

Some amendments have been offered that address aspects of the Iraq war. These amendments only serve to advance the current failed policy. Instead of giving us the new direction and the fresh thinking that we so badly need, this policy, these amendments continue what already exists.

I oppose, for example, one amendment mandating that we must turn over Iraq's security to the Iraqis only when they are ready for that responsibility and that we must not, and I quote, withdraw prematurely the U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq, unquote. Prematurely.

Mr. Speaker, do more than 2,000 Americans have to die, or 2,000 more Americans have to die before we recognize that bringing our troops home is not premature, but a fact that is long overdue?

This amendment also states that troop withdrawal cannot happen until we are close to realizing a free and stable Iraq that is at peace and not a threat to its neighbors. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that such a policy would make this an endless war because the amendment has it exactly backwards. There can be no stability in Iraq while our troops are still there. It is our very military presence and the resentment that it is breeding that is emboldening the insurgency. It is only by ending the occupation that we can hope to quell the violence and give the Iraqi people some hope for peace and security.

As I said, I will vote for H.R. 2601 because I believe there is plenty that is good and important in this bill. The architects of the legislation should be commended for authorizing billions in foreign aid that will go a long way toward improving lives around the globe.

But once again, and I repeat, this bill represents a missed opportunity to completely reexamine Iraq and foreign policy more generally. With this bill we could have charted a new course, launched a new and more peaceful strategy for helping Iraq stand on its own two feet. But all we have done on Iraq is declared it U.S. policy to extend our military presence indefinitely.

In Iraq, and around the world, I believe we need to adopt what I call a SMART security plan. SMART stands for sensible multilateral American response to terrorism. It would make military action not a reflex, but a very last resort. SMART would fight terrorism with brains, not brawn, with stronger multilateral alliances, improved intelligence capabilities and vigorous weapons inspections. It would forbid the sale and transfer of weapons to regions of conflict. The agreement reached yesterday with India most certainly would not meet the standards of SMART.

SMART also calls on the United States to set an example for the world by living up to its own nuclear non-proliferation commitments, something H.R. 2601 clearly does not mandate. SMART would divert resources from Cold War weapons systems, reinvesting

them in Homeland Security and energy independence. And SMART would attack terrorism at its roots with an ambitious international development plan for the troubled regions around the world.

Democracy building support, human rights education, education programs, small business development, these are the cures to the poverty, oppression and hopelessness that breed terrorism in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H.R. 2601. But I lament its failure to substantially or realistically address the most pressing foreign policy challenge in our generation, the supremely misguided war in Iraq.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### LEAKS FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been made lately about leaks coming from the White House, and the outing of CIA Agent Valerie Wilson was admittedly an egregious act.

But I, for one, would like more leaks, not less from this White House. And let me quote the President. Bring it on.

Let me be clear. I am not looking for more of the kind of leaks that have tripped up Karl Rove and Scooter Libby. It is generally not a good idea to out undercover CIA agents working on behalf of America's national security. Those are the types of leaks that can lead to unfortunate consequences, like people getting killed and national security being breached.

Even if you leak on double super secret background you might get caught. And if there is a special prosecutor involved, well, look out. You could end up, as the old cliché in the book says, the former White House official is doing time in Allenwood.

The kind of leaks I am thinking about might include like the real cost of the prescription drug bill for Medicare or the secret plan for Social Security solvency. Those are the types of

leaks that I wish this White House would provide and knew. It would have been useful, for example, if someone had leaked the true cost of the Medicare prescription drug program before Congress had voted to commit future generations to twice the obligation we were told.

Originally they told us that the prescription drug bill would cost \$394 billion over 10 years. The American people are going to pay \$800 billion. The administration actually kept secret the extra \$400 billion from the Congress and the American people. And they even threatened to fire the government actuary who wanted to just simply tell the truth. All along they knew that it was going to be \$800 billion and all along they repeated that it was \$394 billion.

Now that was the type of leak that is worthy of a good Washington leak. And I think I know something about leaks.

And it certainly would have been nice if some brave soul in the White House had told the American people that the President's tax cuts would raid the Social Security Trust Fund for \$639 billion, explode the deficit, all the while benefiting the wealthiest Americans. Instead they told us we could have a big tax cut, balance the budget and strengthen Social Security. Of course, former Secretary of Treasury Paul O'Neill eventually blew the whistle on what the real cost of the tax cut was. But by that time it was too late for him and too late for the American people, and Social Security is \$639 billion less today in the trust fund, all because nobody wanted to tell the truth when they knew it.

But these are not the only examples of not willing to tell the truth to the American people, and wanting to hold back information when they should have done what their instincts were, which was to leak. Remember when we had the terrorist report from the State Department and somebody actually had to doctor the data to say that in fact there was a decline in terrorism when all along they knew there was an increase in terrorism. And Secretary Powell had to come back with a new report, a fresh report to show what the actual data said originally, which was there was a rise in terrorism in the last number of years.

Then there was the mercury report from the EPA which was doctored and played with, and they tried to doctor up; as the British like to say, they had to fix the data. Well, they had to go back and fix the data again and come back with the truth.

