now silent.

We have example after example of how our procurement policy has gone wrong. You have the big-ticket, high-profile examples, like the Air Force KC-x Tanker which went to Airbus rather than to an American-based bid. You have the 21 helicopters that we are supplying to the Afghan military today that we are buying—not from an American manufacturer but from a Russian manufacturer. And then you have the thousands and thousands of smaller examples on seemingly a daily basis in which American companies come up short. When we buy Chinese-made doorknobs for the renovations at Camp Pendleton when there is an American company that can do the same work, when we buy our copper and nickel tubing for our subs from a German manufacturer, when there is an American firm that can do the same work, we are wasting billions and billions of American dollars sending our jobs overseas.

I am here today, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the latest affront on this issue. The Army, last month, offered a solicitation for 96 machines that will make dog tags for our service men and women. These iconic placards are not only a symbol of the life and death faced by our American soldiers, but they serve a crucial function in the field. Frankly, there is little else that embodies the American military tradi-

tion than those little plates that hang off of a soldier's neck.

An American company, NewBold, which manufactures its dog tag machines in Virginia, lost its bid to a company that manufactures those machines in Italy. Now while the NewBold machine was marginally—only about 4 percent—more expensive, they offered around-the-clock technical support for our soldiers in the field. Even after they filed a protest, the Army still awarded the bid to workers in Italy.

Unfortunately, due to the loss of this contract, NewBold is going to have to lay off some people, and the 4.7 percent that we saved is going to be completely offset by all of the lost income taxes to the Federal Government due to the layoffs, the lost payroll taxes, and all of the increased social costs like unemployment compensation. This is insanity. Not only are we now relying on an Italian-made machine to make one of the most iconic pieces of our military uniform—all to save just a few thousand dollars on the contract—but it is now going to cost the U.S. economy jobs, and it is going to cost the U.S. taxpayers additional expense. We can't allow this to continue, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues.

For the last year, I have been working with a bipartisan group of Members, including the previous speaker, Congressman JONES from North Carolina, so that we can shore up the loopholes in our “Buy American” policies, so that we can make sure that more of our U.S. taxpayer dollars stay here at home. I have introduced legislation that will do just that, that will begin to reorient our money here to American-made products for our U.S. military.

I've had enough. This country has had enough. As we bleed manufacturing jobs out of this country, the U.S. Government cannot continue to exacerbate that problem by sending U.S. taxpayer dollars overseas. It's time for this Congress to deem this practice unacceptable, to strengthen the “Buy American” provisions, and to bring our taxpayer dollars back home.

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

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WESTERN SAHARA

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we have seen the issue of the Western Sahara receive a great deal of coverage in the world press. Unfortunately, the press coverage has often been biased; in

fact, I've seen cynical attempts at purposeful disinformation.

I think it's important that we remember history. Let's not forget that while the Sahara was under Spanish colonial rule, only Morocco laid claim to that territory as its own. The Kingdom of Morocco repeatedly claimed the Western Sahara and demanded the end of Spanish colonial rule. It was only when Morocco's efforts at recovering the Sahara from Spanish colonialism under the leadership of King Hassan II began to be seen as making serious progress in the 1970s that the so-called Polisario Front came into being. Then, as now, the so-called Polisario group is financed by Algeria and is propped up by Castro's Communist dictatorship in Cuba.

Why is it important to understand this? Because in Morocco, our ally in North Africa in the struggle against international terrorism, the issue of the Sahara is the decisive issue. The reality of Moroccan sovereignty over the Sahara enjoys the support of the entire population of Morocco, including the Sahara itself. In other words, the issue of the Sahara is the sine qua non, the necessary ingredient for stability and peace in that country of strategic importance in North Africa, our friend and ally, Morocco.

King Mohammed VI and his negotiating team have demonstrated great courage and patience in dealing with this critical issue so closely tied to the security of the entire region. Let us never forget that a make-believe, an illusory, a fake microstate in Northern Africa would be led by a Castro-Cuban-formed political class which would constitute a minority of the population even within the fake microstate, but would control it through Castro-style repression. Let us never forget that such a microstate would serve as a focal point of regional instability and destabilization, as well as an exporter of terrorism.

For over a decade, Mr. Speaker, Morocco has agreed to grant a genuine and profound autonomy to the Sahara under Moroccan sovereignty in order to reach a realistic and definitive solution to this problem, but Algeria and the so-called Polisario continue to insist on the creation of a fake microstate.

