

in and taking out the duly elected president.

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

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

THE CARBON CYCLE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present what I hope you will find as fascinating facts about the carbon cycle. There has been a great deal of discussion over the last several years about climate change: Is human activity causing the climate to change or is that not the case?

What I would like to present tonight, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat of a science lesson about the carbon cycle. Carbon, when burned, turns into a gas called CO₂, and CO₂ is a gas in the atmosphere that is needed to sustain life in its cycle. Excessive CO₂ would add to the greenhouse effect or cause the climate to warm. Thus, the climate would change.

What I would like to do tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to give some interesting facts, almost like a 7th grade science class; and I would like to go back to 1771, where an English minister named Reverend Priestley performed an experiment. Now, this is 1771.

He took a glass jar, about a foot high and about 8 inches in diameter, and he wanted to see how long air would stay good in that glass jar. And he discovered the air stayed good as long as he sealed it. Whether it was a week, a month, 3 months, it was always good air. What he did next, though, was put a flame next to that glass jar, which he found immediately fouled the air.

After that, he got another glass jar, and he put a mouse in that glass jar, and he sealed the glass jar. And it was not too long before the air was fouled again and the mouse died.

What he did next was pretty extraordinary. He took a glass jar, put a sprig of mint, a small green growing vegetable in that glass jar. Then he saw that the air stayed fine for a long time. He then put a flame to it. And we know that CO₂ comes from burning wood. The air stayed fine.

Then he put the mouse in the glass jar with that mint sprig and the mouse stayed in there for a long time and the air stayed fine.

□ 2115

Now Reverend Priestley did not realize what he had in that glass jar with the mint sprig and the mouse was a carbon cycle. The mint absorbed the carbon, built up its woody structure

and exuded oxygen and so the mouse could live.

Trees across the planet breathe in carbon dioxide. They turn it into leaves and wood and breathe out oxygen. If we tested around the globe different areas and tried to discover the level of the CO₂ in the atmosphere, which is less than 1 percent, you would discover if you are near a forest, the CO₂ level is less than in other areas, if you are in an urban area. The trees breathe in CO₂, make wood and breathe out oxygen. This is the carbon cycle.

Every time you start your car, turn on a light, turn up the thermostat, you contribute more CO₂ to the atmosphere because you are burning carbon. Coal, oil, and natural gas fuel the world's economy, and they all use carbon dioxide which are inhaled by our forests and they turn that into oxygen.

But when we burn a lump of coal, when we burn oil, when we burn natural gas, we are releasing into our environment what took the natural processes, 20 million years ago, millions of years to lock up. So we are releasing into the atmosphere the same amount of CO₂ that took millions of years to lock up in about 150 years. So we are being excessive more than we have seen in eons of time by putting excessive extra amounts of CO₂ that goes against the grain of the natural cycle into our atmosphere.

Are there consequences to that faster releasing of CO₂? There are. The consequences are we see coral reefs around the world dying. We see deserts expanding, and we see the ocean currents themselves changing and in some cases slowing down. We see sea levels rise. In the northern parts of Canada, Alaska, and Russia, beetles are infesting millions of acres of forest that never infested those forests before because it was not that warm in the Northern Hemisphere. Forests, grasslands, and even our oceans absorb CO₂ that we emit into the atmosphere as humans.

If we diminish those carbon sinks, we accelerate CO₂ release into the atmosphere, and the consequences are that we are changing our climate.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

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

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S PREEMPTIVE WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House today debated America's first preemptive war. If this were about the courage and valor of our soldiers, I would ask that we act by unanimous consent to praise our troops, but this resolution is really about the Bush policy of global domination.

A year ago America launched a preemptive war. Today we are considering the consequences of that war. Words of great Presidents and great Americans offer guidance. In 1848, Abraham Lincoln expressed the fear of President Polk's power when he wrote to oppose U.S. annexation of Mexican territory. "If today, President Polk should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could we stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us' but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you do not.'"

Does that sound like George Bush to Members, with all of the misrepresentations we had?

One of America's greatest soldiers was President Dwight Eisenhower. In what many regard as his finest speech, President Eisenhower said this about war: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who are hungry and not fed, those who are cold and not clothed."

Eleanor Roosevelt, "We have to face the fact that either all of us are going to die together or we are going to live together, and if we are going to live together we must talk."

Finally, Martin Luther King, "Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that. Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence, and toughness multiplies toughness in a descending spiral of destruction. The chain reaction of evil, hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars, must be broken or we shall plunge into the dark abyss of annihilation."

Today, we are considering whether to endorse the Bush doctrine of domination. The world the President claims to be making safer finds our actions offensive. The nonpartisan Pew Research Center, as reported in today's Washington Post, conducted a survey in nine countries. The results are frightening. It found people in several Middle Eastern countries increasingly support suicide bombings and other violence against Americans.

