

me to try and stop that illegal immigration. It is a dangerous thing for these folks. They hire people, called coyotes, who bring them up to the United States, and sneak them in. Often the women are raped, the men are robbed and they are pushed into the United States into some desert area where they perish. Hundreds have perished. They are abused on the way, they are abused when they get to the border, and they are abused many times by unscrupulous employers in the United States who take advantage of them. Knowing that they are here illegally, they will pay them less, and not give them the benefits that they deserve, and they are cast aside.

If we cared about them, we would do something about our borders and we would do something about our immigration policy. We would create a guest worker program that would allow people to come into the United States legally to take the jobs that, quote, no one else will take, which we have heard and which I will challenge. If there are such jobs, fine. There are ways in which people can come into this country legally, that their rights can be protected. They do not have to hire coyotes. They do not have to come up here and be abused by employers. We can tell who they are, how long they are here, who they are working for, and when they return. But no, that program will not be adopted. I have a bill for that purpose. It will not be heard because it is easier, of course, to simply ignore the folks coming across illegally.

It is easier to hire them. People do not have to go through all of the paperwork. Just open your door and say where is your green card, where is your work permit, and those things are purchasable at just about any flea market in America. You can buy your Social Security card and any other kind of identification you want. So employers would just as soon not have that kind of burden.

Of course as I have stated already, there are a lot of people here who want to simply abolish the borders. If we have a true guest worker program, then you need borders. Borders mean something then because then you are distinguishing who can come across them and who cannot. But if you do not want borders, then why would you want a guest worker program. You would not. What you want is to allow as many people as possible into the country, then chip away at every single law in the country that distinguishes someone as a citizen, that confers some right on them as a citizen. There are municipalities in this Nation, in this city, as a matter of fact, that are pushing for voting privileges for people here illegally.

Okay, as I say, Mr. Speaker, if that is where we are going, fine. Just make a decision. Make a conscious decision as to the direction this Nation is going. Abandon the borders or protect them. That is really and truly the choice we

have. As long as we ignore it and as long as we maintain this half-baked posture, we are abandoning them. That is exactly what is happening. We are doing that, I think, to our peril.

I have a dear friend by the name of Hugh Fowler. Hugh and Shirley Fowler have been friends of ours for 30 years or more. They gave me a great book. It is called "Crowded Land of Liberty" by Dirk Chase Elderidge, and I certainly recommend it to anyone. It talks about the impact of massive immigration.

There are all kinds of ramifications, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker. Certainly just in terms of the numbers, the growth in our population, and everyone wonders how it is in Colorado we have this huge number of people coming into the State every year. Growth has gone wild. We are building highways and schools and hospitals. California has to build a school a day to keep up with the numbers. Where are they coming from? Is this the natural birth rate of the country? No, of course not. Our natural birth rate is almost replenishment level. It is almost 2.1. The increase in population in this country is as a result of immigration. Immigrants coming in, immigrants having children. That is the population increase. There are ramifications. Crowded conditions, crowded public lands. Rocky Mountain National Park, Yellowstone, which you cannot get to any more. You have to wait in long lines. Pretty soon you will have to have reservations to go to scenic spots in America, and there are not that many scenic spots left any more because houses are popping up where there once was pristine grasslands. This is happening because of population pressure, population growth. Where is it coming from? It is coming from immigration.

Now, it could be okay. That may be absolutely all right with everybody, but it should be a condition that we establish in this country followed by an honest debate over a controversial issue.

Mr. Speaker, these are difficult issues. There is certainly no two ways about it, and difficult for us to discuss and deal with. I just want to say from a personal standpoint, it is good for us all to kind of stand back once in a while and think about things that put everything in perspective because we have a tendency for all of us to get wrapped up in this stuff.

A little over a week ago my youngest son and his wife had a baby. My daughter-in-law gave birth to a little boy named Gabriel. I went out to California the Saturday before last to see him. When my son walked out of the delivery room carrying him and handed him to me and I took him in my arms, I thought, This does put the world in perspective. It is for Gabriel and it is for Thomas, my oldest grandson, and for William, his brother, that we do all of these things, that we try all of us, not just Members of Congress, everyone I know, that is what we labor for. It is the future. And it is for them, Mr.

Speaker, that I do in fact try to advance this issue. I believe it is an important one. I want to leave them a country as good if not better than the one I grew up in. That is why we labor here.

WAGING THE PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AKIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, how we wage peace should be the agenda priority as we close out the 107th Congress. To attack or not to attack Iraq should not be the issue which dominates the final work of this Congress. To attack or not to attack should not be the question which overwhelms the minds of America at this critical hour as we move toward very important elections on November 5.

If September 11, 2001, has made the American people preoccupied with security and safety from terrorism, then let us examine all of the components and elements of a program to make our Nation more secure and more safe: Action involving Iraq, whether it is United Nations inspections or military offensive, at the conclusion of either one, we will still face major questions of security and safety from terrorism.

Only serious attention to the full agenda of the Congress can accomplish our continuing mission to make this Nation secure and safe. Our Nation is most secure not when we wage war but when we mount a sustained peace offensive. We must pass laws, we must appropriate money which supports the increase of prosperity and peace. Security and safety are enhanced when we have a foreign policy and a foreign aid program which promotes peace.

Our Nation's security is threatened when we conduct silly and wasteful sessions of Congress like the present session. The present session includes days like today when we voted on three resolutions. One was Recognizing the 100th Anniversary of the 4-H Youth Development Program, another was on the Sense of Congress Regarding American Gold Star Mothers, and another was Welcoming Madame Chen Wu Sue-Jen, the First Lady of Taiwan, three resolutions that got all 435 votes, three resolutions which could have been handled with a voice vote of no substance, and we have been doing this for the last 3 or 4 weeks as we close out this Congress.

□ 2230

We need to focus on vital programs, such as senior prescription drug benefits, an increase in the minimum wage, minimum funding for school repairs, pension reform which stops corporate stealing and retrieves the millions of dollars swindled from ordinary workers. If we spend the remaining weeks and days of this Congress with a total focus on Iraq instead, we will engage in a major betrayal of our constituents.

