boy but soon became the youngest reporter to ever work for the Monitor. He traveled all over our great country in search of stories.

In 1972 he returned to the South and spent time as an editorial writer with The Charlotte News. He has been the editor and publisher of The Weekly Post since its inception.

John's articles and columns were widely read and widely respected in Stanley County. As a matter of fact, I would gladly trade a week of national TV interviews for a good mention in one of John's articles.

John had a reputation for always doing the right thing in all of his pursuits in life. His time at the newspaper was no different. He was a stickler for accuracy and doing the right thing during his newspaper career.

John passed away on a Tuesday, the day they put the paper together, and therefore, the busiest day of the week at The Weekly Post. I am going to miss John, and I know that Stanley County is going to miss John and miss reading his weekly insights.

He is survived by his loving wife of 39 years, Pat; three sons, John A. Long, III of Monroe, Matt Long of Raleigh, and Tim Long of Charlotte; daughters Elizabeth Vettorel of Charlotte and Laura Long of Charlotte; four grandchildren; and brother Michael Long of Atlanta. My heartfelt condolences go out to his family for their loss and the community's loss.

Though we all felt a bit selfish, I know I speak for a lot of us in the community when I say that after the initial shock of hearing the bad news we all wondered if The Weekly Post was going to continue. I am pleased to note that his wife, Pat, and daughter Laura have pledged to continue publishing. I commend them for their hard work and continued dedication to Stanley County.

While his presence in Stanley County will be missed, John's legacy will remain with us forever.

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

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

AIR CARGO SECURITY ACT

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, I rise today to introduce the Air Cargo Security Act, a bill to strengthen air cargo security on all commercial flights by closing existing air cargo security loopholes. This bill is the companion to legislation introduced by Senators HUTCHISON and FEINSTEIN.

Since September 11, we have worked diligently as a Nation to improve the safety of our commercial air travel, dramatically increasing the security requirements for passengers on airliners. Yet on those same aircraft, there remain glaring gaps in air cargo security, according to a 2002 GAO report. Nearly one-quarter of all air cargo is transported on passenger aircraft, typically filling the hull of each passenger plane. Yet only a fraction of that cargo is ever inspected.

According to the GAO, air cargo is vulnerable to tampering at multiple points during land transportation and at air cargo handling facilities. First, there are lax processes for verifying the identification of air cargo handlers and conducting criminal background checks. Second, the Known Shippers Freight Forwarding program does not have sufficient safeguards in place to adequately protect against cargo tampering; and most important, nearly all cargo shipped by passenger plane is never screened.

The Air Cargo Security Act would require the Transportation Security Agency to resolve these deficiencies in air cargo security through several key mechanisms. First, it requires the TSA to develop a strategic plan to screen, inspect, and otherwise ensure the security of all cargo transported through the Nation's air transportation system.

It also imposes measures that would require the TSA to increase inspections of air cargo shippers and their facilities and to work with foreign countries to conduct regular inspections at facilities transporting air cargo to the United States.

This bill requires TSA to establish an industry-wide pilot program database of known shippers of cargo that is shipped in passenger aircraft and to conduct random inspection of freight forwarder facilities. The Secretary would be required to suspend or revoke the certificate of noncompliant freight forwarders.

Under this act, the TSA retains tremendous flexibility in developing a program to inspect and screen air cargo in which it can select from a wide range of technological and operational options to enhance security. These measures, ranging from low- to high-tech, include using bomb-sniffing dogs, installing more cameras in cargo areas, screening air cargo for explosives, securing cargo with high-tech seals, or using cargo tracking systems or industry-wide computer profiling systems.

□ 1445

By using a combination of these techniques, TSA will be able to design and implement an effective system to ensure the security of our air cargo. Aviation security is a bipartisan issue that directly affects all Americans. Aviation is only as safe from terrorism as its most vulnerable component and that component is now the cargo. Strengthening air cargo security is vital to ensuring passenger security.

I want to thank my Senate colleagues for their leadership on this issue, and to the cosponsors of this legislation in the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), and I urge my colleagues to support the Air Cargo Security Act of 2003.

IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF CHRIS AND BOB EGGLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce two homeland heroes. They are Robert Eggle and his late son, Chris.

Chris was a brilliant young park ranger in the Organ Pipes Cactus National Park in Arizona when he was brutally murdered by an illegal alien who had crossed into the United States after committing two murders in Mexico. Chris was in the front lines on a battlefield we pay far too little attention to. He gave his life in service to the country, and certainly deserves the designation as homeland hero.

But I want to introduce another homeland hero, and that is Chris's father, Bob, the gentleman here in this picture to my left. Mr. Eggle is an incredible individual with whom I had the opportunity to spend some time in Arizona just a couple of weeks ago. He has become an incredibly articulate spokesman for the cause of homeland security. He understands fully that that security begins with the security of our border.

Mr. Eggle and several others, as well as Members of the House, including the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) endured the trip to the very spot in Organ Pipe Cactus National Park where his son was killed. And I say ''endured the trip'' because, as anyone can imagine, this was a difficult undertaking for anyone, especially the father of the murdered victim. But Mr. Eggle's stoic character was a true inspiration for all of us who were with him that day. He was an inspiration as we traveled to the spot where his son was killed. He was an inspiration as we stood and he led us in silent prayer for his son.

Mr. Eggle does not, understandably, does not want his son's death to be forgotten by this Nation. He wants to make it an example for others. He wants people to understand that there are many folks on the border like Chris, who put themselves in harm's way every day to try to protect those borders. But he also recognizes that we are in sort of a halfhearted war on those borders because we really do not fully support the men and women who we send to defend them.

