



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2003

No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 25, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LEE TERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Michael J. Greer, Pastor, Good Shepherd Catholic Church, Miami, Florida, offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, extend Your guidance and inspiration over this legislative body. May they find the ways and means to extend assistance to those in need, appropriate, equitably, and build up foreign relations to promote trust in a spirit of collaboration. Deliver the United States from violence and those things that divide so that we may be more faithful to the words we so often say, one Nation under God.

And as we are so fortunate to be able to speak and to act freely, yet responsibly, may they encourage that right here and everywhere so as to promote liberty and justice for all.

And so bless these Members, and as they receive suggestions from their constituents, so may they also receive the support they need from the people they represent and work for and be assured of Your providential care in their lives and for this Nation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BEREUTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND MICHAEL J. GREER

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure and truly an honor this morning to welcome to the United States House of Representatives my friend, Father Michael Greer. Michael Greer is truly a wonderful human being and our community in South Florida is so very privileged that he lives and works with us.

Father Greer has been a teacher of theology. He possesses extraordinary academic credentials, with degrees in theological and liturgical studies from various institutions of higher learning, including the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana, Father Greer's hometown. Father Greer has taught at the St. Vincent De Paul Seminary and Florida International University. But most of all Michael Greer has become known and beloved in our community by and through his work as the pastor of the Good Shepherd Catholic Church in Miami for the last 16 years.

The Good Shepherd community has flourished during Father Greer's years

there. Love, compassion and mercy toward our fellow human beings are not only practiced at Good Shepherd, their presence there is perceived by our entire diverse community.

Michael Greer does not only believe in diversity, he lives it each day in his work, including his constant visits to the sick and his masses, in English, Spanish and Creole.

Good Shepherd now has a wonderful school, also. We are privileged today to have the presence as well of the school's distinguished principal, Dr. Maria Elena Lopez.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is honored today by the visit of a humble and great man, Father Michael Greer of Miami.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes per side.

WAR CRIMES IN BELGIUM

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, should the United States allow its military and political leaders like General Tommy Franks, Colin Powell and Vice President CHENEY to be tried for war crimes in Belgium? Some bureaucrats in Belgium would like to think so. Trying to be a player on the world stage, it adopted a universal jurisdiction law supposedly giving Belgian courts jurisdiction over war crimes committed anywhere in the world. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld did the right thing by saying we would not spend taxpayer money to support the new NATO headquarters in a country that could prosecute our soldiers and leaders. Maybe it is time that we even think of moving

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5819

the NATO headquarters to a more friendly country.

Belgium should not turn its legal system into a platform for divisive politicized lawsuits against her own NATO allies. No civilian or military leader could go to Brussels without fear of harassment from Belgium's courts enforcing spurious charges against them. The bureaucrats in Brussels and around the world who think they can wield unlimited global judicial power without being elected by anyone should be stopped.

IN SUPPORT OF DEBT RELIEF

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support legislation I have introduced with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), H.R. 2482, the Iraqi Freedom from Debt Act. This bill will require the United States to negotiate in the International Monetary Fund and World Bank for these institutions to relieve the debt owed them by Iraq. This legislation also includes a sense of Congress that France and Russia and all other creditors should relieve the debts owed by Iraq.

While estimates of Iraq's debt range from one hundred billion to several hundred billion, the combined debt owed the IMF and World Bank is just \$150 million. These institutions have the resources to relieve this debt, setting an important precedent for the rest of the world.

The case for debt relief in Iraq is especially compelling, given the fact that much of the debt can be characterized as odious. Odious debt is recognized as debt that is taken on by a country for the personal benefit of corrupt leaders or for the oppression of a people.