I think the Iraq question is very important. I think we cannot escape a conclusion on the matter as soon as possible. But to attack or not to attack Iraq should not be the issue which obliterates all other discussion of all other issues, all of the other issues all very much related to the question of security and safety from terrorism.

We should have learned from the past the lessons of the Vietnam War and previous wars. We should understand certain important matters that need to be put back on the table. We cannot have too much discussion. People have chosen to forget that there was a Marshall Plan which waged the peace where we took the initiative against forces that were gathering after World War II, forces that would have made for chaos and a lot of conflict between nations, forces that might have paved the way for a Communist takeover of bankrupt economies in Europe; and we waged peace and we won. If we wage the peace instead of waging war at this particular time, we might find we are more secure and we are more safe from terrorism.

Let us just take two examples. If we focus instead of on the nation of Iraq and the need to attack Iraq because some say it poses some kind of danger to us, and I will come back to that later, if we focus instead on Pakistan, another Muslim nation, and looked at the fact that Pakistan, the leadership there, has taken a great chance in agreeing to serve as our allies in the fight against terrorism. Instead of spending 60 billion or more dollars in a war with Iraq, why do we not spend more money to improve the democracy in Pakistan? Pakistan already has nuclear weapons. Pakistan has, by the most conservative estimate, 150 million people, some say 180 million people. Pakistan has already declared as our allies in the war against terrorism as they were our allies in the war in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union, as they have been in the Cold War over the years.

So why not approach the present problem with an overwhelming embrace of a Muslim nation like Pakistan; and by doing great things for Pakistan, improving the education and a number of other things, we would do far more to secure the world against Islamic fanaticism than we will by attacking Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

I have gotten quite a number of letters, as most of us have, communications from various constituents; and I want to read some of those tonight as well as talk about the need to wage the peace as an answer to those who want to wage war. I want to talk a little bit about who is going to fight the war if the war has to be fought. It is the young men and women out there who need the minimum-wage increase. Wars in America have always been fought by people in the low-income brackets. They are the ones who go out and die. We ought to take care of their minimum-wage needs. We ought to take

care of their needs for safe places to work in. We ought to deal with the corporate empires that have been cheating them out of their pension funds. We ought to deal with the fact that many of our veterans are now suffering greatly because they do not have adequate health care. And among the items they need is some help with their prescription drugs. I am going to come back to that and talk about how we wage the peace, how we deal with making ourselves safe and secure from terrorism by waging that peace.

I have no illusions about the menace that Saddam Hussein represents. I think Saddam Hussein has a lot in common with Hitler. Since he does not possess a German war machine behind him, however, he does not pose an overt military threat to America as Hitler did. But the same brutal egomaniacal mind-set is at work in Saddam Hussein and we can see that, so I think we need to find ways to deal with Saddam Hussein, but I do not think that going to war as is being proposed by our President is the way to do it. I think we run the risk of making matters worse. We could cause the evil that this tyrant represents to actually mushroom. An action against Saddam Hussein might unleash the dogs of chaos in a new world order of disorder. Any well-armed nation could target a weaker nation and charge them with menacing action before launching a preemptive preventive military attack. That would be the worst kind of world to live in.

Before I go on, I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for this opportunity to have an exchange with him on some very vital issues and engage our colleagues in a debate that I think is enormously important. You mentioned something as I was coming to the floor and was listening to why are we here and why are we here in this Congress and what are the important issues. And particularly on the issue of going to war with Iraq, you captured the sentiment of many of my constituents.

This weekend I held a citizens forum on Iraq with an enormous amount of participation from my district but more importantly very wise and informed experts that we had from a number of our academic institutions, Texas Southern University, the University of Houston and St. Thomas University; but one of the things that came out of the audience is the fact that the young men and women that will go to war are our children and that in large numbers, a war with Iraq as it seems to be intended by this administration will be a bloody war with a great deal of loss of life, of American lives. At the same time, of course, it will compound the loss of lives of women and children and men, families, in Iraq. The question becomes, how do

we deal with the prominence that the United States has gotten as the only and singular world power? Does it in any way diminish the United States to engage in diplomacy?

And so the question has to go to the administration as to why we are rushing so fast to war. What is the entrance and exit strategy that we would have if we engaged in a war in Iraq? What is the answer to the question the American public will ask, is it 75,000 or 300,000 men and women on the ground in Iraq? We are already paying \$12 billion a month in Afghanistan. Many of us joined with the President to support going after the terrorists and I stand by that resolve because we were attacked on our soil. The representation that we need to go to war with Iraq because there is an imminent danger has not been proven. Even today in Prime Minister Blair's remarks, and it is a long document, which I have read and reviewed, and he spoke before the Parliament and he gives the case made by the British Joint Intelligence group, the BJI, who for over 60 years has worked on behalf of the British Government. There is a long list of statements about weapons of mass destruction and having to go back in. I agree with that. We need United Nations inspectors to go in unfettered.

But the one thing that the Prime Minister said is that I think we should listen. Our case, he says, is simply this, not that we take military action come what may, but that the cause for ensuring Iraqi disarmament as the U.N. has stipulated is overwhelming.

And to utilize the position of Britain and the Prime Minister as war-war-war seems to be incorrect based upon his remarks. He documents that he believes that there are weapons of mass destruction, but at the same time he also acknowledges that intelligence is often open to question. And so what we really need to have happen is that the United Nations inspectors need to go in unfettered, and the better route for the United States to take is the diplomatic route which is the route of saying, let us join in with the United Nations, let us adhere to the provision 51 in the charter that says that striking first preemptively, making the first strike, is illegal; and let us not violate, if you will, the international law.

Mr. OWENS. Is my colleague implying that the British Prime Minister does not agree with the President? I think the Chancellor of Germany has gotten into serious trouble by not agreeing. Is it likely that there is going to be a falling out between the British Prime Minister and the President?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's question. I hope that the President will listen and actually read the text of the remarks made by the Prime Minister. He lays out a case. But in two simple lines, he says our case is simply this, not that we take military action.

