

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.)

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

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia 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 Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WESTMORELAND 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 California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER 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 Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah 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 Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE—GET IT WHILE IT LASTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, we've all watched late-night television and seen the infomercials that seem too good to be true. Well, that's what we have here on the House floor being presented to us.

Yes, we have a health care bill for you that will solve every problem and not cost a dime. And yes, there is only one, so you'd better get it right away. Don't have time to examine it; don't have time to look it over; don't have time to turn it over. We don't have time for that because we have to solve your problem right now.

And let me tell you, it won't be 2,000 pages long. No, it's only 1,990 pages long. But wait, but wait. You'll get something in addition. You'll get the manager's amendment, maybe 800 pages long, so that maybe we'll have something that we have to swallow that's nearly 3,000 pages long.

And let me tell you, it's not going to cost you \$1 trillion. No, no, no. We've brought it down below that, \$999? No, not \$999. We've brought it down now to \$894 billion. But wait. But wait. There's add-ons. Maybe \$250 billion. Maybe \$350 billion for the doctors fix. But don't worry about that because that won't cost you anything right now. We'll charge you for that later. So remember, only \$894 billion, not \$1 trillion because we have a deal that you cannot reject.

But just remember, Madam Speaker, if this deal lasts longer than 4 hours, you won't be able to call your doctor.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Let me say, I'm going to be joined by a number of my colleagues this evening to talk about an issue which often has a tendency to leave people to have their eyes glaze over. It's the issue of international trade. I know that we have people who are focused on the World Series. I regret the fact that my two Los Angeles teams, the Angels and the Dodgers, haven't made it to the World Series. We're all fascinated watching the Phillies and the Yankees play. We've got people focused on—as my California colleague Mr. LUNGREN just pointed out—the issue of health care. We've got understandable concern about the situation in Afghanistan, and our colleague from Illinois just spent time talking about the families who had loved ones who paid the ultimate price in Afghanistan.

We have a lot of very, very important issues that we are addressing here, and it's important to note, as our distinguished Republican whip, Mr. CANTOR, said in his colloquy with the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, that what we hear at home and what public opinion polls and, most recently, the Gallup Poll that came out the day before yesterday have shown is that the number one priority right now, the greatest concern of the American people happens to be the pressing need to get our economy back on track.

The report came out earlier today that the jobless numbers have, in fact, not improved. We know that we have an unemployment rate that is approaching 10 percent. In my State of California, it's 12.2 percent. As I said, today's report that the new jobless claims did not decline by the extent that had been thought. We did get positive news on the gross domestic product growth over the last 3 months. Annualized, it came at 3.5 percent. But I've got to say—and I was talking to one of my Democratic colleagues late this afternoon who said, What evidence do we have of this economic growth? We all know, as we talk with our constituents across this country, that we have very, very serious problems when it comes to job creation and economic growth.

Now I began by saying that our goal here this evening is to talk about international trade, and the challenge that we have, Madam Speaker, is to underscore the direct correlation between job creation, economic growth and international trade. Tragically, over the past several years, we have had people get it completely backwards. There are people who believe that as we pursue international trade agreements, that the natural step to follow is job loss in the United States. We constantly hear, Well, if we pass a Free Trade Agreement, what is it that's going to happen? Oh, we're going to see our jobs going to Mexico or to China or to any other country in the world, but they're going to flee the United States of America when, in fact, the opposite is the case. Why? Well, the reason for that, Madam Speaker, is that 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside of the U.S. border. They're not here in the United States. The United States is a country that has provided the world access to our consumer market. Meaning, as we all know, we can buy goods from China that people see regularly at Wal-Mart, Kmart, Home Depot, stores across the country. So we allow, virtually tariff-free, for goods to come into the United States so that the American people can enjoy a standard of living that is higher than it would be otherwise, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing.

As I said, we want the standard of living in the United States of America to improve. One of the things that can help us improve our standard of living and create jobs based on every shred of empirical evidence that we have is for us to embark on more, not fewer, trade agreements. Basically, market-opening opportunities for U.S. workers so that manufacturing workers, union members and nonunion members will have an opportunity to sell their finished products in countries around the world. It's very important for us to embark on those agreements because the existence of those agreements—and we have a lot of evidence that we're going to talk about this evening that shows that—the existence of those agreements do, in fact, create jobs right here in the United States of America.

In fact, if we think about our goal, the goal that we have of job creation and economic growth, there are very few efforts that we have that promise more benefits if we move forward on the global trade agenda, and there are very few things that threaten our goal of job creation and economic growth if we fail to move forward on the trade agenda.

So that's why I want this evening to have my colleagues who are here—and I will say that a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—this was to be a bipartisan Special Order this evening—both sides of the aisle were hoping to join me. Colleagues like Mr. MEEKS, Mr. KIND and other Members on the Democratic side and other colleagues here because I very much hope, Madam Speaker, that we can get back to the bipartisanship that has existed on the trade agenda in the past.

Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership has chosen not to move the trade agenda, and I am saddened that President Obama has to this point not been able to move the trade agenda forward as it should be because I know that he very much wants to see new jobs created in the United States, but for I guess a number of reasons that I find hard to comprehend, they have failed to move the trade agenda forward.

□ 1930

Again, there are rank-and-file Members on both the Democratic side and on the Republican side who feel strongly about the need to do this in a number of areas. I want to spend this hour this evening talking about those.

I have two very distinguished colleagues who are here—my California colleague (Mr. HERGER) and the very distinguished gentleman from Woodland Hills, Texas (Mr. BRADY). I would be happy at this juncture to yield to either of the two of you if we could engage in a colloquy and discuss some of these issues.

I know that Mr. HERGER, who, Madam Speaker, has served with great distinction as the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, has been a wonderful leader in this area. I would like to yield to him at this juncture.

Mr. HERGER. I thank my good friend from California (Mr. DREIER) for leading us in this very important discussion on trade.

Really, the surprise, I think, for myself—now, I represent a northern California district which is heavy in agriculture. It's one of the richest agricultural areas in the world. Also, it stretches from just north of Sacramento almost 300 miles to the Oregon border. The northern quarter of it has and along the sides it has some nine national forests, Mt. Shasta and Mt. Lassen. As I mentioned, it is one of the richest agricultural areas in the world. Within the United States, we grow a large percentage of specialty crops grown in the world—walnuts, al-

monds, prunes. We're the third largest rice-producing district in the Nation.

The fact is that our consumers in northern California and in all of California—and one out of every eight citizens in the United States lives in California—cannot consume all that we grow. We need to be able to export, so over half of all that we grow is exported to other nations. It helps with our imbalance of trade. As my friends and Mr. BRADY know, it's not just agriculture. It's manufacturing as well.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I will engage my friend, if I might, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HERGER. Yes, please do.

Mr. DREIER. The issue of agriculture, let's spend just a moment on that, if we might, because the gentleman comes from an agriculture-rich area.

Frankly, there are many people who believe that the State of California's No. 1 industry is tourism, defense, or motion pictures. There are a wide range of areas, but they often don't get it right, because the No. 1 industry in the largest State of the Union is agriculture.

The Central Valley of California, which is going through serious challenges now of which all of our colleagues know because of the water problems out there, has not been able to move ahead as we would like. The area in northern California, which my friend represents, is a very, very rich area in many ways and when it comes to the agriculture field. I know that prying open those new markets with 95 percent of the world's consumers outside of our border would be very, very helpful for job creation and economic growth in his district.

I am happy to further yield.

Mr. HERGER. That's exactly true.

I'd like to give examples of agriculture and then mention that these same challenges we have in agriculture we see in manufacturing as well. As a matter of fact, we as a nation are the No. 1 agricultural country in the world and exporting country, but it's not just agriculture. We're the No. 1 manufacturing and the No. 1 trading nation in the world.

Our big challenge, as it is with our agricultural goods, is that we basically have very low tariffs coming into the United States. Yet, when we look at our markets for agriculture and for other commodities, whatever they might be—getting into the markets of China, getting into the markets of Japan, Asia, South Korea, the EU—Europe—and in the South American countries—we see that their duties, import duties, of getting our rice or our prunes or our peaches or our walnuts into their countries are very high. So, therefore, it's very difficult for us, unless we can negotiate agreements—trade agreements—with these countries, to lower their tariffs in order to get our goods into their countries.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker—

Mr. HERGER. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. I would say it's very interesting that my friend raises both Asia and Latin America.

We have agreements, as we know, and both of these gentlemen here, Madam Speaker, have been involved in this and have negotiated free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. Those three agreements are pending right now, and we, unfortunately, have not had a vote here in the Congress on those agreements.

In the wake of that, our neighbors to the north, Canada, have embarked on a free trade agreement with our allies in Colombia. They have already proceeded with that, in part, because we have not. Our friends in South Korea have already negotiated a free trade agreement with the European Union.

So what has now happened, as my friend has referred to this high tariff rate on all of these specialty crops that would be sold in Colombia, if those things are grown to the north, in Canada, under this agreement that has been struck, by virtue of that—because we have been so slow in putting together our agreement and not passing it and I believe, if we were to have it here in the House of Representatives, it would pass with bipartisan support—the Canadians are able to sell tariff-free into the Colombian market right now, and unfortunately, we are denied the opportunity to do that.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HERGER. Well, that's exactly right. Our tariffs are in the mid-20 percent. It is as much as that that we're paying into these countries.

So it almost defies reason to think that we are standing still in this Congress and that we actually have the three agreements that you mentioned which have already been negotiated. In Panama, they're about ready to rebuild the Panama Canal. The gentleman and myself have been down to these countries. We've seen this. These countries want these agreements. They've already negotiated bringing their tariffs down. They were negotiated in the last administration with these countries. All they need is a vote and an okay by the Congress.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I will say, along that line, the gentleman is absolutely right.