But really who can blame this White House for not leaking? Karl Rove knows that if the American people knew the facts they would not support the policies of this administration. No, this White House is silent about everything it should leak and loose lipped about matters better kept secret. They actually have a bad case of having it all backwards.

So next time when you see the truth, my recommendation, try leaking it.

And I know the American people and particularly our military families would appreciate a White House leak today on our double secret plan to accomplish a mission in Iraq and bring our boys and girls home. I ask Karl Rove to share that next time with a reporter.

Heck, we are still waiting for someone to leak the President's plan on Social Security. So I say do not stop here, Mr. Rove. Do not stop here, Mr. Libby. Dishing the names of our national security agents may be your idea of political, quote, fair game. But turn up that leaky faucet and tell us what we really need to know, which is the truth.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

#### CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dominican Republic and Central American Free Trade Agreement and urge my colleagues to join me in its passage in the next week. Both the strength of our economy and the jobs available to our own people depend on our ability to gain access to new markets and offer products that are price competitive, and quality competitive. Without greater access to the global market, it is our people that pay the price. The DR-CAFTA agreement will, for the very first time, allow U.S. goods to flow into the Central American countries without tariffs, just the way Central American goods flow into America without tariffs. It merely levels the playing field.

Furthermore, it will allow us to modernize the partnership between the United States textile industry and the Central American countries. Through this partnership we can compete with China. If we lose this partnership and the opportunity to modernize it, then textiles will go to China. They will take jobs from the Central American countries and that will take jobs from America because this partnership uses entirely American yarn, and China is

unlikely to do that. So not only would our goods flow into these Central American countries without tariffs, but by modernizing the textile partnership between the United States and the Central American nations we save jobs in both countries and keep ourselves competitive with China.

Finally, this agreement helps strengthen fledgling democracies and economies that at one time were the center of civil war, terrible unrest, terrible suffering and great poverty. Through the development of their democracies and their economies, their people are beginning to do better, and by supporting that growth we can stem both legal and illegal immigration from those nations, which we would like to do.

I strongly support CAFTA, as do the majority of producers of American products from manufactured products to agricultural products, because the agreement levels the playing field for workers by immediately reducing tariffs imposed on exports to Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. It zeros out many tariffs immediately, while others are reduced the first year by 80 percent. This is manufacturers, agriculture products, everything across the board.

Currently, imports from CAFTA countries enter the United States duty free, but of course our goods are not allowed to go back duty free. This is a great leveling of the playing field and will increase exports from the United States to the Central American nations.

It may surprise you to hear that Central American countries are my home State of Connecticut's largest export market for crops. Connecticut's dairy farmers will gain immediate duty free access to the Central American markets for dairy products, and all tariffs will be phased out over time. That is exactly why the American Farm Bureau has endorsed CAFTA.

Now there has been some discussion about the labor requirements, the labor provisions of CAFTA. In fact, this agreement has been roundly criticized by Members of this body who voted overwhelmingly for the agreement with Morocco and the agreement with Jordan. And yet this agreement is far tougher on labor standards and far stronger on enforcement.

I am proud to say that under this agreement, after a year's work between the Development Bank and the ILO to evaluate carefully these countries' labor laws and to upgrade those laws, to evaluate carefully their ability to enforce those laws and what had to be done to strengthen enforcement, after that year of work, all that work is embodied in this Central American agreement, the CAFTA agreement. Consequently, this agreement will enforce laws that meet the ILO standards in all these countries, 100 percent in most of them and in two of them there are constitutional provisions that essentially

make it equivalent to 100 percent. So the labor laws meet high standards and through this agreement enforcement will meet high standards.

□ 1830

We not only commit money to those standards but we creatively approach for the first time the issue of enforcement. First of all, under the old agreement, if the Central American countries did not live up to their obligations to make progress in the area of labor laws, all we could do was completely cut off all trade agreements. That nuclear, that draconian option was never in the whole 22 years used. It did not work.

So in this agreement we have the right to levy stiff monetary fines, up to \$15 million per year per violation; and if that does not work, we can take away their trade benefits. But meanwhile these fines will go into a special fund to be used with American oversight and American agreement to solve specific labor problems to strengthen specific enforcement measures and to make the lives of the workers in these countries better.

Not only do we have flexibility and enforcement and new funding from the penalty system, but our country has committed \$180 million dollars to enforcement.

In sum the DR-CAFTA agreement will for the first time allow U.S. goods greater access to central American markets close to our country, allow us to modernize our textile partnership to compete directly with China, and help strengthen the fledgling democracies and economies of our southern neighbors which alone will stem immigration—legal and illegal—from those nations.

#### COMMEMORATING THE SENECA FALLS CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate an extremely important anniversary: 157 years ago today Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton stood before a women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New York and made it known that women's rights could not be complete until they were granted the right to vote.

One hundred and fifty-seven years ago, women and men would not be considered equal without the strongest tool that existed in this country to enact change and that was the right to vote.

In the greatest democracy in the world, the idea that half of the population did not have a voice was completely unacceptable to these two women and the countless others who stood beside them such as Sojourner Truth, a very strong advocate also for women's rights.

What seems like an absolute now, that women should be part of the process, that women should be able to hold