So I believe that where the Prime Minister now stands is almost where

we have just heard former Vice President Al Gore stand. Multilateral actions, working with your allies, and working with the United Nations, which many in this Congress, we do not all agree, Democrats and Republicans, but we heard a collective voice of suggesting that if we are going to be part of the world family, then we need to not undermine the United Nations, we need to shore it up and to be part of it.

Some people have argued, we don't have the United Nations telling us what to do. You are absolutely right. If there was a cause that we felt that we were about to be imminently attacked, then obviously we have a right to defend ourselves and provision 51 under the U.N. charter provides that leeway. But we are using individuals who are saying one thing, but in fact I believe the Prime Minister has probably heard a lot from his party members to realize that we need to be deliberate, not that we have not acknowledged and the distinguished gentleman from New York said it very eloquently. You described who Saddam Hussein is. We do not make the point of putting him up as a saint, but the real question is disarmament, avoiding destabilization of the world in the region because we have Syria and Turkey and Iran and Saudi Arabia surrounding Iraq. We have no response, if you will, to what happens if we destabilize that area.

Let me pose a question to you, as I indicated. We are already spending \$1 billion a month in Afghanistan. That is to fight the war. That is not necessarily to rebuild the country. Afghanistan some 20 years ago was maybe not the most prosperous and technologically, if you will, competent nation; but it certainly was a nation that was standing on its feet, I would say more than 20 years ago, in its own way. It is now a mere semblance of a nation which we have to rebuild. The question is, who will rebuild Iraq? What is the upcoming government that will take over if we are talking about, one, an attack; two, a destruction of the government and destruction of the infrastructure and destruction of the country itself? I believe it would be just foolish to suggest that in fact we are talking about Iraq rebuilding itself. We would have to be engaged in rebuilding it.

Mr. OWENS. I think my colleague has made a very good comparison of Afghanistan versus Iraq. Afghanistan, versus Iraq, you might say, is a rather primitive country. It was when the Soviet Union attacked Afghanistan. But the Soviet Union found after 9 years that it could not subdue the people of Afghanistan. It had to give up. It lost a lot of lives. It brought the government down in the Soviet Union, also. Iraq has far more sophistication, is far more densely populated, will be impossible to occupy. The problem is not can you wipe out Saddam Hussein, can you wipe out his Republican Guard, his immediate military machine. That could be accomplished fairly quickly. But

what do you do after that? Occupying the country is where you would have to draft thousands of American men to go in there. You are talking about hundreds of thousands who would be there for a long time and who would face guerilla warfare and all kinds of menacing situations from some of the governments and populations around Iraq as well as in Iraq itself. So you have no choice after fighting the war and losing lives but to try to finish it. Whether you are talking about nation-building or just occupying the territory, either way it will drain resources and it will drain lives away for a long, long time. It is going to be no easy matter.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think you have captured it well. You are absolutely right. First of all, if we look at our maps, we realize that Iraq is huge. It would require massive occupation by either U.S. troops or allies. That is one of the reasons that it would certainly be misdirected and wrong-headed to talk about any kind of unilateral effort. As you well know, I think to this point the administration has not moved from its position that if the U.N. does not act, we will act. I think I would say to my colleagues and certainly what I said to my constituents, is that we are no wimps here, that I call everyone a patriot, because we have all rallied to unify behind the administration on the fighting of terrorism and we have been grateful for the fact that our allies have joined us as well.

□ 2245

They realize the new wars of the 21st century will be fought differently from World War II. In fact, there will be probably more wars of terrorism. The question is, have we finished the job on fighting terrorism with our allies? Have we found Osama bin Laden? Have we stabilized Afghanistan with the jeopardy the new President is in in Afghanistan every day?

Then we turn our attention to Iraq, \$100 billion to be spent immediately if we begin a war, with no case being made on the imminence of their attacking the United States, with evidence suggesting that they do not have any missiles that would reach the continental area of the United States, and that the United Nations is prepared under the present resolutions to go in and Iraq has suggested that they can come in unfettered.

I just want to offer, you mentioned the Soviet Union. It is interesting for those of us who either read it in the history books or were here to talk about the Cold War, many of the young people today do not know about that. But just imagine if everybody at that time said let us just do a preemptive unilateral strike on the Soviet Union.

Mr. OWENS. There were people that counseled that, I am sure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. There were people who I understand advised that. But I guess cooler heads prevailed, as we heard our good colleague

and friend, former Member Dellums, give us a really detailed explanation on some of these issues, and we have a situation now that we did not go to war and in essence we saved ourselves from the immediacy of a third world war at that time.

Why not now have disarmament and containment, getting allies? Diplomacy and dealing with the United Nations seems to be the better direction of the day. Because I do not see with respect to the President's position any way that we can be victorious in winning this war in a limited short period of time with a minimal loss of life. I just truly believe that with better study, we would have a resolution of this question.

Mr. OWENS. You offer very strong and glaring examples. If we outlasted the Soviet Union and we outlasted China, all of these evil empires that it appeared we were going to inevitably have military conflict with are now, if not our allies, then certainly civil partners or neighbors. If we outlasted the threats that they posed, then surely we can outlast the threat that Iraq poses also.

Yes, we are going to have to learn in this world to live with a new kind of threat, a new kind of risk. And getting rid of Saddam Hussein and Iraq will not free us from having to live with that risk, because there are nations like Pakistan, a friendly nation at this point, possessing nuclear weapons, and on very shaky grounds in terms of the turmoil in that nation could lead to an overthrow of the government. It could be in unfriendly hands tomorrow, so you could have the possibility of nuclear weapons being stolen from there or transmitted from there.

Even if a nation does not have nuclear weapons, the possibility of a rogue nation selling it to them that we do not even know about, or the possibility of being stolen. The Soviet Union has lost a lot of nuclear materials through theft, or Russia, since the Soviet Union was dismantled. All these things exist. We have some threats and some risks that we are going to have to live with. So why do we suddenly consider Saddam Hussein an imminent threat that must be taken care of in an unlawful use of force?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Immediately. If the gentleman would yield, you raise several very important points that could be part of the solution, and that is whether they are rogue nations or others, how is Saddam Hussein getting some of this so-called material for a so-called creation of a nuclear bomb on the black market?