In mentioning that construction, the modernization of the Panama Canal, we all know what it takes to bring about the modernization of the Panama Canal—tractors, road equipment, all kinds of heavy equipment. What comes to mind? John Deere, Caterpillar, and other companies here in the United States that are on the cutting edge of developing great, great equipment. Yet the tariff rate that exists right now on selling that equipment into Panama exists. With this agreement, we would be able to get it to zero, dramatically cutting the cost of the modernization of the Panama Canal.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HERGER. Well, that's exactly the case.

Like everything else in life, no one stands still. You're either moving forward merely because your competitors are moving forward or you're moving behind.

In this case, not only are we not moving forward with just these three agreements, which could pass, but as Mr. DREIER from California mentioned, we see the Canadians have also negotiated an agreement with the Colombians and with the Panamanians where they will now get in ahead of us and will be able to make agreements. Their businesses will begin developing their relationships, and our businesses and our agriculture will be on the outside, looking in. We'll be behind. We'll still be paying these high tariffs where our competitors will not be. Therefore, we will lose literally millions of jobs that we could have been gaining and billions of dollars in trade that we could have been gaining at a time when our economy is down and at a time when we have some of the highest unemployment we've had in many decades here in the United States.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I think the gentleman makes a very interesting point.

As I've talked to a number of colleagues about the importance of our bringing up and considering and voting on these trade agreements, I know that my friends will hear this argument made:

My gosh. We're dealing with a nearly 10 percent unemployment rate in the United States. Our State has a 12.2 percent unemployment rate. Now is not a good time to bring up a free trade agreement, because aren't we going to lose jobs here in the United States if we put into place a free trade agreement?

When, in fact, as the gentleman has said so well, Madam Speaker, the opposite is the case, because the passage of and the implementation of these trade agreements are job creators right here in the United States of America.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. HERGER. Well, that is exactly the case. It really is a win-win. It is virtually a win-win for all of our manufacturers, not just for agriculture, which I represent.

Again, we're falling behind. We're costing more jobs. We're not moving forward. All we're asking for is a vote on these three areas that we've already negotiated with Panama, that we've already negotiated with the Colombians, and that we've already negotiated with the South Koreans. All we're doing is waiting for a vote, up or down, and yet we have not been able to get that from this Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

I made a horrible mistake earlier. I live in southern California. There is a

great area called Woodland Hills, and I know my friend is actually from Woodland, Texas, but I hope that he'll excuse me. I know there could be a worse slur than being mistaken for a California city, but as a Texan, maybe that's not the case.

Our friend Mr. BRADY has provided very thoughtful, tremendous leadership on the trade agenda. I've been privileged to work with him. Mr. HERGER and I were able to join Mr. BRADY, with the leadership he provided, on a very important roundtable discussion we had over at the Library of Congress on the trade agenda a couple of weeks ago.

I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, thank you, Mr. DREIER. Thank you for your leadership on trade for so many years in Congress.

Thank you, Mr. HERGER, a former top Republican on the Trade Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means.

We are here because we want jobs in America, good-paying jobs, the types you can raise your family on, and today is a good day to be talking about it because two things occurred today.

One, Speaker NANCY PELOSI introduced the Pelosi plan—the new national takeover of America's health care system, which we are going to spend every waking hour defeating, sending back to the drawing board, and getting a health care reform bill that's done right.

The third quarter economic numbers came out, which show how America has done over the last 3 months. It showed that it grew about 3½ percent. Growth is good, but if you look at it, what you realize is almost all of that growth are onetime events—Cash for Clunkers, which is over, and businesses have drawn down their stockpiles of inventory. That only happens one time.

Looking forward, whether we have hit the bottom or not, the question is: Is the private sector, the private market in America, going to drive our growth in the future or is government? The only way you have a strong recovery is if it's the private marketplace.

What we are missing are jobs created by selling American products and services around the world. It's no longer enough to just buy American. We have to sell American because of what you said—so many consumers live outside our borders. We want them to buy our ag products, our services, our computers, our equipment, all of that, but when we go outside the country, what we often find is that the rules are tilted against our companies and our workers.

□ 1845

Other countries, China, Europe, Latin America, have reached trade agreements that give their companies and their workers an advantage over ours. Today, what is interesting, as you both have said, is that when we have trade agreements, we win. We sell our American products and services. We

have a trade surplus with our trade agreement partners.

In Latin America—I was just thinking about it—in Chile people said we would sell about 50 percent more products there. We have sold 250 percent more American products.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I would like to just underscore the point my friend has made. We regularly hear that free trade agreements lead to job losses in the United States. That is a mantra that many people, unfortunately, are beating, when in fact the empirical evidence we have, history has shown the opposite in fact to be the case.

In fact, we enjoy a trade surplus with our free trade agreement, FTA, trading partners as a whole, and the country with which we don't happen to be Mexico. There is a reason for that. It is our purchase of oil from Mexico. Were it not for the purchase of oil from Mexico, we would, for all intents and purposes, have an equilibrium in trade between the United States and Mexico.

