

Today, I stand in the same place asking the same question. Now, 10 years have passed, 1,800 American lives have been lost, and we have spent almost half a trillion dollars, and I have to ask again: Have 10 years in Afghanistan made America safer? Sadly, just as I concluded 2 years ago, I must conclude again today, they have not.

We went into Afghanistan under the mantle of protecting America's national security. The perpetrators of September 11, al Qaeda, were in Afghanistan, and we had to go after them. But just as was the case 2 years ago, al Qaeda is no longer primarily in Afghanistan. In fact, only 50 to 100 al Qaeda operatives are estimated to be operating in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda's primary hub is still located across the border in tribal areas of Pakistan. And other al Qaeda cells are operating around the world in Yemen, North Africa, and through affiliated groups in Southeast Asia and Uzbekistan.

Threats to America are not from Afghanistan but from ungoverned spaces around the world and even right here on American soil. A review of recently foiled terrorist plots shores up the widespread origins of U.S.-centered terror attempts. The Times Square bomber is a Pakistani American who received training in the Waziristan region of Pakistan. The explosives hidden in ink cartridges and destined for an American synagogue in my own district in Chicago were planted by a Saudi militant and shipped from Yemen. The Christmas Day airline bomber was a Nigerian, inspired by Anwar al-Awlaki, who was based in Yemen. And another devotee of al-Awlaki was the Fort Hood shooter, Nidal Hasan, an American citizen born in Virginia.

Not one of these terror plots originated in Afghanistan, and yet still we maintain close to 100,000 U.S. troops on the ground there. Every major U.S. victory the U.S. has had in the fight against terrorism has come not on the ground in Afghanistan but through targeted attacks such as those that killed Osama bin Laden in Pakistan and the recent strike that killed Anwar al-Awlaki in Yemen.

There have been at least 45 jihadist terrorist attacks plotted against the U.S. since 9/11, and each one of them was foiled not by our mass ground forces in Afghanistan, but through a combination of intelligence, policing, and citizen engagement.

According to terrorism expert Erik Dahl of the Naval Postgraduate School, "When it comes to domestic attacks and securing the homeland, what works is really good, old-fashioned policing—law enforcement, tips from the public, police informants."

Not only is our military action in Afghanistan not making us safer, but research indicates it could actually be making us less safe. As counterinsurgency expert David Kilcullen points out, rather than reducing the number of terrorists, the U.S. presence in Af-

ghanistan could actually be spurring new terrorism as locals band together to resist foreign occupation.

It's called accidental guerrilla syndrome.

Further, a report issued last year by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative TIERNEY, revealed the U.S. military is funding the multibillion dollar protection racket. A good portion of a \$2.16 billion transportation contract is being paid to corrupt public officials, warlords, and the Taliban to get needed supplies to our troops. We are funding the very insurgency we are fighting.

We went into Afghanistan to make America safer, but, for several years now, we have known that our enemies are no longer concentrated in Afghanistan. Al Qaeda is an enemy without borders, and so now we must have a strategy without borders. The question now is: Will we adjust our strategy to reflect today's circumstances, or will we continue to live in the past, repeating this destructive cycle of sending dollars and troops to a mission no longer central to American security?

We have to end our military presence in Afghanistan now, because I don't want to stand in this same spot a year from now with another case of *déjà vu*.

DRILLING EQUALS JOBS

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

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, with the free trade agreements being debated this week, some of my Democratic colleagues have been talking about our trade deficit. However, if they really want to reduce the trade deficit, they'd help me end the President's de facto moratorium on offshore drilling.

You see, if oil were a country, it would be our biggest trading partner. Oil makes up 65 percent of our trade deficit. And it's simple: Drilling equals jobs. It equals American jobs.

You see what I have here is a parking lot to one of the heliports down in my district. In 2004, the parking lot was full. Last year, the parking lot was empty. And you don't have to worry because that parking lot, when we're drilling offshore, is this full 365 days a year.

Here is a port in my district which supplies over 30 percent of the oil and gas that fuels this Nation. You can see the boats in 2004 in the busy port; and today, it's empty.

If we really want a jobs bill, this is it. In the past year, deepwater permit issuance is 39 percent below the monthly averages observed over the past 3 years; and shallow water permits, permits that were supposedly never impacted by the moratorium, are off 80 percent over historical averages. As a result of this de facto moratorium, 11 offshore rigs scheduled to drill in the gulf have relocated to countries like Brazil, Nigeria, Egypt, Congo, French Guiana, and Liberia.