Would it not be better for us to address some of these issues, of countries that may be our allies or we are engaged with who are actually providing this material to Iraq for them to function with materials from the black market?

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman for making part of my speech unnecessary. I was going to deal with

the question of have we done enough to confront diplomatically our allies and the people in the world who are furnishing Saddam Hussein with what he needs? The sanctions have not been carried out. We should have confronted France, the Russians and a number of other nations for not cooperating with the United Nations imposed sanctions. Iraq has continued to sell oil on the black market. Everybody knows it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. OWENS. Somebody is buying it. It is not just small countries, it is large countries. We have not confronted them. The rule of law, which we think is so important, the rule of international law is just as important as any other rule of law, but they are just thumbing their noses at the rule of law as far as the United Nations is concerned. We have not confronted these nations and demanded that they stop doing what they are doing.

There is a lot of talk about children dying in Iraq because of the U.S.-imposed or UN-imposed sanctions. That is a lot of nonsense. Saddam Hussein is selling oil. He has billions of dollars to spend as he wishes to spend. He is spending it on trying to acquire weapons materials. He could buy medicine, he could buy food. If children are dying in Iraq, people are dying for lack of medicine, it is Saddam Hussein's fault, nobody else's, because he certainly has the money and resources, because the rest of the world has not bothered to enforce the law or to try to enforce the law as they should, the sanctions and the conditions that Iraq agreed to that were imposed on Iraq.

Why is Iraq special and not different from any other nation with an evil regime, with a dictator? Because they agreed in order to save themselves to certain items and signed an agreement with the United Nations, and they have proceeded not to abide by that agreement. That makes them different and a special case. But the case has not been made for a military attack on Iraq.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman would yield, you are absolutely right, and that is where we have faltered and made great mistakes diplomatically, is we have not insisted that our allies enforce the sanctions. We have not insisted that the United Nations remain strong on some of the resolutions that they have passed.

You can contain and isolate Saddam Hussein, and, frankly, we have not done that. We have given him great latitude. Of course, with everyone's eyes on his oil reserves, he has had a certain degree of freedom.

Our unilateral attack is not going to help the situation. In fact, it is going to make the region more volatile. It is going to again take away from us the high moral ground. So who are we to stop any incursion or any sort of conflict between India and Pakistan, between China and Taiwan? Who are we to say to Israel if they are attacked during the time we start a unilateral

war, if they are attacked by Iraq, who are we to say, even though we were successful in doing that in 1991, because we asked in advance and had the allies, and by the way, let me distinguish in the 1991 resolution, I was not here, but obviously everyone knows Iraq attacked Kuwait.

On the limited premise that an ally was attacked, you could argue that we went in to aid our ally, Kuwait. We have no such circumstance here.

Mr. OWENS. We did not go in alone. That was a resolution of the United Nations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman is absolutely right. We had the allies. Who are we to begin this whole new metamorphical change or 180 degree change, if you will, to suggest now that our policy is totally regime change, and that we can go anywhere as the United States and say we do not like our neighbor and we want them to change? I believe that is a path that we do not want to take.

We did not take it under Democratic or Republican Presidents, to suggest that we, the most powerful Nation in the world, can now go around and attack any regime we so desire, even those that are ugly, that we do not like, and that should be moving toward a path of change. But we must follow international law and begin to look ahead as to what will happen, and people, other nations, allies, foes and friends, will begin to say, you did it, why can we not do it?

That is, I think, the deliberations that I have not heard debated here, that I have not heard the administration make its case. And I might simply say, though I hear of pending resolutions coming, that is why it would be more appropriate for us to hold a special session and for this debate to be carried on singularly with nothing else on the Congress' agenda. It is so crucial, it is wrapped with so many major changes for this Nation, that I frankly believe the American people are done a disservice if we do not give them all of the facts.

I have heard, as the gentleman has heard, not only e-mails and letters, but I am hearing there is a growing sense of opposition, irrespective of political party or political philosophy or region, as people begin to understand the facts. And they see what the gentleman stated earlier, what I have joined in to say, that thousands upon thousands of young lives will be lost, and might I say young men and women who will go anywhere to defend this Nation. It is not them. Our military men and women are superb, as our veterans are. They will go anywhere to defend our freedoms. But the question is, have we thought about the thousands upon thousands of lives, young men and women, our children, whose lives will be lost, and who by our vote, the singular vote that any Member makes, can cast them into harm's way, and for what reason? What imminency? What international law will they be abiding

by? What solution will they provide, if you will? How will they bring closure to this?

We had closure in World War II. We went on to the Marshall Plan and we had the moral high ground. Many think we should have started earlier with the allies. Out of that came NATO.

But what do we have now that would suggest that this is the right direction to take, rather than, as the gentleman indicated, and I have totally agreed, the enforcing of the UN sanctions, the going in with the inspectors, the building up of allies, the containing and disarming of him? That is the approach to do, and then we will find our way on the moral ground and also with our allies making an actual difference as opposed to, I believe, doing what we are intending to do at this point.

Mr. OWENS. I thank my colleague from Texas for joining me and emphasizing again that we cannot have too much debate on this subject.

When we talk about going to war, we say we are going to war, we mean not just the decisionmakers in the White House or decisionmakers here in Congress. We mean all of America is going to war. So we cannot take too much time to discuss this issue and look at all the ramifications. We cannot take too much time and review history, because some obvious lessons of history are being forgotten right now.

We seem to have forgotten the lessons of Vietnam. We seem to have forgotten a lot of lessons of all the wars fought in America in terms of who fights them, who goes to war, who are the ones who die.

Perhaps we should stimulate the discussion by making a whole new set of rules related to Selective Service, because inevitably there is going to have to be a draft. If you occupy Iraq, thousands and thousands of men and women will be needed. There will have to be a draft.

We should make rules that nobody gets exempted from the draft except people who physically are disabled. Everybody else has to go. We should make a rule that everybody who is in the military must do a year in the combat zone. We should learn from the past lessons and not drop the burden of a war that is questionable on the backs of the people who have the least amount to say about it or do anything. We should not drop the war on the backs of people that we will not get passed the minimum wage increase for.

