

and, in effect, taxing American-made imports. This policy has cost the U.S. upwards of 2.5 million manufacturing jobs over the last decade and a staggering annual trade deficit of as much as \$273 billion.

The Chinese have dialogued and dialogued and dialogued for years about allowing their currency to appreciate but have continued the practice of devaluing it. Our Nation is facing a jobs crisis, and we can no longer afford to stand for this destructive policy.

H.R. 639, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, would address the issue of this manipulation by recognizing in law what we already know, that currency misalignment is an export subsidy. The measure would take commonsense steps to ensure our Treasury Department appropriately identifies countries that engage in this unfair policy and allow the United States to place countervailing duties on imports from offending nations.

This act has 230 cosponsors, more than enough to pass the House. In fact, just over a year ago, drawing on support from American labor and manufacturing, the House supported a similar bill. On September 23, 2010, the House approved the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 348-79. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act. More than 260 of the Members who voted in favor of that measure remain in the House. In this Congress, in October, the other body did pass a similar measure by a bipartisan vote of 63-35. It is time for the House to pass this bill.

Those who oppose efforts to punish China for its unfair trade policies insist this measure would start a so-called trade war. We are in a war, a war for jobs, and we are losing. China continues to fight to win jobs while America's Government dawdles. This cannot continue.

According to a report by the Economic Policy Institute, titled, "Unfair China Trade Costs Local Jobs," thanks to our trade imbalance with China, 2.4 million jobs were lost in the United States between 2001 and 2008.

Unfortunately, currency manipulation is far from the only trade-disrupting policy practiced by China. This summer, the New American Foundation convened a task force led by Leo Gerard of the United Steelworkers and Leo Hindrey of New America, and published a report. The report they released further confirms the myriad of activities that China engaged in that undermine our jobs.

China employs a complex and far-reaching set of industrial and mercantile policies. Environmental and labor rules that we take for granted are rare to nonexistent in China. China disregards intellectual property protections such as trademarks, copyrights, and patents and then steals technology from us and other countries around the world at an annual cost of hundreds of billions of dollars. It does this, in part, by shamelessly forcing foreign compa-

nies to divulge intellectual property as a price for market access.

Further, China uses state secret laws to protect commercial interests and is pursuing a policy of indigenous innovation whereby it manufactures and maneuvers to increase the domestic production of high value-added goods.

The House must pass and act on the Chinese currency manipulation bill.

BORDER PATROL AGENT JESUS DIAZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the dangerous border region between Mexico and Texas, in the year 2008, outlaws from Mexico were caught smuggling marijuana into the United States, and they were caught by the Border Patrol agents.

Border Patrol Agent Jesus Diaz's actions later have resulted in him being sentenced recently to 2 years in a Federal penitentiary. On October 20 of this year, District Judge Ludham sentenced Diaz to 24 months in prison because the agent is alleged to have been too rough in his handling of one of the drug smugglers who was arrested; and, also, Diaz allegedly later lied about the incident to investigators.

Now, what Diaz is accused of is pulling the suspect's handcuffs back and pushing the suspect to the ground while pressing the suspect's back with his knee in order to get him to comply with the Border Patrol agent's orders. Prior to the incident the suspect had illegally crossed into Texas by boat with a large shipment of marijuana, and he was accompanied by a member of the notorious MS-13 gang.

The U.S. Government had a choice to make: Prosecute the illegal drug smuggler or prosecute the Border Patrol agent. The United States Government chose poorly. The Mexican Government demanded that Diaz be prosecuted by our government, and he was.

To top it off, the suspect was told he would not be prosecuted for illegally coming into the United States or for the marijuana he brought into the United States in return for his testimony against Border Patrol Agent Diaz.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not here today to comment on whether or not Jesus Diaz used proper police procedure when he detained the suspect or whether the jury or the judge made a mistake. Those issues will be dealt with on appeal. However, it seems to me that this case should not have been prosecuted as a crime. It should have been dealt with and handled administratively within the U.S. Border Patrol, and the drug smuggler should have been prosecuted.

