

Middle East, can now show the way toward democracy in the Middle East.

Finally, the underlying provisions further supports congressional views articulated in the 9/11 Implementation Act regarding the need to reevaluate our previous policies of supporting dictatorships and, in turn, support civil society and reforms as a means of addressing the precursor conditions which breed terrorism.

In Egypt, we see a nation of great potential; and to fully realize that potential, Egypt must reform itself, economically and politically. The language already in the bill seeks to empower Egyptian civil society rather than the entrenched Egyptian military.

In this context, I ask my colleagues to oppose any amendments that seek to strike this provision. Any amendment to weaken or to strike the Egyptian language in the authorization bill would send the wrong message to Egypt and to other dictatorial regimes in the broader Middle East, that they can proceed with virtual impunity and it is business as usual. In a post-9/11 world, this is the wrong message to send.

RENEGOTIATE CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress was promised a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement by the end of 2004. December 31 came and went. Then at a White House news conference in May, President Bush called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement by Memorial Day. Memorial Day came and went. In June, Congress was once again promised a vote which was supposed to have been before the July 4 recess. The July 4 recess came and went.

Now we understand a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement could come in front of the House next week.

The many of us who have been speaking out against CAFTA have a message for this Congress: renegotiate CAFTA.

Those of us opposed to this CAFTA do want a trade agreement with Central America, do want to trade with the five Central American countries and the Dominican Republic; but we want an agree that benefits the many, not the few.

This agreement was negotiated and written by a select few. This agreement benefits those same select few. As the President travels the Nation trying to sell this CAFTA to the American public, he is hearing firsthand from U.S. workers, from family farmers, from small business owners, especially small manufacturers, from ranchers, from religious leaders that they do not want this CAFTA either. Their message is loud and clear: renegotiate CAFTA.

In response to the President's trip this past Friday to North Carolina, a New York Times headline reads, "Bush Sells Trade Pact in Hostile Territory." That is what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) spoke about earlier, a Republican from North Carolina. A Huntsville, Alabama Times editorial in Sunday's paper reads, "Say No to the Central American Free Trade Agreement." Again, a newspaper understanding that the free trade agreement is not good for Alabama. It is not good for the South. It is not good for Tennessee. It is not good for this country.

□ 2000

A Wall Street Journal headline today reads, and this is a newspaper that is always supportive of trade agreements, "CAFTA Is No Cure-all For Central America."

This CAFTA represents more than a decade of failed U.S. trade policies. Look what has happened with our trade policies in the last dozen years. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, the U.S. had a \$38 billion trade deficit. That means we exported \$38 billion less than we imported. Twelve years later, in 2004, that trade deficit went from \$28 billion in a dozen years to \$618 billion. That translates directly into lost jobs; more than 200,000 lost jobs in the district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), more than 220,000 lost jobs in the district of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) and the district of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). It is clear our trade policy is simply not working.

CAFTA languished in Congress for more than a year, then passed the Senate last month by the narrowest margin ever of any trade agreement because this wrong-headed trade agreement does not work for Republicans or Democrats. It offends Republicans, dozens of Republicans in this body, and it offends dozens of Democrats in this body.

We know this agreement is a continuation of its dysfunctional cousin, NAFTA, another failed trade policy of the last dozen years. It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President says it will mean more manufacturing products that we will export overseas. Every time there is a trade agreement the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans. And every time there is a trade agreement the President says it will raise the standard of living in the developing countries. Yet with every trade agreement their promises fall by the wayside in favor of large corporate interests that send U.S. jobs overseas and exploit cheap labor abroad.

This CAFTA is simply, as the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) pointed out, about exploiting cheap labor abroad. This CAFTA will not enable the Central American or Nicaraguan, or Honduras, or Guatemala workers to buy cars made in Ohio. It will not

allow those workers to buy software developed in Seattle. It will not mean more prime beef exports from Nebraska, because those workers simply cannot afford to buy those products. This CAFTA, instead, is about U.S. companies moving plants to Honduras, outsourcing jobs to Nicaragua, and exploiting cheap labor in Guatemala.