If you look at the Vietnam Wall, and among the war monuments in the world there is none nothing greater than the Wall of the Vietnam Memorial. That wall lists every person who died, every soldier who died in Vietnam. There are no more unknown soldiers. You talk about the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, wondering who the soldier is. Everyone gets listed. Let us name them one by one. They deserve to be listed, in order to develop habits which do not encourage war. If we have

to see them named one by one, we understand that this is what war means. 57,000 almost are listed on that wall.

In the Civil War we lost 600,000, more or less, on both sides. More lives were lost in the Civil War in America than any other. We lost enormous amounts of lives in World War II and World War I. All of the statistics will show when you break them out that the overwhelming majority of the lives lost were poor, rural, big city, young men who had to be the cannon fodder for the war. They deserve more than to have us callously make decisions about how their lives are going to be lost, and they deserve us to pay more attention to their needs right now on the domestic agenda of the Congress.

□ 2300

We should deal with working conditions, we should deal with the economy, we should deal with the fact that the pension funds are cheating workers out of their rights.

But let us get back to the war for a moment and hear the voices of some of my constituents. I think it is very important that, like many others who have received communications, mail, e-mail, and telephone calls is becoming overwhelming about this matter, and they will continue. But I like the quality of some of the communications that I received so much that I thought I would share a couple of them tonight. Here is one that is very simple. It is handwritten, but it gets right to the point, and I am going to read it and submit it for the RECORD when I finish.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS: As a constituent of your district, I urge you to oppose the war on Iraq. A strike on Baghdad is unjustified, illegal, and immoral. The issue of weapons inspectors can be handled by the U.N. in a peaceful and lawful manner. With a sinking economy, the American people cannot bear the burden of another war. Please focus on investing in people, not war.

This is written by Michael Feldman and Jeanette Feldman, who are constituents in my district. A very simple statement, and I will enter the entire letter for the RECORD.

One other letter which is not so simple, but written by one of my constituents and obviously she has given a great deal of thought to this letter, and I appreciate the thinking here; and I want my colleagues to hear the connection here with September 11 and how she weaves all of this together and understands very clearly the mood of America. The mood of America is anger; the mood of America is hurt; the mood of America is fear. But we should not let the mood of anger, hurt, and fear drive us into reckless actions that will make matters worse.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OWENS: I am writing to you because I feel so helpless to stop what seems to be inevitable: war with Iraq. Like you and every New Yorker, I tasted war on September 11. It wasn't pleasant, and I am not eager to experience it again. For hours I could not find my husband who worked across the street from One World Trade Center. Fortunately, he returned

home safely after witnessing unspeakable carnage. But many of our friends and neighbors weren't so lucky. That evening I walked down 7th Avenue in Park Slope, Brooklyn, to get a handle on the losses. The stench from burning buildings, computers and bodies was pervasive and the smoke cast an eerie haze over our little community. Everywhere I went I learned of more losses. Twelve firemen from squad one on my block, loved ones of students, and a teacher at the Park Slope Dance Studio, parents with kids at 321, Berkeley Carol, and St. Ann's School, members from church, a former colleague, and many of our neighbors were all among the missing. At 7 p.m. that day, we foolishly held out hope that some would be found in area hospitals, but unfortunately, they weren't.

Weeks later I attended the memorial service for my friend Jeff Hardy, who was killed because he happened to be working on the 101st floor of Tower 1. Hours after I attended Jeff's service, a woman at 7th Avenue and Carroll approached me and asked me to sign a petition opposing the war in Afghanistan. I refused. I supported the war in Afghanistan and have been grateful that our allies have worked with us to round up terrorists worldwide.

However, I have seen absolutely no evidence that Iraq had anything to do with this attack. The rumor that Mohamed Atta met with an Iraqi intelligence agent has been denied by the Czech government. I am not aware of one Iraqi who fought with the Taliban, although I know the citizens of many of our allies fought with the Taliban or members of al Qaeda and were on those planes on September 11, and continue to threaten America and other foreigners every day, particularly in Pakistan.

My hope is to destroy al Qaeda and stop the spread of Islamic religious fundamentalism and hatred for the United States, for Christians, for Jews. To fight the Islamists, we need the cooperation of all of our allies and all countries in the Middle East. I am afraid that this fragile alliance will dissolve if we attack Iraq without provocation and we may not get the help we need. Invading Iraq will only inflame anti-American rhetoric and could even jeopardize our friends in the Middle East. I am deeply worried about the welfare of President Musharraf and concerned that if anything happens to him, religious fanatics could take control of Pakistan, which we know has both nuclear weapons and al Qaeda members. Musharraf is already under attack in his country because of his support of the U.S., and the New Yorker reported this week that a recent car bomb that killed 12 people was intended for him. I truly think declaring war on Iraq will put more U.S. citizens in harm's way.

This is a letter from a constituent of mine.

I would like to conclude the letter which I think is very thorough and thoughtful.

Following the tragedies of September 11, we were a city in mourning. We spent months going to funerals in neighborhoods completely shut down when funerals for firefighters were held. The physical and emotional damage contributed to the economic downturn here. I run a small but successful public relations firm and I booked 93 percent of my revenues in 2001 on projects that were completed before September 11, and only 7 percent after September 11. My situation was not unusual. Small businesses, graphic designers, contractors, beauticians, photographers, everywhere in the metropolitan area, they suffered from the same fate. Large companies like my husband's were evacuated from lower Manhattan, never to return. His company had to rebuild complete systems