Chris was not trained to deal with terrorists. Chris was not trained to deal with people coming across that border with AK–47s and carrying tons

of drugs and all the things we know go on along that southern border. It is, in fact, a war zone. If anybody does not believe that, they should go to Cochese County and spend some time there, spend some time with the rangers, spend some time with Mr. Eggle.

Mr. Eggle stated recently, ''I gave an eye for one war, now I have given my son in another. What is our President going to do about the war on our borders?'' This is an excellent question, Mr. Eggle. It is one that should be asked not just of the President of the United States, but of all the Members of this body, because we have essentially abandoned Mr. Eggle. We have abandoned the people who live along the border to the ravages of what I believe can be called nothing less than an invasion. Their homes are being destroyed. Their families are being destroyed. Their lives are being destroyed.

Chris Eggle's life was taken. Bob Eggle lives to tell us the tale and to help and to ask us to remember. That is the least we can do for Mr. Eggle, a true homeland hero.

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

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

WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have grave concern about this administration's policy in Iraq, and I am one of them. Several of us have come to the floor today to express those concerns. But before I do so, I would like to relate a story from this past Monday when I went to the deployment of the United States Navy's frigate, the U.S.S. *Rodney Davis,* where I saw off a group of what looked like awfully young sailors to the potential war zone.

Mr. Speaker, I went there to tell those proud sailors something that there is unanimity about in America. I went to tell them that no matter what people in America think of the policy in Iraq, every single American is proud of our men and women in the military service. I wanted to tell them that because the very freedoms that many Americans have been exercising in various places across this country in the last few weeks are the freedoms that our service personnel protect, and the freedom of speech to dissent against our government's policies would not exist without the courage and dedication of our men and women in uniform.

So I told them that all Americans of every stripe, short, tall, east, west, Democrat, Republican, that during their mission, our prayers would be with them and our support would be with them in every way shape and form.

But I thought it important to come back and think about the policy in Iraq real hard, Mr. Speaker, because these were young men. Mostly men. There were some women. A mother came up and she was bawling, and she said, about her son, the sailor, ''He's just a boy. He's just a boy.'' He had only been out of bootcamp for just 2 weeks. Upon reflection, I thought to myself that it is old men like us who send young men to combat, and so we should think real hard about it.

With that in mind, I want to pose some questions that millions of Americans to the President before he launches this war in Iraq.

Number one. Why should America abandon its long-term bipartisan belief that we should work with the international community in a multilateral effort at security in favor of an internationally nonsanctioned preemptive attack on another nation? Why are we compelled to break with this long tradition, that has been embraced by Americans, that civilized countries need to work together to stop aggression for mutual security rather than to open the door to war so that every country that is aggrieved can start another war against another one?

Why should we give Pakistan the sanction to attack India without international sanction? Why should we give the sanction for any country to attack another country absent imminent threat without international sanction? And why should our President tell the United Nations that they can just stick it in their ear and that America is going to start a war anyway?

That is a question that the President has not adequately answered to date and that needs an answer before a war starts.

Frankly, it is a little troublesome that our President has said that he respects the United Nations; that he wants the United Nations to be effective; that he wants the United Nations to work together, but tells the United Nations it does not matter a fig what the United Nations thinks, because America is going to start a war anyway. This has not helped to build multilateral international support for the greatest country in the world, which is the United States of America. And we need that question answered before a war starts.

Second question. How many billions of dollars of taxpayer money are being used to buy votes for this war? We have heard of tens of billions of dollars for Turkey. Now we hear the administration trying to buy votes around the world for this war. We need to know how many billions of dollars of taxpayer money are going to buy these votes.

And the reason I say that is that unfortunately, and I think it is most unfortunate, if this war starts, it will not be a coalition of the willing. The international community will look at it more as a coalition of the bribed. And that is not something our country needs to be proud of. We need to be proud, and we are proud, of our men and women in uniform, but this is not a message to be sending internationally.

Third question: After months and months and months of inquiry by Americans across the country, where is the compelling evidence that Iraq was behind the September 11 attack on this country? We have asked. We have searched. We have given the benefit of the doubt to the administration in every way we could, and that evidence has been wholly lacking.

Fourth: Why abandon inspections right in the middle of this effort? Why abandon something that is making progress? Why abandon the process that is destroying these missiles? And, lastly, why create a chaotic situation in Iraq that can be a breeding ground for the al-Qaeda to regroup, like is happening right now in northern Iraq under our northern fly zone.

No, we should keep this tyrant, this thug in his tight little box and we should work with the international community to keep him there. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no war starts until those answers are in to the American people.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S JOBS AND GROWTH PLAN

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of President Bush's plan to grow the economy, create jobs, and provide meaningful tax relief to hardworking Americans.

In these troubling times, some critics across the aisle believe that the answer to our Nation's problems is to take a greater slice of family income pie. President Bush and I, instead, want to grow the size of that pie by growing the economy. When economic growth occurs, businesses generate greater profits, more people go to work, they earn better wages, and they have greater opportunities. To encourage individuals and families to risk their time and to risk their savings on that new software idea, that transmission repair company, that hamburger stand, that new enterprise, Mr. Speaker, they need tax relief. They need permanent tax relief. And the President's plan does just that.

We have historical evidence that tax relief works. It is not just faith, it is evidence. Each time our Nation has significantly reduced income tax rates, economic growth has followed. When President Reagan lowered rates in the 1980s, it fostered economic growth averaging 3.2 percent a year, and Federal revenues actually increased, I repeat, increased by 20 percent. When