

responsive as I would expect a representative of the administration should be.

We now know that thousands of orphans in Haiti are now without food because there is no means of getting food supplies up into the locations where they are. We understand that children have been killed. A young boy who was willing to give his bicycle to one of the thug insurgents was shot dead on the street. Another young boy was injured by a flying canister and lost his life. A Fulbright scholar was fleeing for her life, having to leave the country because of the danger. Thousands of Americans have gone. The U.S. military, specifically the Marines, are in danger because of the refusal to increase the numbers of allied troops on the ground.

It is noted that in 1994 when President Clinton sent 20,000 troops into Haiti to uphold the Santiago Agreement which requires the United States to defend any duly elected democratic government in the western hemisphere, not one military personnel was harmed or was anyone else harmed.

So we know that we have a failure in this policy, we have blood shed in the street, violence in the street, and we have a duly elected president whose supporters are continuing to rebel, if you will, now in exile without any knowledge of his condition or ability to return to a place where he can engage in discussion and be part of a peaceful resolution of installing a peaceful government into Haiti. We have failed in this effort.

It is sad to say that we have not met our goals in Iraq. We have not met our goal in Afghanistan. Now we come full circle to the western hemisphere. Children are starving. People are dying. Violence is raging. No government there for us to negotiate with.

Mr. Speaker, I think for all of us this is on our hands. It is time now for us to stand up and be counted for peace around the world.

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

(Mr. PAUL 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 Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER 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 Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to talk about the issue of trade. The Bush administration rolled up yet another record for the month of January, and I believe it deserves notice. It is quite an achievement. Our trade deficit widened to \$43.1 billion in January. One month, \$43.1 billion.

Now, they have been telling us for the last year just be patient, the dollar is overvalued, it is going to drop a little bit. And as soon as the dollar drops a little bit, why then, U.S. manufacturers will become more competitive and people will start to buy our goods again.

Well, I had two questions for them. I said what do we make anymore since we are exporting so much of our manufacturing to China? And will it not perhaps mean instead that Americans will buy more expensive goods that are made overseas and that, in fact, our trade deficit will widen? Despite all the Ph.D.s and experts and luminaries they have down there, apparently my concerns have been proven out and not the administration's.

In terms of goods, our deficit went from 44 last year to this year \$48 billion. In terms of services, we had a minor increase of about \$300 million.

So, the fact is we are hollowing out the manufacturing of the United States of the America. There is a new trend where we are hollowing out what was supposed to be the next generation of jobs and intellectual technology, and I will get to that a little bit later.

What does the Bush administration say in reaction to this huge and growing deficit in trade and the debt we are mounting up overseas? China alone, \$124 billion trade deficit last year. China is now the largest foreign holder of United States debt. And they are beginning to acquire assets in the United States of America with the huge pile of dollars they are amassing with this extraordinary trade deficit.

Now, the Bush administration's answer is, well, more of the same, free trade, free trade, free trade. They are unabashed radical, knee-jerk free traders. At least they are consistent. It is good. They went on the attack yesterday saying there are only two choices: the failing trade policies of today, which are hollowing out manufacturing, our industrial base, losing jobs, outsourcing, exporting jobs to other countries, quality jobs, losing the next generation of intellectual technology jobs, jeopardizing, I believe, in the future the security of the United States as more and more critical sectors and technologies are exported overseas.

Just last week in the Wall Street Journal, General Electric, there was an article about how they have sold a

whole \$1 billion worth of turbines to China. There was just a small price they had to pay. It is a state-of-the-art, newly developed turbine, took them half a billion dollars to develop it. The Chinese demanded, in violation of the WTO and rules-based trade, which the Bush administration is such a great fan of, demanded that they give them the technology in exchange for this rather insignificant purchase. Because the technology is going to be worth far, far more; and the Chinese admit they are going to use the technology to build competing turbines. But GE in a very short sighted way decided they would be blackmailed. They were going to give them the technology and get \$1 billion worth of sales. It will look good on this year's balance sheet, but not too good 3 or 5 years from now when the Chinese are eating their lunch internationally using the technology which GE went to so much trouble to develop.

But this is repeated time and time and time again by the Chinese. I have a small company in my district called Videx. They developed a new kind of scanning technology. They developed an electronic lock. They are selling in 44 countries, including, their mistake, China, where they were selling about a \$1 million a year. But it turns out, they say in China if you bring in intellectual property within 24 hours it is counterfeited and for sale.

And the Videx company had followed all the laws and protections, went to the trouble of getting supposed Chinese protection and patents and all that. One day they found their entire company had been cloned in China including their Web site. In fact, the Chinese, the fake Chinese Videx, had gone them one up. They had a little fake American flag waving at the top of their Web site, this Chinese company.

They even copied and translated into Chinese the U.S. copyright and patents on their software. They did not make a very good product, the company found out, because they started getting product support calls from people who thought they were clients of the U.S. Videx, but were actually clients of the phony Chinese Videx. This happens time and time again.

When I went to the Bush administration and asked that perhaps we could get some help, get my two Senators to join me in this for Videx, they are a totally American company, they have 160 employees in my district, they do all of their outsourcing in the United States of America, that is all their subcontracting, not in China, and employ people even in Texas to help build their product, the response, after a lengthy delay from the Bush administration, was that the United States of America will not file intellectual property complaints against China for theft of intellectual property, will not help this relatively small company Videx, because the big corporations, the multinational corporations who are exporting their factories to China would not like that