within days to be able to compete with the markets open the following Monday and use AOL and other carriers to communicate by e-mail because the company's service was destroyed. We all limped along. Our woeful city tax revenues are enduring evidence of the economic damage we experienced. This country and especially this city have not yet digested the economic and emotional fallout from September 11. New York City is still struggling to get back on its feet and continues to get hammered by low tax revenues, the recession, stock market volatility and corporate scandals. The economy cannot take another shot like a war with Iraq and its unknown consequences. We have so much unfinished international business that to go forward with a war with Iraq right now would be irresponsible. I share the same concerns that King Abdullah of Jordan has that invading Iraq will lead to a further destabilization of the Middle East, including possibly a civil war, at a time when we need to be rebuilding Afghanistan and seeking a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian war. Even the Kurds are begging us not to invade. We still haven't found Osama bin Laden and Mullah Omar yet. How are we going to round up Saddam Hussein and his secret weapons, particularly without the support of our allies? It's suicidal. I'm reminded of our many unsuccessful attempts to oust Fidel Castro. Besides the economic and diplomatic problems of a war with Iraq, I have a serious moral problem with killing innocent people in that country. I know what it feels like when innocent lives are lost. Even Representative Dick Armey was quoted today in the times as saying that an unprovoked attack would violate international law. However, this administration will not listen to its allies and is only fueling anti-Americanism worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I will place the entire letter from Gail Donovan in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, my message is that we should wage peace instead of being overwhelmed by concerns with war. In this country we have a lot of mechanisms of war. We have West Point, we have several military universities, we have the Naval War College and the Army War College and several mechanisms for preparing the best minds in the world to wage war, and maybe that is as it should be. A great Nation leading the world should have the best minds and the best equipment, the best Armed Forces. But on the other hand, we do very little to prepare our population to wage peace. We have no equivalent to West Point where we train people in diplomacy and in ways in which to wage peace.

□ 2310

We do not even bother to look closely at our successes in the world, like the Marshall Plan. With the expenditure of money that could have been spent fighting wars, we were able to stop the spread of communism in Europe and to rebuild prosperous economies in the nations of Europe.

If we had a peace college or a peace university, peace universities, maybe they would look at questions like the relationship between war and those who make the decisions about war and those who fight the wars. It is worth examining. I have studied it and I have made speeches on this floor before offering the statistics related to the Civil

War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War in terms of the number of people who died and where they came from.

The pattern is clear. In the Civil War, if one was drafted or scheduled to be drafted, one could buy one's way out and somebody else, a poorer person, would take your place and die for you in that war. We lost the largest number of Americans in the Civil War, approximately 600,000. Modern weapons were not invented at that time, so more people got killed as cannon fodder in face-to-face, bayonet-to-bayonet contact, so on.

In World War I, the same pattern: The people who died came from the rural areas and the big cities, the poorest populations in the big cities. In World War II, the same as in World War I; and in Korea, and in Vietnam. The names on that wall over there, two-thirds of them are from low-income communities. A disproportionate number on the Vietnam Wall are also minorities.

The people who are going to die deserve to be included in this debate. If we attack Iraq, if we are successful, as we will be, in destroying their military forces, we will have to occupy Iraq. That is where large numbers of men and women will be needed to carry out such an occupation. We will have to have a draft, eventually.

Let us take a look at that and see in a democracy how we might improve upon the process of making war by examining the process by which we draft people to go off and fight the wars. Maybe we should start talking, now, about changes in the Selective Service approach. If we reinstitute the draft, maybe there should be a definite qualification that nobody gets exempted, except only those who are physically disabled. Everybody who is eligible, who is in the category to be drafted, should be drafted. They all should serve the same amount of time in a combat zone.

In Vietnam, the latter part of the Vietnam War, a man had to spend only a year, and after a year he was allowed to go home out of the combat zone. There should be some kind of understanding that one's life is at risk, and those kinds of rules and practices maybe should be made up ahead of time. Congress should take a close look at it. Everybody goes. The grandsons and great-grandsons of the people who make decisions to go to war must be on the front lines as well as the rest of the population.

Also, the way we treat our population: If we are going to have a draft, then certainly the issues that are not being dealt with in this Congress are important for consideration. If we are going to have a draft, we have no right to draft men and women that we do not want to provide job opportunities for.

Our minimum wage is such now that, at \$5.15 an hour, one can work a 40-hour week all year long and make less than \$12,000. No family of four or even three, barely two, can live off of that small

amount of money. Yet, large amounts of Americans make only the minimum wage. This Congress has refused to address any consideration of raising the minimum wage.

If we cannot raise the minimum wage for those young men and women who are going to have to go to war, if we cannot provide decent working conditions in their places of work, instead of attacking OSHA as the first act of a the new administration, and eliminating the ergonomics regulations, we should have been bolstering the safety and health conditions of the workplace, because those are the men and women who are, in the ultimate defense of the country, going to be the ones on the front lines.

We should pay homage to them. We should at least guarantee that when they grow old, as veterans of World War II and Vietnam are now old, they should not have to worry about prescription drugs. Why should a veteran who risked his life in Vietnam or Korea or World War II, why should they have to worry about having to not eat, to forgo a meal, in order to get the prescription they need to stay alive?

A great nation should address the full agenda of items. We should not shut down this Congress and fail to address that agenda because we are considering a war that might secure us against terrorism and make the Nation safe. We are safe only when we do all of these things. We have to walk, chew gum, dance, and do a lot of other things at the same time. We are not secure unless we mount a sustained peace offensive. Our peace offensive must consist of passing laws and appropriating money which supports the increase of prosperity and peace.

Let us just take the Muslim nation of Iraq versus the Muslim nation of Pakistan for a moment. Pakistan has always been our ally, always been our ally. In the Cold War, in the Afghanistan war against the Soviet Union, always Pakistan has been there. Again, in this very controversial and dangerous situation, the Pakistan administration has chosen to ally itself with the United States.

We have given Musharraf and the government of Pakistan I think something like \$800 million, not even \$1 billion, but \$800 million in aid. Pakistan has a population of no less than 150 million people, some say up to 180 million, but no less than 150 million people. If we were to make Pakistan a firm ally and make certain that everything is done that can be done to prop up that administration, to help our ally, to make sure that Musharraf and his government will survive, to make certain that a communication goes out to the whole Muslim world that we are not into fighting a religious war, we are not anti-anybody because they are Muslim. We can have strong Muslim allies as we have Muslim enemies, those who chose to make themselves our enemies.