By taking the lead on debt relief, the U.S. has an opportunity to boost the Iraqi economy and to prove to the world that a major reason for U.S. action in Iraq was to benefit the Iraqi people.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

U.S.-EU SUMMIT IMPORTANT

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today this city is the site of the annual U.S.-EU summit. Leaders of the European Union are here meeting with President Bush and members of his administration in order to strengthen transatlantic relations and to work on a common agenda which seeks solutions to issues within this relationship.

A balanced and well-defined U.S.-EU relationship is critical to global peace and stability. Although the difficult debate over Iraq presented yet another challenge to the relationship between the United States and Europe, it remains clear to this Member that a

strong, mature transatlantic relationship is critical to the long-term economic, political and security interests of both the United States and Europe. And one of the central ingredients to a successful partnership with Europe is a stable and integrated European Union. It is important that the EU has evolved to become, along with NATO, one of the two critical international organizations to achieve these objectives.

Summits such as the one today along with legislative exchanges can serve to reinvigorate transatlantic relations in order that we, the United States and the Europeans, can together meet the global challenges we face.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bring to this House an affordable and guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit to seniors. So far, my Republican colleagues have proposed a bill that does nothing to lower the cost of prescription drugs and actually raises seniors' Medicare part B deductible at a rate of eight times higher than their Social Security cost of living increase, which was just 1.5 percent.

Perhaps they are not hearing the same message that I hear when I go home and talk to my constituents. In the cities that I represent in East Los Angeles and in the San Gabriel Valley, seniors are telling me that they want an affordable and guaranteed drug benefit, just like the Democratic plan. They do not want a voucher program that dismantles Medicare as they know it. They simply want their medicine, and they want a choice to be able to keep their doctor.

Thirty-eight years ago this program was created. So many people in our district, the district that I represent, feel that this is their safety net and here we are attempting to try to privatize it. That is the wrong thing to do while people right now are struggling to make ends meet. Vote down this proposition that is being put forward by the Republican Party.

REMEMBERING ARMY SPECIALIST ORENTHIAL J. SMITH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness to report the third death that has touched the Second District of South Carolina during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Twenty-one-year-old Specialist Orenthial J. Smith paid the ultimate sacrifice in the war against terrorism when he was killed during an ambush on his convoy south of Baghdad on Sunday. He was born in Barnwell, South Carolina, and

lived in nearby Martin in Allendale County.

O.J. joined the United States Army shortly after graduating from high school with the intent on making the military his lifelong career. Stationed in Dexheim, Germany, with the 123rd Maintenance Support Battalion, Specialist Smith was a leader with a great potential. While in Germany, he graduated ninth out of 127 from a leadership development course.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in extending to O.J.'s family our most sincere thanks for their son's sacrifice and commitment to bringing liberty and freedom to the oppressed people of Iraq while protecting the American public in the war against terrorism.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops.

WAS AMERICA MISLED ON IRAQ'S WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION?

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider an amendment to H.R. 2417 which will direct the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct an audit of all telephone records and electronic communications between the CIA and the Office of the Vice President that relate to so-called weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq preceding Operation Iraqi Freedom. I have introduced this amendment to obtain the Vice President's records in response to a June 5 article in the Washington Post which reported that the Vice President made multiple visits to the CIA by which some analysts felt pressured to make their assessments on Iraq fit with Bush administration policy objectives.

This administration has repeatedly claimed they had evidence which proved that Iraq had vast stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction that posed an imminent threat to the United States. Americans remember that this administration cited their evidence of Iraq's weapons as reason to go to war.

It has been over 3 months since the start of the war. No such weapons have been found. Has there been a massive intelligence failure on the part of all our intelligence agencies? Or has this administration deliberately misled this Nation to war? Either way, there needs to be an investigation.