Majorities in this Congress comprising both Republicans and Democrats have spoken clearly in support of our ally Morocco's position on this critical issue in letters we have sent, first to President Bush, and then to President Obama. The United States, during both administrations and with the strong leadership of Secretary of State Rice and Secretary of State Clinton, has agreed with the position expressed by the overwhelming majority of this Congress.

The future of America's struggle against international terrorism and the stability of Northern Africa require that the Government and the Congress of the United States continue to stand firmly and clearly with our friend and ally, the Kingdom of Morocco.

□ 1920

U.S.-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, please allow me to explain what happens when flawed free trade agreements are implemented and outsource more U.S. jobs.

Our Nation has not had balanced trade accounts for over 25 years. In fact, every time we sign one of these so-called free trade agreements, we lose more and more jobs in our country. In its attempt to move forward the George W. Bush-negotiated U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, it appears the Obama negotiators may have forgotten the real costs of so-called free trade.

With Korea, it has been more than a dozen years already since the United States held a trade surplus with Korea. We're already in the red. In 1997, America actually held a small trade surplus with Korea of a little over \$1 billion. Since then, we've accumulated \$161 billion worth of trade debt, and that is in the red. That translates into lost jobs, lost opportunity in our country. Using the Department of Commerce's estimate that each billion dollars of trade deficit costs us 14,000 jobs, our trade deficit already accumulated with Korea has cost us over 2 million American jobs. And everybody knows we're short over 20 million jobs in our country.

The proposed new Korea Free Trade Agreement will make our markets more open to Korean industries but does not do enough to open Korean markets to our products. Every time the United States imports more than we export, it leaves us with higher trade deficits and more lost jobs. This NAFTA-inspired Korean free trade agreement will lead to just that, even higher trade deficits and lost jobs here with Korea.

Since NAFTA passed in 1994, more than 3 million American manufacturing jobs have been lost to Mexico and Canada. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that a trade deficit between NAFTA countries alone could have led to 1 million additional manufacturing jobs here in our country. Why would a NAFTA-inspired free trade agreement like the Korean deal yield different results? It won't. The Economic Policy Institute projects 159,000 more jobs will be lost if this deal is put forward, and the International Trade Commission projects increases to our trade deficit with Korea. How can this be a pathway to economic growth in our country?

Just in the automotive sector in 2009, Korea sold 700,000 of their cars in the American market, compared to sales of U.S. cars there of 7,000. Just a smidgeon. Acknowledging that Korea's population is about one-sixth of the population of the United States, a propor-

tional fair trade equivalent would be a total of 113,000 cars from our country sold in Korea—not 7,000, 113,000. That would require a 1,514 percent increase in the number of American vehicles sold in Korea. Why wouldn't we wait for them to open their market to our goods before we give away the store again? Instead, the proposed solution in the auto sector—and this is written in the agreement—says, our three auto companies can expect to export 25,000 vehicles each, so it's 75,000 total, into their market—which is certainly better than the current 7,000—but it accepts no limits on the amount of Korean cars that can be sold into our market. But there are limits imposed on U.S. vehicle sales to Korea. How is that balanced? How is that fair?

This is neither fair trade, nor is it reciprocal. It is a managed trade arrangement that accepts an inferior position for U.S. producers. And why do we do that when our economy is hurting so very much? And it's not just in autos. It's in beef. It's in electronics and every single category.

In order for the United States to have a square deal with Korea, this is what should be in the agreement: We should eliminate tariffs in both countries. We should make certain that discriminatory nontariff barriers are immediately eliminated by both nations, not gradually implemented over time. We should include provisions to redress Korea's discriminatory value-added tax. We should contain mechanisms that will prevent an offset currency manipulation and, as well, eliminate provisions that weaken trade remedy laws. This deal does none of that.

The United States can ill afford to continue job-killing trade policies. We should embrace the old adage that, in fact, George Bush once used, "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." Well, Congress cannot allow the American people to be fooled again by the false promise of the so-called free trade agreements. When have we heard that before?

The U.S.-Korea free trade agreement should not be ratified until changes are made to make it truly free, truly fair, and truly reciprocal based on results, not dreams. Then we would hold promise to create jobs again in our Nation as well as in South Korea and Asia in general. But why should the United States keep coming up with these agreements that make us second class and that hollows out our middle class?

Let me say in closing this evening, as did Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the people of our region in northern Ohio—in fact, our whole Buckeye State—wish to offer deepest condolences in the death of Elizabeth Edwards. Her passing truly takes from the horizon one of the bright stars in our country. I met many people in my political life. And I can tell you, her intelligence, her humility, her kindness are values that I know her children and her family will long cherish. And we send our deepest sympathy to them, to