But instead, we are going to expend billions of dollars in the war against

Iraq, instead of billions to help Pakistan. For very tiny amounts of money, more aid to Pakistan to help it get its economy on the feet, to help it provide a more legitimate education system, a lot of their youngsters were drained off into the al-Qaeda movement. They went off to Afghanistan and became part of the terrorist movement because they were hungry, and they were given three meals a day and fed hate and taught how to fight, and given some purpose in life. They should not have that as the only alternative.

I happen to have a large Pakistani community in my district, so I am personally familiar with Pakistan. I went there and visited 2 years ago. Pakistan is not at all a backward Nation, backward-thinking Nation in any way. The fact that it is Muslim does not mean that it does not appreciate its women. I saw or visited several girls' schools. In one class, girls were taking a math exam. They were not just learning minor matters, they were learning science and engineering, just as the men were. It is a nation that needs more schools, and they need more help with their education system.

So let us wage peace by getting closer to Pakistan, by embracing Pakistan. We have given the Pakistani-American population a very difficult time here in this country. They have rounded them up. A lot of Pakistanis have been put in detention as a result of immigration problems, and they have been treated as if they are enemies of the people.

Not a single Pakistani has been identified at this point as a terrorist. They have not found a single Pakistani terrorist. They have found some al-Qaeda people in Pakistan, but they are not Pakistani. They have found no Pakistani-American who was involved in any way with money laundering or any aspect of terrorism; yet, the Pakistani community in America is under great pressure right now.

We should embrace them, instead. We should wage peace by understanding who our allies are and by rewarding our allies, by appreciating our allies. I think we ought to have some kind of amnesty for the Pakistani-Americans who have problems with immigration.

□ 2320

I think we ought to show some sort of special concern with respect to exchange students from Pakistan. We ought to go all out. Pakistan is not the largest Muslim nation; Indonesia is. Indonesia has more Muslims than Pakistan. Pakistan is in a transitional situation where it is receptive. Their graduate students, students of science and engineering, come here. I am certain the nuclear scientists who created the nuclear bomb in Pakistan went to American universities. We know who some of them are. They have the nuclear weapons capability now, Pakistan.

The great danger is that if we do not embrace them, if we do not prop them up, if we are not capable of waging the

peace by making them special allies, we may lose control of Pakistan, and the nuclear weapons that they have would fall into the hands of unfriendly people. We would have a clear and imminent danger then that we would have to deal with.

So I want to conclude by saying that this debate deserves to continue and to include as many people as possible. The American people, those who lived through the war in Vietnam, some are still around from World War I, certainly World War II, the Korean war, we should not take their wisdom lightly. We should look at their contributions and listen to their voices. A war in Iraq would not be fought in the quagmires and jungles like a war in Vietnam, but it would be the worst human quagmire that we could possibly contemplate.

We would not be going to war against Iraq. It would eventually be a war against the entire Muslim world. Through the gates that are open in Pakistan we could become allies, have allies and friends from the entire Muslim world. Why close that gate down and suffer from excessive preoccupation for the use of military force in Iraq? We have the United Nations. We have deliberations going on there. There is no great hurry. There is no imminent threat from Saddam Hussein. However monstrous Saddam Hussein might be, he does not have the capacity to inflict any great hurt on America at this point. We have time. We have time to wage peace instead of rushing into war. I hope we will listen to the wiser voices among us and not rush into a war with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the letters mentioned previously are as follows:

BROOKLYN, NY,
September 3, 2002.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWEN: As a constituent of your district, I urge you to oppose a war on Iraq. A strike on Baghdad is unjustified, illegal, and immoral. The issue of weapons inspectors can be handled by the U.N. in a peaceful and lawful manner. With a sinking economy, the American people cannot bear the burden of another war. Please focus on investing in people, not war.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL FELDMAN.
JEANETTE FELDMAN.

BROOKLYN, NY,
August 9, 2002.

Rep. MAJOR OWENS,
House of Representatives,
Brooklyn, NY.

DEAR REP. OWENS: I am writing to you, because I feel so helpless to stop what seems to be inevitable—War with Iraq.

Like you and every New Yorker, I tasted war on September 11. It wasn't pleasant and I'm not eager to experience it again. For hours I couldn't find my husband who worked across the street from 1 World Trade Center. Fortunately he returned home safely after witnessing unspeakable carnage, but many of our friends and neighbors weren't so lucky. That evening, I walked down 7th Avenue in Park Slope, Brooklyn, to get a handle on the losses. The stench from burning buildings, computers, and bodies was pervasive and the smoke cast an eerie haze over our little community. Everywhere I went I

learned of more losses—12 firemen from Squad 1 on my block, loved ones of students and a teacher at the Park Slope Dance Studio, parents with kids at 321, Berkeley Carroll, and St. Ann's, members from church, a former colleague, and many of our neighbors were all among the missing. At 7 p.m. that day, we foolishly held out hope that some would be found in area hospitals, but unfortunately there weren't.

Weeks later I attended the memorial service for my friend, Jeff Hardy, who was killed because he happened to be working on the 101st Floor of Tower 1. Hours after I attended Jeff's service, a woman at 7th Avenue and Carroll approached me and asked me to sign a petition opposing the war in Afghanistan. I refused. I supported the war in Afghanistan and have been grateful that our allies have worked with us to round up terrorists worldwide.

However, I have seen absolutely no evidence that Iraq had anything to do with this attack. The rumor that Mohamed Atta met with an Iraqi intelligence agent has been denied by the Czech government. I am not aware of one Iraqi who fought with the Taliban, although I know the citizens of many of our allies fought with the Taliban, are members of Al Qaeda, were on those planes September 11, and continue to threaten Americans and other foreigners every day, particularly in Pakistan.

My hope is to destroy Al Qaeda and stop the spread of Islamic religious fundamentalism and hatred for the United States, Christians, and Jews. To fight the Islamists, we need the cooperation of all of our allies and all countries in the Middle East. I am afraid that this fragile alliance will dissolve if we attack Iraq without provocation and we may not get the help we need. Invading Iraq will only inflame anti-American rhetoric and could even jeopardize our allies in the Middle East. I'm deeply worried about the welfare of President Musharraf and concerned that if anything happens to him, religious fanatics could take control of Pakistan, which we know has both nuclear weapons and Al Qaeda members. Musharraf is already under attack in his country because of his support of the U.S. and the New Yorker reported this week that a recent car bomb that killed 12 people was intended for him. I truly think declaring war on Iraq will put more U.S. citizens in harm's way than containment.