But we do have in other countries a manufacturing job surplus, a manufacturing job surplus, right here in the United States. So we have a surplus. When we export, more jobs are created for those countries with which we have free trade agreements than with not. So the answer to deal with manufacturing job creation here in the United States is more, not fewer, free trade agreements.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. You are right, Mr. DREIER. Those agreements simply level the playing field. They say if your country sells into the United States, we get an opportunity to sell our products into your country, and we have fair rules to do it. And when we compete, our companies, our workers win. They do it in ag, they do it in manufacturing, in technology, in services, in all types of goods.

But, as Mr. HERGER said, and you earlier, America is falling behind. This new government has taken itself voluntarily off the playing field. They have said we are not going to engage in trade right now. And while we have benched ourselves, the rest of the world is still playing this game. They are cutting agreements that favor China, Europe, Latin America, Brazil and other countries, Korea, the Asian-Pacific area. They are cutting agreements and deals to give their companies advantages far greater over ours. As a result, that doesn't just cost us sales of our products, it costs us jobs, because we are so good as a country when we compete.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will say that yesterday I had the great ambassador from Colombia, Carolina Barco, in my office, and we were talking about the fact that Colombia has just embarked on this agreement with Canada, and they have proceeded with a fair trade agreement with Canada. So now what is happening is, our friends

to the north are going to have a competitive advantage over us in Colombia, a market of 40 million people, that we should be getting into, and we could do it very, very quickly.

I would like to talk and get into some of the details now, if I might, with both of my friends. Since I mentioned the Colombia agreement, it has gotten a great deal of attention. It is seen as one of the most controversial in the eyes of many, and I will admit that I am very troubled, while we want to have bipartisanship, and I know there are many Democrats supportive of the U.S.-Colombia free trade agreement, I think that one of the saddest actions taken in dealing with the trade agenda was when, for the first time since implementation of the 1974 Trade Act, we saw the commitment—and it was a commitment made for an up-or-down vote here in the United States Congress—denied when it came to the U.S.-Colombia free trade agreement. There still is another opportunity for us to do that.

But there are a number of myths out there that I would like my friends to join me in shattering, and I would like to share some information that I just received yesterday, Madam Speaker, from Ambassador Barco, Colombia's great ambassador here to the United States.

We regularly hear about union violence in Colombia. In fact, as I listened to a number of labor leaders here in the United States, we are regularly told, and it saddens me to hear this, that the Colombian government is murdering our brothers. That is a statement that I have heard repeatedly in television and speeches made by union leaders here in the United States.

Colombia is a country which has I believe in a 5-year period of time gone through a more positive transformation than any country in modern history. Are there problems in Colombia? Absolutely. Is the situation perfect in Colombia? Absolutely not. Work still needs to be done in Colombia.

But under the great President Alvaro Uribe, we have seen again a very positive transformation take place there. And this report of tremendous, tremendous violence being inflicted on union leaders has in many ways been shattered.

Many of my colleagues, and I know my friends have been to Colombia, people on both sides of the aisle have been there, but just yesterday Ambassador Barco provided me some information from an independent study that was done by the University of the Andes in Colombia, a very respected institution.

They went into a detailed analysis of violence against unionists in Colombia. Their data samples actually included the Colombian unions' own data. Information that they used for this study actually consisted of information that was provided to the University of the Andes in Colombia by the unions of Colombia.

Their findings were that while overall violence in Colombia has steadily

declined, we have seen a decline in violence in Colombia, we know that very well, in the last 8 years the decline in union violence has actually been greater than the decline in overall violence in Colombia. They went on in the study to say that there is absolutely no evidence today that violence against union members is systematic or targeted.

So this notion that we have heard that the Colombian government is murdering our union brothers, which is, again, a message that has come forward from a lot of union leaders here in the United States, is just plain wrong.

The authors of the study said the following, and I quote, Madam Speaker: "Of course, any murder is a very serious matter. However, an evaluation of the progress made in confronting such a serious problem as violence against union members in Colombia must necessarily look at the statistical evidence. This is particularly so if the conclusions of such an assessment are to be used to block important economic reforms, such as free trade agreements."

So, in other words, Madam Speaker, they are saying that every murder is a tragedy—we all know that—and every government has a responsibility to apprehend and prosecute those who commit violent crimes.

In Colombia, the Uribe government is doing just that. But the numbers don't lie. Any claim that unionists are being targeted is patently false. In fact, the murder rate for unionists in Colombia is one-fourth the rate for the general population.

In fact, I remember on our last trip there, I was there in mid-August with our House Democracy Partnership and we had a lengthy discussion about this at what is their Attorney General, it is called the Fiscalía.

The figure I was most struck with, as we spent a great deal of time going through the analysis of violence and specifically union violence, is that the murder rate in Colombia is, tragically, 39 per 100,000 for the average Colombian. If one is a union Member, the murder rate is 4 per 100,000. So actually the threat is greater for someone who is just an average citizen as opposed to a unionist in Colombia. So this notion that somehow there is this planned violence against union leaders is preposterous.

In fact, one of the things that President Uribe has done is he has put into place around-the-clock, 24 hour security for 1,500 labor leaders in the country, because they are determined to do everything within their power to ensure that union leaders' lives are not threatened. They are doing everything they can to protect those union leaders.