Desperate after failing to gin up support for the agreement based on its merits, CAFTA supporters are now attempting to buy votes with fantastic promises. And if that fails, they will twist arms. Count on this; this is a prediction: They will call the vote in the middle of the night, hold the rollcall open for hours to pass a bad agreement that will benefit only a select few.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we should throw out this failed agreement and negotiate a better CAFTA. When the world's poorest people can buy American products and not just make them, we will know then that our trade policies are working.

THE ECONOMY/CARL ROVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, our Democrat colleagues said Republicans should not lower taxes because we needed those tax dollars for more programs and more spending. Republicans knew that more new programs and additional spending was the last thing we needed to be doing. We fought to reduce taxes, and we said that lower taxes would bring this economy out of a recession.

Today, our policies have been proven to be correct. Our tax relief has spurred economic growth and created jobs. We have a near historically low unemployment rate of about 5 percent. Home ownership is at historic highs. We have helped millions of Americans achieve the dream of home ownership. We have a 69 percent home ownership rate.

Mr. Speaker, 146,000 new jobs were created in June, adding to the millions of jobs created in the past 3 years, giving us 25 months of sustained consecutive economic growth. We lowered taxes and this year we are seeing unexpectedly high tax revenues. Our deficit is going to be \$100 billion less because of tremendous economic growth.

And what about this is confusing to Democrats? Well, they say, okay, that is good economic news, but we have a deficit. And to that we say, well, why not join us and cut spending. Let us reduce and eliminate unneeded programs. Let us not raise taxes.

When we lowered taxes, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, led the Democrats in predicting that this relief would do nothing at all for our Nation's economy. I think it is fair to say that she and her party are pretty much out of touch on that issue. And I know that

the newspapers, many of which opposed our tax relief, are hesitant to admit that they were wrong, but they should be out there reporting this data, showing the American people that this economy is growing and that jobs are being created.

Mr. Speaker, our philosophy on this side of the aisle is that when you get government out of the way and let the American people in this wonderful free enterprise system go to work, they do it quite well. This great economic news shows that Republicans are on the right side of this argument.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things I want to say this evening. Last year, former Clinton Security Adviser Sandy Berger stole, that is right, stole classified materials from the National Archives. This is not an accusation. It is fact. He pled guilty. He stole classified material. In the "Sloppy Socks Scandal," Berger stuffed classified materials in his clothing in order to sneak them out of the National Archives building. Democrats, however, never considered this a big deal. In fact, most barely seemed to notice or say anything at all about what had happened.

Today, those same Democrats, who did not blink at Berger's actions, are calling for Karl Rove's head. Now, let us put this in perspective. Sandy Berger devised a plan, got into the archives to view the documents, then he stuffed classified documents in his pants to smuggle them out of the National Archives so that he could destroy the material, and Democrats did not so much as call for an inquiry. Today, the minority leader is calling for President Bush to fire Karl Rove for telling a reporter that they were "barking up the wrong tree."

I hope Americans see this for what it is, a partisan attack launched by a minority leader who cannot get her party to unite around a policy.

H.R. 3268, EMINENT DOMAIN TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud author of H.R. 3268, the Eminent Domain Tax Relief Act of 2005. I also rise to continue the discussion on eminent domain in light of the recent *Kelo v. The City of New London, Connecticut*, decision by the United States Supreme Court.

Within 1 week of the *Kelo* decision, this House demonstrated its commitment to the American people and their property rights through passage of House Resolution 340 by an overwhelming and bipartisan vote. Mr. Speaker, through H. Res. 340, this House condemned the *Kelo* decision and issued a warning that abusive eminent domain will not be tolerated by this Congress.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is more work to be done, and I look forward to

the House's consideration of H.R. 3135, the Private Property Rights Protection Act, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). I have proudly joined the chairman in cosponsoring this bill that will codify into statute the principles and concerns that we expressed by House Resolution 340.