My amendment would uncover the role the Vice President may have played to achieve a political translation of CIA intelligence about alleged stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction in order to suit the Bush administration's campaign to push this country to war.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Only in Washington, Mr. Speaker, could Congress be prepared to add a whole new entitlement to Medicare which may cost children like my today 10-year-old daughter Charlotte \$7 trillion and Democrats are holding up tombstones to say Medicare is being phased out. It is astonishing to a conservative like me.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I informed our leadership that I cannot support the creation of a new Federal entitlement in the form of a universal drug benefit in Medicare, which is not to say that I am not ready today to help those at or near the level of poverty that are struggling with that terrible choice between food and rent and prescription drugs.

□ 1015

Let us focus resources at the point of the need and not answer the scare tactics of the other side and end up playing their game and creating an all new massive Federal entitlement that kids like my little Charlotte will have to pay for for generations.

THE REPUBLICANS' PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. How can the Republicans spend \$400 billion on a prescription drug benefit that will impose costs without benefits on many seniors and a totally inadequate benefit for those most in need? We start with the premise that, first and foremost, the plan is designed to protect and enhance the profits of the pharmaceutical industry and the private insurance industry. Yes, seniors will be pushed into a confusing maze of PPO, HMO, discount card, private insurance plans, no limit on premiums, no limit on profits, and no required benefits. Very expensive. The pharmaceutical industry will prevent the reimportation of their manufactured U.S. drugs from Canada, and they are going to protect the obscene prices they get for their drugs.

This plan will do a great job protecting the profits of the pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry but pitifully little for our Nation's seniors, those so much in need. But so it should be. The insurance and pharmaceutical industries are the number one and number two campaign contributors to the Republican Party.

MEDICARE REFORM

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, the debate rages over health care in this country. I rise in support of improved health care for our Nation's seniors, and I think it has to be done through Medi-

care. I believe that Congress can truly improve the seniors' standard of living through preventative care and alternative treatment. The proposed Medicare reform legislation will move us in the right direction. I am encouraged by the prospects of shifting Medicare from a system that manages seniors when they are already sick into a system that is designed to prevent them from becoming sick in the first place. Preventative care is a part of the Medicare reform. Preventative care is truly the best form of care that we can and we should provide for our America's seniors.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, what is missing from the debate about Medicare this week is how to make medications more affordable at affordable prices and more accessible to all Americans of all ages. And this is not a partisan problem. It is an American problem.

We have a bipartisan bill to use market forces to reduce prices, allow generics to come to market to compete against name-brand drugs, which would save \$60 billion over the next 10 years. Another piece of our legislation uses market forces to allow consumers, businesses, Federal Government through Medicare to buy drugs in 27 countries, be they Germany, France, England, Italy, Canada, where prices are 40 to 50 percent cheaper.

I have the full confidence through our market forces we can make medications cheaper, and I have the confidence and hope my colleagues have the confidence in market forces that they are able to do that.

The third component would be to allow the NIH to recoup a 10 percent royalty on any drug developed with taxpayer resources. In the private sector, 30 percent is normally recouped on a rate of return. Ten percent for NIH funded research, all the cancer drugs, all the AIDS drugs on the market are developed with taxpayer return.

We should no longer consider taxpayer research dumb money. We should recoup that money because the NIH is the largest venture capital fund out there, use market forces to reduce prices, make medications for all Americans more affordable.

THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the prescription drug program that we are about to vote on this week, I am not an expert on health care or prescriptions; but I have observed over the years what happens when govern-

ment takes over some of these programs. The big change of course was when we amended the Social Security bill in 1965 to add Medicare. We estimated at that time that the cost of Medicare by 1990 would be \$9 billion. It was \$70 billion projected 2003 to be \$26 billion, but the actual cost today is \$265 billion. This bill we are estimating at \$400 billion. I suggest that is a very low estimate, and the second 10 years is the greater challenge because of retirements.