I would be happy to yield to either of my colleagues who would like to comment on this.

Mr. HERGER.

Mr. HERGER. Well, as my good friend from California is pointing out,

in Colombia, I think most people picture Colombia as we pictured Colombia 10, 15, 20 years ago; the heart of the narco trade, everyone fearful to go out anywhere, whether it be in the cities or countryside or wherever it might be.

As a matter of fact, I remember my first trip to Colombia, I believe it was in the early 1990s. Literally wherever you traveled, we were in Cartagena and traveled around, and you had armed guards. You had an armed convoy that you traveled with.

I was there just this last year. You mentioned President Uribe and the incredible job he has done in the center of the narco traffic of South America, how they have got in and brought in those who used to be selling narcotics and used to be part of the military that was on the side of those in the drug trafficking, brought them in, trained them.

We have met, as I know you have, Mr. DREIER, and I am sure Mr. BRADY, we have met with some of these young people who were part of the other side who have come in, who have been trained for jobs.

Mr. DREIER. It is called the demobilization effort, those from the FARC, the Armed Revolutionary Forces of Colombia, which have been the guerrillas, and the so-called paramilitaries, those on the right who responded. They have had this amazing demobilization effort, where young people have been drawn into violence and now they are so excited to be part of productive society.

Mr. HERGER. Again, as you met with them, and we met with them not only in Cartagena but also in Medellin, who would have thought about going to Medellin, where we did, and see how safe it is and met with these same young people, people in their mid-twenties, early twenties, but had spent basically their whole life on the other side, that were now productive and excited about the life in a democracy there and being able to live.

It is incredibly exciting. And it is even that much more of a reason, when they have fought and done so much to change their countryside, have risked their lives to turn their country around, that if there is anyone we should be an ally to, it should be the Colombians.

So not only are they helping us with their trade, but we are in a position there to aid them, to help them, to stand as an ally with them, as we should be with the Panamanians, as we should be with our allies the South Koreans, where, again, they are helping us at a time where economically we need these jobs in America.

This is when our Speaker PELOSI and the head of the Senate, HARRY REID, should be allowing these three already-negotiated trade agreements to come before the House and the Senate to be voted on so that we can be moving forward. They are bringing down their barriers, selling our agriculture, selling our manufactured goods, and putting literally millions of Americans to work.

Mr. DREIER. I appreciate my friend getting back to the point of why it is that we are here, because the number one priority, according to the American people in the Gallup poll that was released the day before yesterday, was job creation and economic growth. We have all been talking about that.

We want to make sure that we can create good jobs, agriculture, manufacturing, small businesses. We want to create service-sector jobs. We want to create these jobs here in the United States of America. And I believe that one of the best ways for us to do that is to open up these new markets.

Now, obviously we want to underscore concern. If governments are taking action, murdering union leaders, that understandably is outrageous. But there is a complete, complete blur that has been put together on the part of many people who, for some strange reason, are opposed to engaging in these trade agreements that I just find incomprehensible. It is, again, beyond me why it is that they would hurt rank-and-file union members, who are going to be the ones to benefit by opening up these new markets.

I am happy to yield to my friend from the Woodlands.

□ 2000

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you for raising this issue because I think it is shameful that America has not ratified the trade agreement with Colombia. Yeah, there are strong jobs reasons. Colombia is able to sell their products in the United States almost duty free. We want the opportunity to compete with their customers. Canada, Europe are cutting agreements with them that will cost us about half a billion dollars of sales of U.S. goods and services and products which, again, those are lost jobs.

The point you made early on, Mr. DREIER, is that beyond that, here's a country that has brought itself, with America's help, from darkness to light. President Uribe has taken the country, established the rule of law, freedom of democracy, freedom of the press, freedom in the marketplace, has a judiciary that is working. They have lowered the violence rate in a neighborhood, in a region that absolutely rejects America and all we stand for, including this new President, rejecting him as well.

Here's America's allies who are fighting with us to stop drug trafficking, stands with us on security issues and human rights, have done remarkable things, and we've turned our backs on them.

So whether it is Colombia and that strong national security reason, Panama and the market that goes with that, Korea, and the rest of the world, where, again, as you have said, America is falling behind, it is just a shame.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, my friend makes a very, very important point on the foreign policy implications here when we talk about the tremendous alliance that we've been able

to build with Colombia. Let's look at the kinds of threats that exist there.

The neighborhood is a tough one. Of course, the very famous Hugo Chavez, the strong man in Venezuela. We have Evo Morales, the leader of Bolivia, who is a Chavezista. We know that. Very closely aligned. Rafael Correa, the leader of Ecuador, has fallen in line the same way.

In the region, we of course have Daniel Ortega, the leader of the Sandinista movement there. And we have this strong—very, very strong ally of ours in Colombia. And it's amazing. When you look at the numbers, it has been 1,073 days—1,073 days, Madam Speaker—since the signing of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Guess what? \$2.3 billion—\$2.3 billion in additional tariffs have been imposed on U.S. manufacturers, other job creators here, in their quest to get their products just into Colombia alone. \$2.3 billion in the last 1,073 days.

