

Greater integration of the world's economies has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in the developing world, nearly doubled the middle class population in Mexico and expanded our economy into a \$13 trillion global leader for greater economic and political freedom.

The benefits of globalization can be seen every single time that a Chinese blogger gets past government censors or a U.S. company trains factory owners in Thailand in worker rights and protections.

So how did the greatest engine of global prosperity become so maligned? How did this poverty fighting, democracy enhancing force get blamed for all of the world's evils, from job losses in Michigan to poor water quality in Guatemala?

In part, Mr. Speaker, this can be explained by the fact that globalization has improved so many aspects of our lives, but it has done so in very subtle ways. As a result, we do not always recognize its benefits.

When you go to the grocery store and find fresh grapes in the dead of winter, you might not know that the fact that they are there and fresh and reasonably priced is that they come from Chile. You just know that you get to enjoy those winter grapes.

When you buy educational software for your second grader, you might not know that it was developed by a small business in Pennsylvania, assembled in Malaysia and serviced by a technical support firm in India. You just know that your daughter is starting to do a better job at reading.

When you buy a new TV because Wal-Mart finally had it at a price you could afford, you might not know that they cut costs by developing and implementing a revolutionary operational structure. You may not know that they source, ship and track goods to and from every corner of the globe by using such innovative practices that they have transformed the entire retail industry. You just know that you get to watch this Sunday in the Super Bowl the Colts and the Bears play away on an amazing screen.

Globalization has impacted us in countless ways, with improvements that range from a better MP3 player to a better job, and together they contribute to a better life.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the improvements to our standard of living often go unnoticed, the challenges that come with change are painfully clear. When a factory closes down, the hardship is very real and very visible. For the individuals who face those tough times, winter grapes and flat-screen TVs seem absolutely meaningless.

□ 1945

When confronted with the difficult challenges change can bring, it is very natural to condemn change itself. But like all hard things in life, it is just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition from China, several

others thrive by utilizing low cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India; and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers here in the United States.

In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation right here at home: over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, including more than 7 million new jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment, as we all know, is at a near historic low of 4½ percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there is no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let us set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few.

Let us ask the question, Can we do that? Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers or the workers who design, market, and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all buy American. Does that mean that we buy Fords that are made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas made in Kentucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism absolutely obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the leading role that we as a country are facing. I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way to join in support of this effort.

But like all hard things in life, it's just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition with China, several others thrive by utilizing low-cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India, and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers. In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation: Over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of NAFTA, including 7 million jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment has dropped to 4.5 percent, a near-historic low.

But while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there's no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let's set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few. Let's ask the question of can we?

Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers, or the workers who design, market and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products, or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all "Buy American." Does that mean we buy Fords, made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas, made in Ken-

tucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods, designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism obsolete. Its impact is wide, pervasive and irreversible. We simply do not have the option anymore of withdrawing from the world and denying ourselves the benefits of a global marketplace.

Our only option is to use the prosperity it has brought to help those who are struggling. It doesn't matter why a job is lost. Whether globalization played a part or not, what matters is that workers have the skills they need to find even better jobs than the ones that were lost. If we make a commitment to American competitiveness, including worker competitiveness, we can both enjoy the benefits and address the challenges of a global economy.

What we can't afford to do is demonize the source of our unparalleled prosperity. There's no question individuals will face hardship at times, and that naturally breeds anxiety. But anti-globalization rhetoric that exploits and preys upon the anxieties of working families is cheap, dirty politics. And it is dangerous. It risks the growing standard of living that the world's economic liberalizers are enjoying. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the politics of isolationism and continue to pursue the path of greater economic integration in the worldwide marketplace.

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

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

#### FIREARM TRACING DATA

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks you have heard me talk about gun violence in this country, and I happen to think there are solutions where we can reduce gun violence.

I would like to talk about firearm tracing data. Firearm tracing data gives law enforcement agencies the ability to retrieve useful data on guns used in crimes. Tracing data will let our police departments locate the gun dealers who sell guns used in crimes. Without this tracing data, local law enforcement will not be able to pursue civil action on suppliers that have been implicated in crimes without asking the ATF's permission first.

It is important that we use tracing data to single out the bad gun owners. One percent of gun owners sell 50 percent of the guns used in crime in this country. That is a staggering number. We can crack down on that 1 percent. We can make our streets and cities safer. The collection of tracing data does not prevent anyone from purchasing a gun. It simply gives law enforcement the tools that they need to solve crimes.