

That means more Americans, more American jobs are exported, more American job losses, and that is bad news not just for manufacturing and the people that own those companies; it is bad news for American workers, it is bad news for our communities, it is bad news for our schools and our families.

And if we really want to talk about American values, then we ought to be talking about what these trade agreements do to our children, do to our families, what they do to the school systems, what they do to police and fire protection, school districts, police districts and fire districts; and cities lose more and more tax revenue.

The fact is the promises of the Central American Free Trade Agreement are again the same as they were under NAFTA, the same as they were under China trade, the same as they were under the legislation setting up the World Trade Organization. But what we see time and time again is more trade deficit, more hemorrhaging of American jobs.

Now, when they talk about CAFTA, the six countries in Central America that this trade agreement involves with the United States under that, the entire economies of these six countries are equal to the economy of Columbus, Ohio or the State of Kansas, or Orlando, Florida. Their buying power is such in those countries, those six countries, as poor as they are, and as small as they are, they simply do not have the buying power to buy American products. Guatemalans and Nicaraguans and the people in Honduras and Costa Rica and El Salvador simply do not have the money to buy cars manufactured in Ohio, or steel made in West Virginia. They do not have the purchasing power to buy textiles and apparel from Georgia, South Carolina, from North Carolina.

They do not have the money or the purchasing power or the income to buy software from Seattle or high-tech products from California. Madam Speaker, what this trade agreement is about is what all of these trade agreements are about: they are about cheap labor, no environmental regulation, weak worker safety laws. We need to vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

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

#### NO EARMARKS IN HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the House Appropriations Committee floated a trial balloon in some of the newspapers that cover Congress. They indicated that they might allow earmarks into this year's appropriation bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Not surprisingly, the announcement has elicited little reaction outside the Beltway where Americans pay little attention to the arcane ins and outs of congressional appropriation bills.

The same cannot be said for K Street where lobbyists can barely contain their glee at the prospect of another appropriations bill to fill with earmarks. By opening up the door to earmarks in the homeland security appropriations bill, we are opening a Pandora's box of government waste, pork-barrel spending, and weakened homeland security.

In the 2 years since its inception, the Homeland Security appropriations bill has been free of earmarks. House leaders have recognized that something as important as the bill funding national security agencies ought to be absent of earmarks.

□ 2230

I am puzzled as to why we now suddenly believe that earmarking homeland security funds is an acceptable practice. There are a number of reasons why earmarks would corrupt the homeland security appropriations process, but unquestionably the most serious is that it would jeopardize our national security.

A few months ago defense analysts complained, the news that earmarks in the defense appropriations bill had put the lives of our troops at risk. They argue that congressional earmarks had drained the pot of available money for supplies like body armor or Humvee armor for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. You can be sure that earmarking homeland security funds will have the same effect.

The Congress created the Department of Homeland Security to assess domestic threats to our country and address them. Now, after only 2 years of funding the department, Congress believes it knows how best to allocate these funds. Congressional oversight of this department is vital and that is why congressional earmarking is so dangerous.

Homeland security earmarks are also sure to slip down the pork barrel slope so many other appropriations bills have gone down. It will not be long before Members are inserting earmarks for projects with only a modest relevance to homeland security. A first responders hall of fame project, for example, or a port security museum. The possibilities are as endless as appropriators' imaginations.

Anyone who believes that such a scenario is a stretch needs only to give a cursory look at the more than 4,000 earmarks in this year's transportation bill. Members will be hard pressed to

vote against a bill intended to protect our national security even if it is over budget or stuffed with pork. For that reason, lobbyists will view it as a must-pass vehicle for earmarks.

Adding earmarks to the homeland security appropriations bill is clearly bad policy, but I also believe that for Republicans it is bad politics as well. The earmarking process was abused by the Democrats, but I am sad to say that during Republican control of Congress we have made it much worse. It is no wonder that the Republican Party, the party of fiscal constraint since the New Deal, has seen public trust in its ability to balance the books evaporate.

For the most part, Americans no longer believe that Republicans are more fiscally prudent than Democrats. I cannot say that I blame them. Every Republican who values serving in the majority should be troubled by this trend.

Further, I worry that by opening up the homeland security bill to earmarks, we would let public distrust of our handling of fiscal issues spill over into national security. While it may be hard to tell the difference between Republicans and Democrats on spending, there is still a very real difference when it comes to national security. It would be a shame to let our growing appetite for earmarks jeopardize our ability to lead on national security.

Just how far Republicans have strayed for limited government orthodoxy was apparent recently when a current Member of this body ran for reelection a decade after he had first been in this body. He told of being approached by legions of lobbyists and local officials, each wanting to know how he would proceed to help them get earmarks for local projects. But I am a Republican, was his response. We know, was their retort.

What a sad commentary this is on our party.

I was elected to Congress with aspirations higher than groveling from crumbs that fall from appropriators' tables. I suspect that this is the case with each of my colleagues. Yet, we are quickly approaching a point where that would simply be an apt description of our jobs.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reverse course. To do so, we need to shoot down this trial balloon. The last thing we need to do is open up the \$32 billion fund, the Homeland Security bill to pork barrel spending.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.