Let's look at a couple of those items. Automobiles. Right now there is a 35 percent tariff on U.S. automobiles in the quest to get into Colombia. What does that mean? On a \$20,000 automobile that would be manufactured in the United States and sold into Colombia, the tariff would be \$7,000. If we can pass this agreement, have a vote here in the House and put it into place, what will happen? Well, we'll see that tariff go to zero.

Similarly, for DVDs and movies it's a 5 to 15 percent tariff. For cotton—and we know that textile manufacturing is very, very important. A lot of manufacturing takes place in Latin America. Cotton comes from the United States. Right now there's a 10 percent tariff on U.S. cotton going into Colombia. If we can bring that to zero, it means that more cotton in the United States of America will actually end up, Mr. Speaker, going to Colombia for finished product.

Mr. Speaker, we're very fortunate to have been joined by my very good friend from Lafayette, Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY. I appreciate his presence here and the strong leadership that he has shown not on only in this health care debate with his brilliant response to President Obama after he addressed us here in this joint session of Congress, but on the issue of international trade as well.

I'm happy to yield to Mr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend from California for his kind comments. There are so many aspects to trade that we really need to discuss. First of all, if you look at our economy, the United States economy has been a consumer-driven economy. We have seen imports vastly exceed exports in this country.

All the economists are talking about getting back to some sort of global trade balance and current accounts balance. And the only way to do that is for us to increase our exports. That won't happen without trade agreements.

I can give you some examples from my home State. For instance, exports from Louisiana following the NAFTA agreement rose 271 percent since 1994. Since 2004, with the U.S.-Chile Free Trade Agreement, exports from Louisiana rose 219 percent. With the Singapore-U.S. Trade Agreement we saw a 53 percent increase in exports since 2004. Morocco, 99 percent increase in exports since 2006. And with CAFTA we've seen a 43 percent increase since 2006.

Now the fact of the matter is 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States.

Mr. DREIER. My friend just added an additional percentage point. I've been saying 95 percent. Is it in fact 96 percent live outside our borders?

Mr. BOUSTANY. Those are the facts I have.

Mr. DREIER. Thanks for correcting me.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I think it's important to recognize that jobs related to exports pay, on average, 13 to 18 percent more than non-exporting jobs. These are benefits for families in the United States. These are benefits that create jobs in the United States.

I know I walked in a little late into this discussion and you were discussing the foreign policy implications of this, and specifically with Colombia, but I would submit that it's even broader than that because as President Obama and his administrative team travel around to the world's capitals to deal with very difficult foreign policy problems, whether it's in Central Asia or in the Middle East and so forth, even in Africa, in these capitals those leaders are going to want to talk about trade and expanding trade opportunities because it all comes down to economic opportunity in the long run.

If we're not prepared with a trade agenda to move forward with the leaders in these respective areas, then our foreign policy is going to be a failure.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time for a moment just to underscore what my friend is saying on this foreign policy issue, which is an important one. President Obama has, I believe correctly, talked about the importance of soft power. Dealing diplomatically, which I think is important. I, of course, am a strong proponent of a tough decision posture as well. But utilization of soft power is something that President Obama has referred to.

In fact, at the G-20 meeting that took place, those leaders all agreed that they would reject protectionism. Unfortunately, if you look at 66 of the 78 trade measures that have been implemented since that G-20 meeting, they have been protectionist. It's very sad because as we're talking about the economic downturn through which we're going right now and the challenges that we face here in the United States and in the global economy, one can't help but think about history. Because people are talking about regularly this economic downturn and what

took place seven decades ago. The Great Depression.

We know that, unfortunately, under Republican leadership, President Hoover and Congressman Hawley and Senator Smoot, we saw passage in 1930 of very, very poor trade policy. Fortunately, we as Republicans have been proudly providing leadership since then and we want to work in a bipartisan way on this.

But most economists, regardless of their stripe, acknowledge that the protectionist actions which, frankly, Smoot-Hawley began as just a little agricultural tariff measure at the outset and grew into one of the most protectionist measures in the history of the United States. It undermined our ability globally to provide leadership.

If you look at what happened to Europe, as we all know, following that, the Second World War, it can go back to this use of soft power question, which the President has correctly raised and, similarly, at that time engaging in protectionism undermines that.

The unfortunate thing is we seem to be slipping down that road of protectionism now, which seriously undermines our ability to provide that strong global leadership in dealing with the war against radical extremism, in dealing with the challenges that exist in a wide range of areas.

I'm happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I want to add as we look at this difficult economy and the significant unemployment we're seeing here in the United States, it's important to keep in mind that 97 percent of U.S. exports are from small and medium-size businesses.

Mr. DREIER. I was afraid you were going to say 97 percent of the world's consumers are out of our borders; that it's gone up 2 percent since I started.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Here we are. If we want to grow small business jobs, the best way to do it is to expand our exports and that will help us also expand our manufacturing capacity. Actually, the world is moving forward and we're sitting still here.