Now, what does this say about American policies when businesses prefer the regulatory certainty offered by Egypt over the bureaucratic uncertainty off our own shores? And while 11 rigs might not seem like a lot, each drilling platform supports 200 to 300 workers every month. Additionally, each exploration and production job supports four other positions. Therefore, 900 to 1,400 jobs per idle rig platform are at risk if production does not resume as soon as possible.

□ 1050

Wages for those jobs average \$1,800 per week, so the potential for lost wages is more than \$5 million to \$10 million per month, per platform.

Drilling equals good-paying jobs.

According to the Obama administration's own estimates, the 6-month "official moratorium" on drilling cost up to 12,000 jobs. However, the long-term impacts of the de facto moratorium could be significantly higher. A study by Louisiana State University predicts, if the de facto ban on deepwater drilling were sustained for 18 more months, we could lose 36,000 jobs nationwide, 24,000 of those along the gulf coast region alone. If the administration would accelerate the permit issuance instead of continuing this de facto moratorium, we could create a quarter of a million jobs in this country, and we could increase the GDP by \$8 trillion over the next 10 years.

As I said, the solution is actually very simple—at no cost to the taxpayer and with the ability to bring revenue into the Federal Government.

It's simple, Mr. Speaker: Drilling equals jobs.

LIBERTY, JUSTICE, AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk on two subjects: one, liberty and justice and, number two, our economy.

On the first, as cochair of the House Ukrainian Caucus, I stand today and join my voice to the citizens of the free world who stand in solidarity with freedom lovers in Ukraine seeking liberty and justice for all. It is with the deepest concern that we raise strenuous objection to the political decision by Ukraine's Pechersk court that sentenced former Ukrainian Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko to prison this October 11. The court's "guilty" verdict sentences her to 7 years in prison, bars her from holding office for 3 years, and effectively stops her from participating in Ukraine's upcoming elections.

Ukraine's actions should also call into question Ukraine's accession to the European Union. I join with the members of the Ukrainian Congress of America in supporting immediate congressional hearings on what has transpired in Ukraine. I urge our leadership

to allow the passage of a resolution expressing U.S. objection to the actions of Ukraine's politically driven judicial system that seem to have more to do with politics than justice.

In furtherance of these objectives, I place on record on behalf of the Ukrainian Caucus the official statement of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents over 1 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, equally incensed at what has occurred. From their statement, the Ukrainian Congress states:

They call upon the Government of the United States to take appropriate measures to support democracy and human rights in Ukraine. They urge the United States Government to restrict visas and freeze assets of the current antidemocratic regime and to hold congressional hearings on sanctions and future foreign assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me, to join our caucus; to speak out and to act then on behalf of the advance of democracy and justice in post-Soviet Ukraine.

I also wish to address today the U.S. economy. We've heard a lot about the trade agreements that are going to come before us today dealing with so-called "free trade" for South Korea, for Colombia and Panama. I wish to place some information on the record.

I've served in Congress awhile now, and fought against the NAFTA trade model back in the nineties when they said it would create jobs that would result in trade surpluses. Advocates promised we would have all this extraordinary economic growth and new jobs in the United States. Then after NAFTA was passed, we saw the beginning of these hemorrhaging trade deficits with Mexico, with Canada and, indeed, with the world. In 1997 and '98, when the China permanent normal trade relations, which I might add are anything but normal, kicked in, America went into an even greater trade deficit. Each billion dollars of trade deficit represented a loss of thousands upon thousands of lost jobs.

So, as we look at the period that we've been living through over the last 20 to 25 years as these so-called free trade agreements locked down, with every single one, America goes deeper and deeper into trade deficit, which kills the economic growth in our country. Now, today, we're being delivered three more: South Korea, Panama, and Colombia.

When we look back at CAFTA, which was passed in the early 2000s, what happened? Did we get trade balances with those countries? No. We got more U.S. job loss.

Sure, there were a few industries that made out like bandits. Okay, that's fine, I'm glad that some industries can export, and generally, agriculture is able to sell a little bit more, but the overall net is negative. The net is negative. That translates into lost jobs. We've lost over 7 million jobs in

this country because these agreements are not fair trade agreements. They really don't result in trade balances for our country, nor job creation. They yield job losses—coast to coast.