The U.S. Federal Government had its priorities wrong. The National Border Patrol Council, which represents 17,000 of our Border Patrol agents, our border protectors, they agree. They argue that

a situation like this should have been handled administratively and did not rise to the level of criminal conduct. But millions of taxpayer dollars and thousands of man-hours were expended to obtain a 24-month sentence and a conviction for Diaz, who had already spent 8 months in custody.

There is more. An internal investigation by the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office of Professional Responsibility both cleared Agent Diaz of any wrongdoing in the 2008 incident.

□ 1030

But Mexico would have none of this and demanded and got its way.

The U.S. Attorney's Office went after Border Patrol agent Jesus Diaz. And his case was tried in the western district of Texas, a jurisdiction that has a history of, in my opinion, unfairly targeting border protectors for prosecution. You remember, this is the same jurisdiction that prosecuted Border Patrol agents Ramos and Compean for allegedly shooting a drug smuggler as he ran away from the agents while they tried to apprehend him. It took a Presidential commutation in 2009 to finally end the persecution of these two agents, and millions of Federal dollars were wasted on this case.

Then there's a similar case where Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez was prosecuted for firing his weapon at a fleeing vehicle that had tried to run him over. Same jurisdiction.

But the question we must ask ourselves is why the Federal Government is spending time and money to prosecute our Border Patrol agents who put their lives on the line every day down there on the border of the U.S. and Mexico instead of spending time and money and resources to enforce immigration laws in this country.

When ICE Director Morton and Secretary Napolitano from Homeland Security recently testified in front of the Judiciary Committee, they both said they just didn't have the money or the resources to fully enforce immigration laws. They, in essence, in my opinion, granted amnesty or parole to thousands of illegals in the United States. But they have the money to go after Border Patrol agents.

Maybe they should use some of that prosecutorial discretion they're so proud of to prosecute people who cross the border into the United States with drugs over prosecuting Border Patrol agents.

In this case, the United States Government is on the wrong side of the border war. The U.S. Attorney's Office should quit being the voice of Mexico and be the voice of America. We should secure the border and keep the drug smugglers from having their way, and don't give them a get-out-of-jail-free card. It's time to get our money and our priorities straight. Let's stop going

after the good guys and spend time and money going after the bad guys. And that's just the way it is.

DOES GOD TRUST US?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as we see the Nation going through such pain, I rise once again to see why we can't get along, why Republicans and Democrats find it almost impossible to try to raise some solutions to the problems we face.

There is no question that there are many Republicans in the House and Senate that believe that the most important contribution that they can make to our country is to get rid of the President. But at the same time, we have 14 million people that have lost their jobs, many have lost their homes, their savings, their hopes for the future. Probably double that number we find underemployed. And the millions and millions of people in districts like mine where people have actually given up hope that they can restore their dignity and get the resources necessary to provide for their families.

Yesterday, the House overwhelmingly passed a bill that would support the motto "In God We Trust." I reluctantly supported it because I didn't want anyone to believe that I didn't trust God. But I felt awkward because I didn't see where that was the question.

The real question, I would think, is, does God trust us? Does God trust us to do the things that every religion says we should be doing? Are we trusted to provide care and compassion for the vulnerable? Are we trusted to know that we have a responsibility to the sick, to the aged, to the disabled? That's where God really counts, no matter what your religious background is.

And to talk about a motto and sharing that, I don't think that has to be challenged. What is challenged is, what are we going to do about it?

Why do we find people young and old around the country protesting against the disparity that exists between the poor, who God said through his servant Jesus, his son Jesus, that they should be taken care of? And the Scriptures are not too kind—at least not as kind as I am—to the rich. But common decency would expect that there be fairness in the resources this great Nation would have.

And that when we find that less than 1 percent of Americans control 42 percent of the national wealth, would we find that our educational system is definitely not going to allow us to be competitive in the future? When we see that the American Dream—and that to me is the most important part of my pride in being an American; you don't have to succeed in America, but the hope and the dream that people from all countries can come here and have an opportunity to break out of their class system, out of poverty, and join the middle class.