If you look at the TransPacific Partnership, everybody's waiting on the United States to move forward with this agreement. It's a critically important agreement to work out with Chile, Peru, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and Brunei.

We're also looking at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. This is where we need to be engaged with China and these Eastern countries, because we have huge, huge trade opportunities and job growth opportunities by expanding these agreements.

So I think it's clear that this administration needs to come forward with a comprehensive trade policy to Congress and let's get to work on creating this liberalized trade order because that is the element of soft power that you were emphasizing earlier. And it is probably our most important instru-

ment of power as we move on the global stage.

With that, I will yield back.

Mr. DREIER. Let me say that my friend is absolutely brilliant. Not all doctors are seen as that way. But I'm so impressed Dr. BOUSTANY has been able to charge towards great brilliance in a wide range of areas beyond his field of expertise. We're very fortunate to have him in the House.

I'd be happy to yield to my friend who sneered when I mentioned doctors, my friend from The Woodlands.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I was just thinking about people who are out of work. We have lost 9 million people who no longer have jobs since the recession began—almost 3 million since they passed that huge stimulus bill—who may be watching tonight, to have no jobs, maybe have lost hope of getting them. Yet the companies that could hire them are manufacturing products or offering services or growing agricultural goods they don't have an opportunity to sell throughout the world. That the rest of these countries are just moving past us so aggressively selling, promoting their country's goods and services. And America is so arrogant that we don't even go out there to try to create a level playing field.

I always tell people, in closing for myself, that if you drive down a highway, every third acre you see planted is for sale around the world. If you go to a computer company, every fourth worker is building something for sales around the world. If you go to a manufacturing plant, every fifth worker is building something for sale around the world. If you look at our whole economy, four out of every ten workers are tied to trade.

So if we can sell American, not just buy American—sell American—we can create jobs for Americans. We can put people back to work. We can improve our own economy. So what are we waiting for?

I yield back.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful contribution. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think one of the things that we have not really spent a lot of time discussing here this evening has been the U.S.-Korea deal.

We've talked in large part about Latin America; about Colombia and Panama and the benefit of opening that up. But I do know that the three ambassadors representing countries with which we have signed these trade agreements have come together and they have unified on the message that the issue of trade and free trade is a priority for all of them. They each have unique cases to make as to what those benefits are. Frankly, as I listen to virtually all of those arguments, they are very positive for us.

When it comes to Korea, the amazing thing that we look at there, if we were to pass this U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, it would be the single largest trade agreement ever embarked

upon in the world because of the size of the U.S. economy and the size of the economy of South Korea.

□ 2015

They have a trillion-dollar economy, and it's a very, very growing market right now for our goods, and it's our seventh largest trading partner today. We have annual two-way trade today of \$82 billion between South Korea and the United States.

It happens to be and I know, Mr. HERGER, Mr. Speaker, will be interested in this. It's our sixth largest market for agricultural goods in the world and our seventh largest market for another industry that is very important in Texas, and I know in Louisiana as well as California, is the IT market.

The largest level of broadband usage in the world is in South Korea at 83 percent, making it a really key market for U.S. technology goods and services, and there is an enormous potential for increasing those already high agricultural exports as Korea, as we all know, must import 70 percent of its agricultural needs.

It stands to benefit the agricultural sectors of all of our States tremendously if we were to embark on that. Nearly two-thirds of agricultural exports to Korea will become duty-free immediately with passage of this. Our agricultural products currently face an average tariff, those products going from California, from Texas, from Louisiana, into Korea, on average, a 52 percent tariff today. Again, that would be slashed, two-thirds slashed immediately and ultimately they would get to zero.

Under the agreement, nearly 95 percent of bilateral trade and consumer industrial products will become duty-free within 3 years and tariffs on almost all goods will be totally eliminated within the 10-year period of time for implementation. The economic and job creation benefits of eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers to trade with a \$1 trillion economy would be of great, great importance.

It would be a very, very powerful display of unity between our countries, South Korea and the United States, as we work together to address, as we have said, the very important national security issues, nuclear proliferation treaties that exist, the war against radical extremism, pandemics that are there. The idea of using this soft power, as President Obama correctly says, would be dramatically enhanced if we were to pass the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from California (Mr. HERGER) if he would like to add to that.

Mr. HERGER. I thank my friend.

That is so true. People don't realize. You know, we hear a fair amount, or some, about their trade agreement that has been negotiated but not voted on with Colombia and some with Panama, but as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) so rightly mentioned, the

big one, the biggest of all the trade agreements that we have ever negotiated is with the South Koreans.

As a matter of fact I just yesterday had eight South Koreans who represented businesses in South Korea that were in my office, and they were describing to me how they wanted us to be able to pass this agreement, be able to have a vote here in the House and the Senate on this very important agreement, that their concern was that they wanted to do business with our American companies. They wanted to do business with us and that the European Union, the EU, was already negotiating, was in the process of having an agreement with them.