Today, though, I would like to press forward in the fight to protect the American people's property rights and to discuss H.R. 3268, the Eminent Domain Tax Relief Act. This bill will ensure tax fairness for all who lose property through eminent domain. The Eminent Domain Tax Relief Act will exempt individuals who lose their homes or businesses by eminent domain from paying capital gains tax on the revenue generated from the forced sale.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that eminent domain must remain a tool of last resort for the government and a tool employed only for public use. However, while most Americans accept traditional and proper execution of eminent domain for schools, roads, and other expressly public uses, no individual should ever have to pick up the tab with IRS when the government decides to sell his or her own home or business. Mr. Speaker, these individuals did not make the decision to sell their property, and they should not be penalized by the Tax Code for a decision that they did not make.

In the wake of the *Kelo* decision, this Congress, the media, and the collective discussions around American dinner tables across this country have focused upon questions of acceptable uses of eminent domain. Well, the Constitution speaks loud and clear. Eminent domain should only be for public use.

Additionally, the Constitution also requires the government to give just compensation for any taking of private property. Is it just compensation, Mr. Speaker, to send the government wrecking ball and an IRS agent to the same door at the same time? I think not. It is simply unconscionable for the government to add insult to injury by taxing those people who are losing their homes and businesses by no choice of their own.

Often, these individuals have to pay many additional costs when the government condemns their properties. Individuals assume the cost of relocating to somewhere else, and condemned businesses have merchandise that would not only have to be moved but, in many cases, would have to be stored in the interim. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the government must redouble its efforts to ensure these individuals receive just compensation and are not additionally burdened by the Tax Code.

I encourage all my colleagues to take a good hard look at this legislation. I believe that they will see that it is the right thing to do. There should be no taxation on government condemnation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to stand firm against this injustice.

Sign on to H.R. 3268, supporting tax relief for all those who pay the price when the government wrecking ball comes.

HONORING THE FALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Emanuel) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, there are now 1,979 American military personnel who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan. We owe these brave individuals and their families a debt of gratitude that can never be fully repaid.

It is our responsibility to honor the ultimate sacrifice that our men and women in uniform have made while serving our country. We often invoke their sacrifices in general but seldom take the time to thank them individually. In the previous weeks my colleagues and I, from both sides of the aisle, have recognized these individual servicemen and women on the floor of the people's House by reading their names and rank, the names and rank of each servicemember who has fallen in the Iraqi and Afghanistan theatres of war.

Today, approximately 1,700 names have been read. Tonight, we will continue and complete this tribute with the names of our most recent fallen fellow Americans. In the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, each of these heroes stands in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live and grow and increase in its blessings.

God bless and keep each of the brave Americans whose memory we honor tonight:

Specialist Francisco G. Martinez
Lance Corporal Kevin S. Smith
Specialist Travis R. Bruce
Corporal Bryan J. Richardson
Sergeant Isiah J. Sinclair
Sergeant Lee M. Gumbolt
Private 1st Class Samuel S. Lee
Specialist Eric L. Toth
Sergeant Kenneth L. Ridgley
Sergeant Kelly S. Morris
Warrant Officer Charles Wells Jr.
Sgt. 1st Class Robbie D. McNary
Corporal Garrywesley Tan Rimes
Staff Sergeant Ioasa F. Tavae Jr.
Lance Corporal Tenzin Dengkhim
Corporal William D. Richardson
Sgt. James Alexander Sherrill
Sgt. 1st Class Stephen Kennedy
Staff Sergeant Christopher W. Dill
Lance Cpl. Jeremiah Kinchen

□ 2015

Mr. EMANUEL. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Sergeant Javier J. Garcia
Specialist Glenn J. Watkins
Specialist Sascha Struble
Specialist Daniel J. Freeman