

by Memorial Day, and now he is promising a vote by July 4.

Where I come from, 3 strikes means you are out. As a result, Congress is waiting and waiting and waiting for the CAFTA vote count down to begin. While we wait, the many of us who have been speaking out against the Central American Free Trade Agreement have a message for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and for the President, and that is renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

President Bush signed CAFTA more than a year ago. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration, Australia, Chile, Singapore, Morocco, every trade agreement negotiated by this administration was voted on by this Congress within 60 days of the President signing the agreement. CAFTA has languished in Congress for more than a year without a vote because this wrongheaded trade agreement offends Republicans and Democrats alike.

It offends small manufacturers. It offends labor unions. It offends environmentalists and ranchers and small farmers and food safety advocates. It offends religious leaders in Central America and many religious leaders in this country.

Most importantly, just look what has happened with trade policy in this country in the last 12 years. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, the United States had a \$38 billion trade deficit. That means we imported \$38 billion more than we exported. Today, a dozen years later, in 2004, last year, our trade deficit was \$618 billion. From \$38 billion to \$618 billion in only a dozen years. It is hard to argue that our trade policy is working.

□ 2000

Some people say, well, those are only just numbers, that is the trade deficit; who really cares? What that means is it means a significant loss in manufacturing jobs.

The States in red are States that have lost 20 percent of their manufacturing. The State of Ohio, 216,000 just in the last 5 years; Michigan, 210,000 manufacturing jobs lost; Illinois, 224,000; Pennsylvania, 200,000; Mississippi and Alabama combined, 130,000. In the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. LEWIS) home State, they have lost between 15 and 20 percent.

These are the States in blue, 107,000. In the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from California's (Mr. BERMAN) State, 354,000 jobs lost.

In State after State after State we have seen hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs lost in the last 5 years, not entirely because of but in large part because of failed trade policies. Each one of these jobs translates into the loss of a bread winner, translates into less money for education in the community, less money for police and fire as the tax base shrinks with

more and more industrial concerns shutting down.

These are faces of real people, what these numbers represent, and it is hurting an awful lot of families in every one of these States and our country.

As we see, the Central American Free Trade Agreement was negotiated by a select few for a select few. It was negotiated by the U.S. pharmaceutical industry to help the U.S. pharmaceutical industry. It was negotiated by big energy companies in the United States to help big energy companies in the United States. It was negotiated by insurance and financial institutions to help insurance and financial institutions. But it is not helping workers. It is not helping the environment. It is not helping small manufacturers. It is not helping small farmers and small ranchers in our country.

It is the same old story, Mr. Speaker. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President makes three promises. He promises there will be more jobs in the U.S., more manufacturing products that are exported to other countries, and it means better wages and a higher standard of living for workers in the developing country. Yet, with every single trade agreement, their promises fall by the wayside.

Benjamin Franklin said, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different result. The President makes the same promises about NAFTA, about PNTR with China, about CAFTA, about every trade agreement over and over and over, and the results are the same: more manufacturing job loss; more stagnation of wages in the developing world where their standard of living does not go up; more plant shutdowns in community after community in our country.

In the face of overwhelming bipartisan opposition, the administration and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican in the House, have tried every trick in the book to pass this CAFTA. Mr. Speaker, CAFTA is a bad idea. Overwhelming opposition to this agreement says we should renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

#### WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate on this House floor recently about the war in Iraq and not so much about Afghanistan, interestingly, but certainly about Iraq. Some in Congress are clamoring for us to pull out of Iraq immediately. Some want a timetable indicating a date certain when we will withdraw. Some say there is no plan concerning postwar Iraq, no exit strategy. I would like to address each of these points just briefly.

Number 1, we promised the Iraqi people that we would not pull out prematurely. Remember that back in the Gulf War in the early 1990s, we made a similar promise. We did pull out, and thousands of Iraqis died. We have had a very difficult time regaining their trust since. I think to this point we may have regained some of that status and some of that trust.

A date certain on which we will leave Iraq will encourage insurgents to hang on until that date and then intensify the attacks. I think the date certain of withdrawal will certainly be looked upon by many insurgents as a sign that they were winning, a sign of victory. I am sure they would claim victory at that point.

Also, I think it is important that a withdrawal without victory will dishonor the memories of those who have died and sacrificed, and I, for one, would very much hate to go back and face some of those parents and some of those husbands and wives who have lost soldiers in the war and try to tell them that basically their son, their daughter, their husband, or their wife died for no cause at all. That would be very, very difficult for them to swallow.

Then I think most of us who have been overseas, and a great many Members of Congress have, have been to Iraq and Afghanistan and Kuwait, and Landstuhl in Germany to the hospital, and up to Walter Reed, and one thing that we found almost universally is that our soldiers have tremendous morale. They have a very strong sense of mission, and they have a real sense of purpose. Almost to a person the military personnel that I have talked to would tell you that they absolutely do not want to leave this thing undone. They want to make sure there is a sense of accomplishment and a sense of purpose.

Finally, let us address the issue of no plan, that there is no strategy, no exit plan at all. We might refer to this chart here. One year ago, there was one Iraqi military battalion that was trained and equipped. Now there are more than 100 battalions trained and equipped, and those are reflected over here on this 75,791 total of Ministry of Defense forces. Also, in addition, there are 90,883 policemen and other patrol and security guards that have been trained. So it is a total of 170,000 Iraqis who are currently trained and equipped.

I have been to Iraq where I have seen some of this training occur. I have been to Amman, Jordan, where a lot of the police academies are held. So at the present time we are aiming for 270,000, and we are most of the way there. We still have 100,000 to go, and we are training about 10,000 a month. So that means in about 10 months we will be at roughly 270,000.