If their agreement went through before ours did, they would lose their ability, obviously, if they could purchase more economically from the EU, that, economically, is what they would need to do. I was looking at some statistics, that just with South Korea, not only would we not pick up that extra business, those extra jobs, hundreds of thousands of jobs here in the United States, but we would actually lose business that we already have because we would lose part of this market—it was estimated by staff on our Ways and Means Committee, we could see an 8 percent or \$1.1 billion decline in our U.S. exports to South Korea.

Again, at a time when nationally we have 9.8 percent unemployment; in California, 12.2; and in my rural northern California district it's up around 14 percent unemployment, the last thing we want to do is be losing jobs. We need to be gaining these jobs is why it's so particularly paramount at this time that we move forward.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for getting back to this issue of job creation and economic growth, which is what these agreements are about. It's about improving the standard of living and the quality of life for people here in the United States of America by not only allowing them to have access to products from around the world, but to create good jobs so that we can continue to export to those 95, 96, 97, 98 percent of the consumers who are outside of our borders.

I am happy to yield further to my good friend from the Woodlands.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Let me just say this, because I have enjoyed this discussion. It's about jobs, it's about America falling behind.

There is this principle in trade we should not forget. The principle is if you and I build a better mousetrap, we should have the freedom to sell it throughout the world without government interference. If someone else builds a better mousetrap we should have the freedom to buy it for our family and for our business.

That freedom to buy, sell and compete is critical because you forget, other countries, because others compete to sell to you and I. We have a wide choice of automobiles and clothing and electronics and all. They say,

by studies, that we save so much money because of that trade, that competition, that most families in America can go to a grocery store once a month for free because of the benefits of free trade here in America, which is even more puzzling on raising our standard of living why we allow ourselves to fall behind and why we are giving up on those jobs, why America isn't leading.

That is a question I believe only our President can answer.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for his very thoughtful remarks.

Mr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Very briefly, I would say my friend from Texas is absolutely right. This is about growing U.S. jobs and creating job opportunities for our small businesses.

As these export markets open up and that greater connectivity is created between our country and our trading partners, the standard of living goes up in those countries and those markets expand. It creates more opportunities for our small businesses to create jobs here and to continue to export.

So, at a time where we are having these discussions, when this country is seeing high unemployment, we are coming out of a recession, we should be vigorously pursuing these types of agreements.

And what are we hearing now from this White House? Silence. Silence. It makes no sense.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend. Let me express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues from Louisiana, Texas and California and to say that it's very important for us to get back to bipartisanship on this issue of trade. I have been troubled with the fact that the President has not sent up these agreements for us to consider, as I know my colleagues are. I have been troubled at some of the decisions made by the Democratic leadership.

But I have to say this, there are Democrats with whom we serve who share our commitment to the issue of global leadership by expanding these trade agreements. They understand the improvements that have taken place in Colombia, where unionists are not, in fact, being murdered by the Government of Colombia. They share our recognition that we could have jobs created for Caterpillar and for John Deere if we were to go into the Panama agreement. And they understand the implications of this U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

This is the right thing for us to do, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we can come together in a bipartisan way. If we will simply have the vote here in the House of Representatives, we will have strong, bipartisan support for the right thing.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Michigan, Congressman THADDEUS MCCOTTER, is known here for his extremely subtle wit, his use of metaphors that challenge the most intelligent among us, and for incredible insight into issues. He talks a lot about freedom, and he published a piece today from the Republican Policy Committee that I would like to use as the basis of my comments tonight.

The title of it is "Leeches vs. Laser Surgery: The Contemporary Crux of Health Care Reform."

He goes on to say that "Contrary to 'conventional wisdom,' on the issue of health care reform (and all others) the Democrats are the party of the past. We Republicans are the party of the present and the future.

"Bluntly, Democrats are fighting against the times. Their stale, government-run health reform proposals are as outdated and unsuited to contemporary life as a leaching is to laser surgery."

No one can quite put things in perspective like THADDEUS MCCOTTER.

But when I read that today, I wanted to share that with the American public, because I think it is a very, very good analogy.

Everywhere I go, I talk to people in my district and they say they are scared to death with what is happening in our country. And I talk to other people who travel all around the country, and they say they hear that, too.

What are people scared to death of? What they are scared of is losing their freedoms. We have people all over the world fighting to protect the freedoms that have been so dearly won in this country and to help other countries gather their freedoms and to get the freedom that they deserve.

Yet the biggest threat to our freedom in this country right now isn't anywhere else in the world; it's right here in this Capitol, right here in this room and in the Senate Chamber across the hall. That's the greatest threat to our freedom.

Republicans, though, have alternatives, and I want to talk a little bit about those alternatives. We should be looking at reforming medical liability laws, ending exclusions for preexisting conditions, expanding health savings accounts, providing tax credits for purchasing private health insurance, allowing association health plans, permitting health insurance purchases across State lines, encouraging individuals to ensure against changes in health status, giving incentives for preventive health care, and applying information technology to enhance transparency and increase efficiencies. All that can be achieved without trillions in new spending. In fact, most of it can be done for absolutely no cost.

Instead, what we have offered to us by the Democrats is an erosion of our freedom. It's a government takeover of the best health care system in the world.