Even those who came as slaves and had their backgrounds just eliminated; their names, their culture, their songs, their history, but nevertheless, because of the Congress and trust in God they, too, have been able to achieve, even to the extent of becoming President of the United States and honored Members of the Congress through the Congressional Black Caucus.

So once that hope is challenged by anybody, then it means for the whole world the symbol that America is supposed to be. It's not one that improves your quality of life but finds us having people losing hope in the system. The fact that we don't speak out when thousands of young Americans, brave warriors, are being killed and have been killed in countries that their families have no idea where the countries are located or what the issues were, and the necessity of protecting oil has no longer been the issue.

So I say, yes, in God we trust, but we've got a few days left to see whether or not we can have God trust in us.

BACK TO BASICS WITH THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the International Monetary Fund estimated that as of Halloween night, the debt of this Nation surpassed its entire economy for the first time since World War II.

We all know that if you live beyond your means today you're going to have to live below your means tomorrow. That's the tomorrow that our generation has created for the children who were dressed up as princesses and cowboys when they came calling on Monday night. This is our generation's eternal shame. And it's something that our generation must act to set right.

The House is expected soon to vote on a balanced budget amendment that's critical to stop this plunder of our children. There are a number of excellent proposals out there, and I'd have no trouble supporting any of them. I do rise, however, to express the hope that the final product of these deliberations proves worthy of the wisdom that guided the drafting of the Constitution.

The beauty of the American Constitution is in its simplicity and its humility. The American Founders recognized Cicero's wisdom that the best laws are the simplest ones. And they realized that they couldn't possibly foresee the circumstances and conditions that might confront future generations, and therefore they resisted the temptation to micromanage every decision that might be made centuries in the future.

□ 1040

Instead, they set forth general principles of governance and erected a structure in which human nature, itself, would provide guidance in future

decisions to conform with these principles.

In crafting a balanced budget amendment, we need to maintain these qualities. We shouldn't attempt to tell future generations specifically how they should manage their revenues and expenditures in times that we cannot comprehend. The experience of many States that operate under their own balanced budget amendments tells us that the more complicated and convoluted such strictures become, the more they are circumvented and manipulated.

Many have quoted Jefferson's 1798 letter to John Taylor as support for a balanced budget amendment. Here is what he actually wrote:

"I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution. I would be willing to depend on that alone for the reduction of the administration of our government to the genuine principles of its Constitution. I mean an additional article: taking from the Federal Government the power of borrowing."

What is a balanced budget? It's simply a budget that doesn't require us to borrow. So, as Jefferson did, why don't we just say so? Instead of trying to define fiscal years, outlays, expenditures, revenues, emergencies, triggers, sequestrations, and so on, I hope that we would consider 27 simple words:

"The United States Government may not increase its debt except for a specific purpose by law, adopted by three-fourths of the membership of both Houses of Congress." That's it.

Such an amendment, taking effect 10 years from ratification, would give the government time to put its affairs in order and to thereafter naturally require future Congresses to maintain both a balanced budget as well as a prudent reserve to accommodate fluctuations of revenues and routine contingencies. It trusts that three-fourths of future Congresses will be able to recognize a genuine emergency when they see one and that one-fourth of Congress will be strong enough to resist borrowing for light or transient reasons. The experience of the States warns us that a two-thirds vote is insufficient to protect against profligacy.

Some advocate going much further by establishing limitations on spending and taxation as well; but if borrowing is prohibited, there exists a natural limit to the ability and willingness of the people to tolerate taxation and therefore spending. The real danger is when runaway spending is accommodated and made possible by borrowing, which is simply a hidden future tax. The best and most effective way to invoke that natural limit is with a simple prohibition.

At the end of the week, I will introduce this 27-word amendment and will ask my colleagues to consider it with the many others that are currently before the Congress.