General Petraeus says there is no shortage of volunteers; we have more people applying for this position than we have slots to fill them at the present time.

So I think we are in reasonably good shape. The exit strategy is obviously to draw down our forces as the Iraqis are able to take control of the situation, and currently, in almost every military action, Iraqis are out in front. There are many areas of Iraq at the present time where there are no U.S. forces. Iraqi forces are totally in control, not a whole lot of those areas, but there are some. So the Iraqis are assuming more and more responsibility for their own protection. At the present time, there are 21,000 fewer Americans in Iraq than there were in January. So there has been some drawdown at the present time.

One of the wild card situations is the Sunnis. Recently, the Sunnis, it was reported, reached a resolution with the Shias and the Kurds as to their role in government. I think if that can be accomplished, then we are in reasonably good shape for a resolution.

A constitution will be written by August 15. It will be approved by October 15, and a new government will be elected on December 15.

So there is a strategy. Progress is being made. It is a very difficult situation. I really, truly believe all Members, both sides of the aisle, are very much in support of our troops. I think it is important that we support them with our votes, with money, with equipment, and also with our words, because our words that are spoken on this House floor and in the press certainly reverberate around the world and al Jazeera.

So I know our troops very much are hoping that we will show unqualified and tremendous resolution in resolving this issue.

#### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION AND THE GROKSTER DECISION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, today the United States Supreme Court, in a unanimous 9-0 decision, held that peer-to-peer file-swapping companies can be held liable if they promote the use of their sites to infringe copyright. The Grokster decision is a victory for all law-abiding Americans, especially the hardworking and talented individuals that make up our creative industries.

I am pleased that the Supreme Court struck the right balance between the protection of intellectual property and the desire to provide consumers with easy and lawful access to movies, music, and other content. Impressive advances in technology in recent years have produced a host of new and exciting avenues for consumers to access music and other content online. These new technologies, however, have also bred a culture of rampant pirating on the Internet.

Grokster and other peer-to-peer networks have become bastions of illegal

activity, providing safe havens for pirates to swap copied versions of copyrighted material without paying a cent. Every day, millions of copyrighted protected movies, songs, computer games, and other pieces of intellectual property are stolen over peer-to-peer networks.

The statistics speak for themselves. Over 90 percent of the file-sharing activity on Grokster is illegal copyright infringement. Of the music files available online, 99 percent are unauthorized, leading to a substantial drop in shipments of music to retailers.

In the last year alone, the number of feature films posted on file-sharing sites more than doubled to 44 million. Some estimates show that as many as 400,000 movies have been downloaded in one day alone.

Last month, it took just a few hours after the latest Star Wars movie opened in theaters for a copy to show up online on a file-sharing site. While so many Americans flocked to movie theaters across the country with their children and families to see the latest episode of this great Hollywood franchise, millions had access to an unauthorized copy of the film online, free for theft and the taking.

Our Nation's economy and creative industries that employ over 5 million Americans suffer a huge blow from the billions of dollars lost annually through illegal downloading. These networks that actively promote illegal activity continue to pose a serious threat to the livelihood of copyright creators and artists, many of whom live in my district.

One of our country's greatest exports, indeed the only area where we have a positive balance of trade with every Nation on earth, is in the area of creative content and our intellectual property, which is derived from the hard work of song writers, technicians, artists, programmers, musicians, independent filmmakers and scores of others who make their living from the lawful sale of these items.

The Supreme Court decision today strikes the right balance by protecting copyright holders from such illegal activity and promoting legal avenues for downloading movies, music, and other works by consumers.

Very simply, the Court decision today codifies an age-old principle: that one man should not profit from the fruit of another man's labor.

As the Court noted, their decision leaves breathing room for innovation, and a vigorous commerce and does nothing to compromise the legitimate commerce or discourage innovation having a lawful purpose.

Today's ruling upholds the principle that technology must and should advance, but not without respecting copyright law. Just moments after today's decision, a new legal peer-to-peer model was unveiled that will incorporate many user benefits common to the peer-to-peer file-sharing experience, and a number of sites have al-

ready been launched that offer Internet music downloads at affordable prices without infringing on copyright laws. These positive efforts provide a victory for both consumers and artists.

Today's decision will further encourage and spur even more technological innovation. As a result, consumers will be the ultimate winners as they will have more access to high-quality music, film, and other content on the Internet and elsewhere.

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

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

#### BRINGING TROOPS HOME

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as the right honorable gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), a good friend, former coach, had indicated, there are Members of this body who believe the solution in Iraq is to set a date certain by which we will begin removing or have our troops removed from Iraq. When asked recently if such a strategy would not have been devastating if used in World War II and would not have left Hitler in power, one Congressman said, well, World War II is not really an appropriate comparison. He believed the more appropriate model was that of Vietnam, where we set a time and then we got out.

I do not question anyone's motive here, but for freedom's sake, what in the world kind of a mission is that? The retreat from Vietnam created a vacuum that was filled by dead and mutilated bodies of those we ran out and deserted, and it is one of our darkest and most heinous hours in American history. It is rivaled, however, for its humiliating nature by the very war in Vietnam itself in which we sent soldiers to fight but tied one arm behind their backs and did not give them the equipment and backing to actually win. They were not authorized to win. They were told to just hold what they had. No war can ever be won unless there is a commitment by the government to win.

If we did not learn anything from the wars of the 20th century, it would be obvious here, but in 1979, we had an attack on American soil. That is what it is when someone attacks an American