To me this administration's warmongering is further evidence of the "Kremlinization" of Washington under Bush. This administration thrives on secrecy. In the beginning of the term we saw cronyism and secret agreements among the elites in government and business. Now there is lavish federal spending in Florida where the president's brother happens to be running for re-election. According to a recent New Republic article, even questionable SBA loans are being made in Florida at a time when several businesses with which I have worked that were located at or near ground zero have been denied SBA assistance.

After September 11, we had secret arrests and detentions of more than 1,000 individuals. Even Reagan-appointed, federal judges have been appalled by this. We have seen civil rights being applied arbitrarily with some American citizens who happen to be poor and of color like Jose Padilla being denied the right to legal counsel and the American justice system, while prosperous Americans like John Walker Lingham, who actually fought American soldiers, received them. No investigation has been allowed into the intelligence failures before September 11. Time magazine this week has a scathing article about how this administration ignored terrorist threats prior to the attacks, but we can't examine this. Free speech has been

chilled because any elected official who dares criticize or stand in the way of the administration has been called unpatriotic and obstructionist and in some cases compared to Saddam Hussein in newspaper ads. The government is asking ordinary citizens to spy on one another, reminiscent of something out of a Solzhenitsyn novel. The attorney general has ignored the Supreme Court's 1939 opinion on the Second Amendment and has decided to apply his own, wildly different interpretation and also won't allow gun checks on suspected terrorists. I won't even get into what started all of this, the election of 2000 and how the voter registration lists were "scrubbed" and the failure of the Supreme Court to honor a presidential candidate's request to count votes as allowed under Florida law. Now this administration is invading countries without adequate discussion or support.

Following the tragedies of September 11, we were a city in mourning. We spent months going to funerals and neighborhoods completely shut down when funerals for firefighters were held. The physical and emotional damage contributed to economic downturn here. I run a small, but successful public relations firm and I booked 93 percent of my revenues in 2001 on projects completed before September 11 and only 7 percent after September 11. My situation was not unusual. Small businesses—graphic designers, contractors, beauticians, photographers, etc.—everywhere in the metropolitan area suffered the same fate. Large companies like my husband's were evacuated from lower Manhattan never to return. His company had to rebuild complete systems within days to be able to compete when the markets opened the following Monday and use AOL or other carriers to communicate by email because the company's servers were destroyed. We all limped along. Our woeful city tax revenues are enduring evidence of the economic damage we experienced.

This country and especially this city have not yet digested the economic and emotional fallout from September 11. New York City is still struggling to get back on its feet and continues to get hammered by low tax revenues, the recession, stock market volatility, and corporate scandals. The economy can't take another shock like a war with Iraq and its unknown consequences.

We have so much unfinished international business that to go forward with a war with Iraq right now would be irresponsible. I share the same concerns that King Abdullah of Jordan has that invading Iraq could lead to a further destabilization of the Middle East, including possibly a civil war, at a time when we need to be rebuilding Afghanistan and seeking a solution to the Israeli/Palestinian War. Even the Kurds are begging us not to invade. We still haven't found Osama bin Laden and Mullah Omar yet, how are we going to round up Saddam Hussein and his secret weapons, particularly without the support of our allies? It's suicidal. I'm reminded of our many unsuccessful attempts to oust Fidel Castro. Besides the economic and diplomatic problems of a war with Iraq, I have a serious moral problem with killing innocent people in the country. I know what it feels like when innocent lives are lost. Even Rep. Dick Army was quoted today in the Times as saying that an unprovoked attack would violate international law. However, this administration will not listen to its allies and is only fueling anti-Americanism worldwide.

I am a conservative Democrat and was highly supportive of President Clinton and particularly his economic policies because he gave everyone a seat at the table of opportunity, cut budget deficits, and supported free trade. (Unlike Bush who has caved to

special political interests on steel, the farm bill, tax cuts, energy, the environment, etc.) I don't trust these people in the White House now. Unfortunately, they seem to be unstoppable. Please help stop them.

Sincerely,

GAIL DONOVAN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and September 25 on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mrs. THURMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and September 25 on account of a birth in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Ms. NORTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend his remark and include extraneous material:

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

- H.R. 486. An act for the relief of Barbara Makuch.
- H.R. 487. An act for the relief of Eugene Makuch.
- H.R. 4558. An act to extend the Irish Peace Process Cultural and Training Program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 25, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and an amended report concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the first and second quarters of 2002, by Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon ⁴	1/8	1/11	Germany		948.00						948.00
	1/11	1/11	Belgium								147.48
	1/11	1/13	France		1,047.00						1,047.00
	1/14	1/17	England		1,576.00						3,922.66
Hon. George Miller ⁵	3/23	3/24	Siem Reap, Cambodia		135.00						7,675.17
	3/23	3/24	Siem Reap, Cambodia								5.00
	3/24	3/26	Phnom Penh, Cambodia		450.00						450.00
	3/26	3/28	Hanoi, Vietnam		410.00						410.00
	3/28	3/29	Hue, Vietnam		185.00						185.00
	3/29	3/30	Hanoi, Vietnam		205.00						205.00
John Lawrence ⁵	3/23	3/24	Siem Reap, Cambodia		135.00						10,081.47
	3/23	3/24	Siem Reap, Cambodia								5.00
	3/24	3/26	Phnom Penh, Cambodia		450.00						450.00
	3/26	3/28	Hanoi, Vietnam		410.00						410.00
	3/28	3/29	Hue, Vietnam		185.00						185.00
	3/29	3/30	Hanoi, Vietnam		205.00						205.00
Committee total				6,341.00			19,990.78				26,331.78

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ To participate in Congressional delegation of Hon. Joe Knollenberg.
⁵ To participate in Congressional delegation of Hon. George Miller.
⁶ Roundtrip airfare.
⁷ Van.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, Sept. 10, 2002.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Chairman, Sept. 13, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Sept. 3, 2000.