Let's just take a look at what happened with Mexico alone. Back when NAFTA was passed, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. The same people who are arguing for these agreements today said, Don't worry about NAFTA—jobs are going to be even better. We said, No, no. It's not going to be better because there's not a real rule of law. There is no respect for the peasant class in Mexico, and the agricultural adjustment there is going to be horrendous.

In fact, it is at the basis of the exodus of Mexican farmers and peasants into our country. That is what is fueling illegal immigration—the lack of a resolution to what occurred during NAFTA when the agricultural adjustment was not allowed to occur in a humane way in Mexico. What a pity to go to the communities and to see how people are living there, disrupted from their land, and then in our country to see the jobs outsourced from the United States down there or from the United States to almost anywhere—China, et cetera—to the low-wage havens with no rule of law. Every year, the trade deficit with Mexico has grown greater and greater. Remember when we began with NAFTA, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. That has disappeared and gone very negative translating into lost jobs.

Now just take a look at Korea. They say this deal is going to make trade better. Well, do you believe that? We already have a trade deficit with Korea, and this agreement isn't going to solve it because Korea already sells over a half a million cars in this country, but we only sell a few thousand cars there now. This agreement will not change these numbers and will result in more lost jobs in our country. This agreement contains no requirement for reciprocity.

I ask the Members to vote "no" on the agreements dealing with Korea, Colombia, and Panama.

UCCA CONDEMNS TYMOSHENKO SHOW TRIAL VERDICT

NEW YORK, NY.—The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the representative organization of the over one million Americans of Ukrainian descent, is outraged and strongly condemns the Pechersk court's sentencing of Yulia Tymoshenko.

The October 11th guilty verdict, which sentences the former prime minister to 7 years in prison, and bans her from holding office for three years, displays the selective and political motivations of the current regime and leaves no doubt that the court's decision was dictated by the government to remove one of the top opposition leaders from taking part in upcoming elections.

From the start, the UCCA, along with the international community, deemed the various court proceedings to be biased, not meeting international standards and selective in persecution of opposition leaders and former government officials. Thus, today's guilty verdict not only demonstrates the on-

going anti-democratic and authoritarian tendencies of the regime, but also severely threatens the country's European aspirations, specifically the expected ratification of an association agreement with the European Union.

President Yanukovich's use of criminal law to serve his own political end, must not be tolerated! The UCCA calls upon the government of the United States to take appropriate measures to support democracy and human rights in Ukraine. We urge the United States government to restrict visas and freeze assets of the current anti-democratic regime and to hold congressional hearings on sanctions and future foreign assistance to the government of Ukraine.

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I want to talk today about two people opposed to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement:

Alejandro Jose Penata—a teacher, a union organizer, a spokesperson for fairness for his fellow educators in a country where getting a decent education can be difficult to impossible. Also, I want to talk about Ana Fabricia Cordoba—an advocate for the displaced, an advocate for returning stolen land to those from whom it was taken.

Ana and Alejandro were part of a vocal and committed and brave group of Colombians willing to stand up for what they believed in. They stood up for the dispossessed, for peasants, for trade union members, and for those who want to join trade unions. Like many Colombians, they were tremendously concerned about a free trade agreement that reflected the interests of large corporations but not of those workers and farmers and poor people they fought for every day.

Ana and Alejandro, if they could, would be with us today to voice their opposition in person to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, but they can't voice that opposition because they were both murdered in Colombia. Ana was shot dead on a public bus. Alejandro was tortured and hung with barbed wire. These are tragic facts, uncomfortable facts, unacceptable facts, but they are not isolated facts.

Sadly, the faces of Ana and Alejandro are the faces of Colombia today. Nowhere in the world is it more dangerous to be a union organizer, fighting for the wages and rights of working people than in Colombia. Twenty-three trade unionists were killed this year. Fifty-one were killed last year. And over the last several years, hundreds more have been threatened, driven out by violence or have simply disappeared. In 2010, more trade unionists were murdered in Colombia than in the rest of the world combined.

In Colombia, there is an organized, intensive campaign to prevent working men and women from working together to fight for better wages and working conditions, and it seems to be working.