To seniors, the danger is they are going to start out with choice on whether seniors keep their current Medicare and other insurance; but eventually as government goes broke and needs the money, there is the tendency to force everybody in the program to moderate the cost of the program. Industry is promoting this system because eventually they are going to reduce their prescription drug coverage to the retirees that they are now paying for. After that comes rationing. I think there are a lot of disadvantages for seniors in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

HOLDING THE ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to support accountability in education reform. Last year, Congress passed President Bush's "no child left behind" education reform bill. The legislation authorized billions of dollars in new funding to support administration's reform effort that seeks to ensure accountability from our schools, but who will hold the administration accountable?

The fact is that this administration is shortchanging our schools nearly \$20 billion under the No Child Left Behind. While our schools' struggle to meet tough new standards and local budgets is stretched to the limit in this bad economy, the administration has failed its responsibility to provide leadership and resources for our schools. Congress must hold the administration accountable. I have introduced legislation to do just that. H.R. 2366 requires full funding of the No Child Left Behind act or suspends its punitive measures. Without full funding, No Child Left Behind will become a massive unfunded mandate that will require cuts in vital services and increased property taxes or both. Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to hold the administration accountable to our children, to our schools, and to our taxpayers.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has an unprecedented opportunity to give America's seniors an up-to-date Medicare system that includes more choices and better benefits like prescription drug coverage. Health care is being transformed by new drug therapies and active prevention. Yet in the current system, Medicare must pay for those treatments out of their own pocket or go without them. One third of the seniors on Medicare have no drug coverage at all, and that is about 90,000 American seniors.

Our seniors should have choices so affordable health care plans compete for their business and at the same time give them the coverage that they need. Medicare recipients who are happy with their current benefits will be able to stay in the current system with an added prescription drug benefit. So our program is voluntary. Those who want enhanced services, like more coverage for preventative care, will have that choice; and seniors who like managed care plans will have that option as well. This is a plan we Republicans passed out of committee, and this is a plan we will pass very soon here in Congress.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES IN THE KOREAN WAR

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the brave men and women who served in the Armed Forces and fought for the freedom of the Korean people. This week marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the cease-fire agreement that ended the fighting of the Korean War. A peace treaty was never signed, leaving strained relations on the Korean peninsula until today. Armed Forces from over 20 countries came together to fight in what is often called the "forgotten war." Casualties in the United States Armed Forces totaled 54,260 dead, with 8,176 listed as missing in action or as prisoners of war.

I would also like to recognize Orange County resident Martin Markley, who recently received a Bronze Star for combat valor after surviving a bloody battle in Korea over 50 years ago, and I want to give my thanks to those veterans who helped defend for the Korean people; and I want to extend my sympathy to those who lost loved ones during that war. They have not been forgotten and their memory will always be remembered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. May I use the name of a Senator, a sitting Senator in attributing a quote to him or her?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). During 1-minute, the gentleman may not refer to or quote Sen-

ate proceedings, but may refer to statements made generally with attribution.

SADDAM HUSSEIN AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to be working on the intelligence bill, probably voting on it later this week; and we are going to be hearing a lot from the left in this Chamber that we have not located weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and somehow the President is at fault. I just wanted to remind my colleagues what some of their Democrat Members in the other body said.

Here is a Member from Indiana, October 3, 2002: "Saddam Hussein possesses chemical, biological weapons and, if events are allowed to run their own course, will some day possess nuclear weapons."

Here is another Senator from California, a woman. My colleagues get the choice which of the two: "I believe that Saddam Hussein rules by terror and has squirreled away stores of biological and chemical weapons." That was October 10, 2002.

Here is a Senator from West Virginia, one with a very common name: "The people of the United States and the rest of the world are at risk as long as Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction," March 18, 2003.

And here is another one from a Senator from Maryland: "Over the last 12 years he's ignored U.N. resolutions and embargoes and has illegal chemical and biological weapons . . ." That was March 18, 2003.

Many, many leading Democrat liberals were in support of our going into Iraq in the name of weapons of mass destruction. I just want our colleagues to keep that in mind as we debate this bill today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Georgia that he is not allowed to make such references to members of the other body.

