

that the occupation is still going. As proof of that, nearly 300 American and Iraqi soldiers and Iraqi civilians have been killed or wounded so far this month alone. Yes, the bloodshed continues.

And after nearly 5 years of occupation, our leaders still have no exit strategy. They have even stopped pretending that they have one. Last year they told us we couldn't get out of Iraq because things on the ground were going badly. This year they're telling us we can't get out because things are going well; and if we get out, they'll go badly again.

So if you follow the administration's argument to its logical conclusion, this is what you get: We can't leave when things are good; we can't leave when things are bad. Which means we can never leave. The result is permanent occupation, which is precisely what the administration appears to want.

Forgetting about the bloodshed in Iraq is bad enough. But it's dangerous for many, many other reasons. It gives the administration a free hand to ratchet up the threats against Iran. It takes the pressure off the Iraqi Government to make progress toward national political reconciliation. It means our military will continue to be overstretched and less capable of meeting real challenges to our national security that may and will arise elsewhere. It continues to make America appear to be a lawless and arrogant Western occupier of the Middle East. And it allows our budget to be plundered at a time when our economy is more than shaky. People are in danger of losing their jobs here at home; but thanks to the administration's policies, the boys at Blackwater will always have their high-paying military contractor jobs in Iraq where they can continue to terrify the Iraqi people.

We are spending over \$300 million every day in Iraq, Madam Speaker. We couldn't afford that when the economy was good, and we certainly can't afford it as the economy goes into recession.

But thankfully, thankfully, the American people are too smart to fall into the trap of believing that everything is just swell. According to a recent CBS News poll, nearly 60 percent of Americans continue to believe the occupation is going badly, and 58 percent believe the U.S. should never have gotten into Iraq in the first place.

Madam Speaker, we cannot stick our heads in the sand and pretend that Iraq isn't a problem anymore. The only way to change course is to hold the administration accountable, and the only way to do that is to keep the pressure on the administration every single day. That's why I'll continue to raise my voice against the madness of this occupation, and why I will continue to urge the House to use its power of the purse to end it.

Iraq is not a television show that got canceled because of the writers' strike.

Iraq is a real place where real people continue to die. We must redeploy our troops. We must give the Iraqi people back their sovereignty, and we must give them their hope for a brighter future.

□ 1515

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH INDIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, today my very good friend Mr. CROWLEY of New York, in a bipartisan way, and I joined together, and we now have, I'm happy to say, our good friend from north Dallas, a great Member of the Rules Committee, PETE SESSIONS as a cosponsor of legislation, a resolution actually calling for free trade negotiations to begin between the United States and India. We introduced this resolution to highlight the tremendous benefits of deeper economic engagement between the world's two largest democracies.

While bilateral trade has spurred growth in both of our countries, we have not yet come close to realizing the full benefits of complete access to each other's markets and full liberalization of the Indian economy.

Madam Speaker, the American people are very focused on the economy right now, understandably. While growth remains strong and unemployment remains low, and we just this morning got the report of the drop in unemployment claims, the prevailing economic stories, however, in the news stir up a great deal of fear and concern among working families. The subprime mortgage crisis has dominated the headlines for months. The housing slump in many communities makes homeowners feel like their financial security is threatened. And as always, Madam Speaker, there is the natural anxiety that comes from the highly dynamic and fast-paced environment of the global economy.

At a time of economic anxiety, the most important thing is to ensure that growth remains strong, so that opportunities can be creative. If we look at what has been our biggest source of strength in recent months, it has been export-led growth. Over the last year, there have been dire predictions for GDP growth, and every single quarter the numbers have come out much stronger than has been anticipated because exports have made up for softer areas within our own economy.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, imports have ensured that working families have access to the goods they need at prices that they can afford. We are weathering these economic challenges because we are engaging in the worldwide marketplace.

India has been a very important component of that engagement. Our exports to India have doubled in the last 5 years. We are India's largest trading partner and largest investment partner. Trading with India has opened up new doors for American producers, service providers, workers and consumers as well.

But India still has miles to go in its reform process. Tariffs in many sectors are prohibitively high. The regulatory environment is absolutely Byzantine. American investors looking for opportunity in an otherwise ripe environment still confront significant roadblocks to successful investment.

If we are to maximize the benefits of trade with the world's second-largest consumer market, there must be broad, comprehensive reform. Free trade negotiations would provide maximum leverage for encouraging this kind of reform. Whether it's slashing exorbitant tariffs, which average 20 percent and range as high as 210 percent, Madam Speaker, that's a 210 percent tariff, protecting intellectual property, and another thing they have done is ensuring transparency in governance, a free trade agreement would provide the necessary impetus for comprehensive liberalization of their economy.

Many of our FTAs are negotiated with foreign policy concerns chiefly in mind. Our pending FTA with Colombia, for example, will solidify strong democratic institutions for a key ally in a key region, in addition to the economic benefits to both countries.

There are certainly foreign policy concerns associated with a U.S.-India free trade agreement as well. It would provide an opportunity to deepen and broaden our ties with a strong, stable Asian democracy that shares our fundamental values in a challenging region.

But Madam Speaker, the commercial benefits to such an FTA would be considerable. It would open up a tremendous opportunity to build upon our export-led growth and ensure that Americans can take full advantage of the more than 1 billion consumers in the world's second-largest emerging market. With all eyes on the economy, now is the time for the U.S. and India to begin to pursue comprehensive economic engagement with a free trade agreement.

THE TRAGIC MISADVENTURE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the 9/11 attacks against the United States, I was sent on the ground for a short period of time to Afghanistan. As a Navy admiral, I saw what needed to be accomplished. Eighteen