Majorities in Jordan and Morocco said attacks against Americans were justified. These same people now favor Osama bin Laden. These opinions are coming from ordinary people, not armed terrorists. In Europe, nations

are so concerned over American foreign policy they want the European Union to take on a new issue: America.

That is the world a year after the Bush doctrine of domination. Our best friends shudder at what we are doing. Those who hate us were convinced that terrorism is a legitimate defense. The world is not safer, America is not safe. This resolution will not help. It will only serve to deepen the mistrust of America and widen the great global divide created when President Bush invaded Iraq. We should all have voted "no" on this.

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

(Mr. FEENEY 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AMERICA EXPORTS JOBS, NOT PRODUCTS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration announced a record \$541.8 billion trade deficit for the year 2003. That means 541.8 billion more dollars' worth of imports coming into our country than our exports going out. That is over one-half trillion dollars, the largest in the history of this country. We are exporting jobs, we are not exporting products.

In fact, this number is so big, it is bigger than the last record deficit set in the year 2002. These are staggering numbers. Let us take a step back and look at them again. \$541.8 billion or almost half a trillion dollars being lost to foreign competitors. This is not just pocket change. With each additional billion, America loses another 20,000 jobs here at home. In fact, since President Bush took office, America has lost 2.2 million more jobs, mostly due to our jobs being shipped offshore.

Meanwhile, taxes are going up for the majority of Americans as only a wealthy few benefit while the majority of our people are paying higher gas taxes, higher property taxes, higher excise taxes, more money for their health insurance, and higher tuition if their children are lucky enough to go on to college. Consumer confidence is plummeting. Disapproval of the President's handling of our economy has reached 59 percent, a career high, in a recent ABC News Washington Post poll, and there is no reason to wonder why.

The Bush administration tells us we can trade our way to a better, stronger economy. But let us look at the record. Since NAFTA passed, unfortunately in 1993, a very flawed trade agreement, we have not had a trade surplus with Mexico. In fact, the surplus we had has plummeted into a giant deficit as more and more of our jobs move south of the border. Every single year since NAFTA passage, we have had a growing trade deficit with Mexico.

The United States signed a trade deal with China in 2000. Before the trade deal, we already had a \$68 billion deficit with China. Guess what, since the trade deal, it has doubled to over \$124 billion in just 3 years. Every time we enter into one of these flawed trade agreements, our balance of payments goes in the wrong direction. What does it tell you, it tells you that the model of trade we are using is seriously flawed. Is anyone in this city paying attention?

When it was only manufacturing jobs being shipped out, some self-styled trade experts claimed this was the way to modernize our economy. I am not quite sure how cutting our core will modernize us, but that did not matter when we had all those service sector jobs to depend on. But not so fast. Now we hear from the jobs of accountants, medical technicians and other formerly untouchables, those are on the line. So where does the future of America lie and how do we stem this job loss?

When we started losing manufacturing jobs in automobiles and other core economic sectors, the economists assured us we were in for a so-called information economy, but now the jobs in the information economy are moving to India, so where are the new jobs supposed to come from?

Well, the Bush administration had several great ideas over the last couple months. First, one of the President's top advisers suggested that outsourcing our jobs was actually a good thing. The administration resorted then to a sleight of hand: When you are losing the game, change the rules. So they proposed reclassifying fast food workers as manufacturing workers. Nobody gets a new job, just a new title.

So when a fast food employee is adding pickles to your Big Mac, that must mean he or she is "working on the line." I will give them points for creativity, but the American people surely cannot be fooled.

Six months ago President Bush, with the fall elections in sight, announced he would be appointing a manufacturing czar. Now, that is not a bad idea to help a little bit, even though 6 months later as our economy still lags behind the administration's own rosy predictions, we still do not have that manufacturing czar in place because his name was pulled because that potential employee had one small problem: As he was letting American workers go, he was building a factory in China.

That is right, the man that President Bush wanted to put in charge of stemming the flow of jobs overseas was busy sending our jobs overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I have been coming to the floor asking for fair trade, good trade, balanced trade, not just free-for-all trade. Please, let us put a human face on trade.

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

(Mr. CONYERS 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 Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ALLEN 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2130

AMERICAN JOBS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin this evening by reading a brief excerpt from a letter sent by my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He sent this letter to the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Greg Mankiw. The dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, writes, "I'm sure the 163,000 factory workers who have lost their jobs in Michigan will find it heartening to know that a world of opportunity awaits them in high-growth manufacturing careers like spatula operator, napkin restocking and lunch tray removal."

Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand my good friend and esteemed colleague's deep concern for the loss of manufacturing jobs in his home State. Jobs are a big concern on everyone's