MEDICARE ON THE HIT LIST

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, down-size, out-source, privatize, erode, dismount, turn back the clock, all buzz words which characterize the thought and actions of many of our Republican colleagues. And now Medicare is on the hit list. And our seniors are being told that they are going to get a prescription drug plan. Yes, we need a plan, but we do not need one that dismantles

Medicare. We do not need one that turns back the clock. We do not need one that skyjacks our seniors and prices them out of the market. They want real government for all people, including our seniors.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. It is obvious that the Republicans cannot do two important things at one time. Remember the 12 million children whose tax credit was dumped from the tax bill to make room for millionaires, including 1 million children of families in the military?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican leader announced that they were just too busy. He said, We have a problem with simple logistics. That is why we cannot take care of the 12 million children.

He was referring to how busy the Republicans are steamrolling through a bill that turns Medicare into a voucher program, throws money at HMOs, lets drug companies continue to gouge, and leaves seniors with thousands of dollars in drug bills. The majority leader, the President, and everybody in this body knows that we could resolve the child tax credit issue in a matter of hours. All that has to happen is for the Republican leadership to stop holding these children hostage, demanding a ransom of \$82 billion unpaid-for tax package. All it takes is for the House to accept the Senate bill, as a majority of the House voted to do. All it would take would be for President Bush to interrupt his whirlwind fund-raising tour long enough to demand immediate enactment of the Senate bill. Surely we can find a couple of hours here so that 12 million children are not left behind.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

□ 1030

ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 858) to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) DUTIES.—Section 4 of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 106-173) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking “redesignation” and inserting “rededication”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) To recommend to Congress a plan to carry out the activities recommended under paragraph (2).

“(4) To carry out other related activities in support of the duties carried out under paragraphs (1) through (3).”

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 8 of such Act (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 106-173) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “The” and inserting “In addition to the interim report required under subsection (b), the”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “FINAL REPORT.—” and inserting “REQUIRED INTERIM REPORT.—”;

(B) by striking the first sentence and inserting: “Not later than June 24, 2004, the Commission shall submit an interim report to Congress.”; and

(C) in the second sentence, by striking “final”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than April 30, 2010, the Commission shall submit a final report to Congress. The final report shall contain final statements, recommendations, and information described under subsection (b)(1), (2), and (3).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Advisory Commission of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, I am proud the House is considering this legislation. This commission was established by Congress through the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act in 2000 through the 106th Congress.

The commission works to honor President Lincoln's momentous legacy by educating the general public on his unequalled contributions to our great Nation. It can be a universally celebrated event of racial reconciliation. It can be a time and an example for unifying America, increasingly diverse with many different populations, about the importance of having a united Nation and a united America.

This bicentennial can also highlight the unique American experience of being able to rise up from growing up in a log cabin, people of diverse backgrounds being able to rise to the very top of positions of power in America.

I am pleased that this bill will extend the commission until 2010, which will allow it to continue its valuable work through the upcoming celebration of the 200th anniversary of President Lincoln's birth in 2009.

I am pleased the other body has already passed this bill that honors perhaps our Nation's most extraordinary

and cherished President. I congratulate the accomplished members of the commission for their work. We look forward to the commission's final report that will be due to Congress on April 30, 2010, if this bill is passed.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge all Members to support the passage of S. 858, and I thank the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) for introducing this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, President Abraham Lincoln is considered by many to be the most outstanding President this country has ever had. As a matter of fact, many have suggested that he was courageous, often misunderstood, renowned in his ability to see situations and then move on them. So I am pleased to join with my colleague from Indiana in consideration of Senate bill 858, a bill to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

The Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission was established by Congress in 2000 to plan the national observances of the 200th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday in 2009. Fifteen Americans were named by the White House, the House of Representatives and the Senate to work together to propose and craft programs of celebration and education.

S. 858 would extend the authorization for the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission through the bicentennial year of 2009. Under current law, the commission would pass out of existence in 2004, 5 years before the event it is supposed to commemorate. In addition to the requirement that the commission submit an interim report in June of 2004, S. 858 also requires that a final report be issued in 2010 after the conclusion of bicentennial festivities.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has tremendous support, and I would urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the distinguished sponsor of the original legislation that established the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, as well as a cochair of the commission, without whose work this would not have occurred.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Indiana for his comments.

I rise in support of the Senate bill 858, a bill to continue the important work of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission. I encourage all of our colleagues to join with me in voting for this fitting tribute to our greatest President. I want to thank Senator DURBIN for getting this through the United States Senate, and I want to thank the majority leader's office for scheduling this for consideration today.

It is my honor to serve as cochair of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission along with Senator DURBIN of Illinois and Mr. Harold Holzer of New York, a noted Lincoln scholar.

Created by Congress, the commission has 15 members and is charged with planning and organizing the national celebration of Lincoln's 200th birthday on February 12, 2009. Current plans for the bicentennial include a joint session of Congress, educational initiatives throughout the country, a new Lincoln penny, film projects and much more.

In celebrating Lincoln's birthday, we honor not just the memory of one man but also the promise of America's freedom. The ongoing struggle against tyranny abroad and the continued fight for racial justice at home both find their inspiration in the life and work of Abraham Lincoln.

Last year, the commission appointed an executive director and moved into offices in the Library of Congress. We have held meetings in Illinois, Kentucky and Washington and will travel to Indiana next year and will also be in Vermont this year.

Through our Web site, www.lincolnbicentennial.gov, we have already received countless suggestions from the public about how best to celebrate this important national event.

This year, the commission celebrated Lincoln's birthday by gathering together our distinguished advisory committee. Made up of scholars, business people and artists, we asked for their help in planning for the bicentennial. That evening nearly 500 people and many more watching C-SPAN witnessed “Lincoln Seen and Heard” in which the acclaimed actor Sam Waterston gave a dramatic performance of Lincoln's speeches, while Harold Holzer provided the accompanying images and narration.

Through events like this, we hope to raise the profile of the commission and prepare the public for the important occasion of Lincoln's 200th birthday, which we hope to celebrate nationwide and around the world.

It is vital that this important commission be allowed to continue its work through the actual bicentennial celebration. This bill would simply extend the life of the commission through the bicentennial year and require a final report so that future generations will have a record of how we celebrated the life of the foremost champion of human liberty.

Therefore, as the representative of the same District that sent Abraham Lincoln to Congress and as cochair of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, I urge my colleagues to support S. 858. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for the time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a Lincoln scholar, a civil war era buff, and a great historian who has studied and written extensively about this period.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for the very kind and generous and very thoughtful introduction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is to be congratulated for his foresight in the creation of this legislation and the appropriate ways that a commission might study the ways in which this Nation might honor, I believe, our most revered President.

I was recently appointed by the distinguished Democratic leader to the 15-member commission which has the esteemed responsibility of studying and recommending to Congress ways to appropriately honor President Lincoln in 2009, the bicentennial of his birth. I think it is very important to interpret the 16th President's life and work.

President Lincoln was an anti-slavery advocate in a Republican Party that sprang to live on an anti-slavery platform. His election in 1860 added fuel to the fire of disunion over slavery and its spread west, a disunion that triggered the American Civil War. While Lincoln was gradualist in his approach to ending slavery, he never wavered on a position that he knew would lead to its end. Slavery would not be allowed to spread into the western territories.

Initially seven, and ultimately eleven, southern States seceded from the Union rather than live under the rule of what many Democrats of that era referred to and called the black Republican Party.

Lincoln valued the Union above all, but he knew that the result of saving the Union was emancipation for the slaves. If the Union had not been preserved, slavery would not have been ended. Strategically, Lincoln understood that the Union was a common ground issue around which he could rally the American people while slavery was divisive.

By holding his coalition together around the issue of the Union, enough unionists eventually saw the connection between preserving the Union and ending slavery. Clarity on that connection helped Lincoln ease into emancipation in the middle of the war when it gave the North a huge boost. This cleared the way for the 13th, the 14th and the 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

President Lincoln said 140 years ago this November in Gettysburg that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the face of the Earth. To Lincoln, the people meant every American, not just a select few. His policy and ultimate sacrifice for this noble belief are instructive for every American, especially public servants.

I am deeply honored to be among those who will shape a national celebration of his legacy.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the other things I would like to add to the record about the extraordinary President Abraham Lincoln are that he gave two of the most outstanding speeches of all time in American history, the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural.

In the book *Lincoln at Gettysburg* by the gifted writer Gary Wills, he points out an extraordinary point that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) just referenced, and that is that the President did not directly address the biggest issues of the day. He indirectly tried to build a coalition to unite our Nation.

As Gary Wills points out, the Gettysburg Address does not mention Gettysburg, nor slavery, nor, more surprising, the Union or the South or the Emancipation Proclamation. Wills refers to it as a transcendental declaration. He laid the groundwork behind uniting America in a union where we would stand together, and in the opening phrase, taking out a few words of it and putting it down in its core form, we are engaged in testing whether any free Nation can survive, and that is what his message of the Gettysburg Address was.

His Second Inaugural speech, which many feel was his greatest speech, also subject to a second book by Stephen White, he pointed out that that was a brilliant theological address, stunned Congress, stunned the press of the United States because it was very short. Here they were very near the end of the Civil War, at a time when people wanted an address from their President, celebrating victory or talking about how things were going to work, and he made a seemingly impersonal address.

Nine straight Presidents did not serve a second term. He was the first President in 10 to serve a second term. Yet in his Second Inaugural he never said anything about that. He made it sound like it was kind of an accident he was there, because what his purpose was to give a theological address on why both sides argued in the name of God, both sides thought that they were trying to do that, some people thought it was fatalistic, but he actually laid a theological argument out as to why we fought a Civil War, why it was important that we fought that Civil War and God's role in human history.

He may have been raised as a simple country boy, but he wrote and personally edited, and we can see all the notes as he worked through the speeches, two of the most powerful and enduring documents in world history. In the Hoosier State, with all due respect to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), we have an expression, Abraham Lincoln grew up in Indiana. He is our most famous Hoosier. We say Indiana made Lincoln. Lincoln made Illinois.

Lincoln epitomizes the American dream, that he grew up in a log cabin in Kentucky where he was born and the first few years of his life. Then he moved to Indiana as a very young boy, grew up in multiple log cabins there in Indiana. He largely educated himself, moved to Illinois, taught himself the law, ran for office, losing more than he won. He participated in arguably the most famous of all American debates, the Lincoln-Douglas debates. He eventually rose as a compromise candidate for President, was trounced on the first ballot but came out as a compromise President, but almost every American will agree it is a classic example of the right man in the right place at the right time.

This is important for the rest of the world because Abraham Lincoln epitomizes the American dream. The four of us who spoke here, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and myself, all come from different backgrounds. None of us were probably born in a log cabin, and our Speaker, who is a super Lincoln fan, who has turned his conference room into the Lincoln Room with paintings and statuary and other things of Abraham Lincoln, he himself grew up in small town Illinois. He would have liked to have been born in a log cabin, but he was not.

□ 1045

But he grew up in Illinois and prides himself on rising up like others in the American Dream.

Abraham Lincoln is an example to us of racial reconciliation, of united nations, of rising up in the American Dream; and that is important in understanding why, like during the 10 years of this commission, we continue to develop at the grass roots level, the same way this commission has started to do, innovative ideas, bubbling up in community after community of how we can recognize those things that unite us as a Nation and to build on that so we do not come apart at the seams like we have seen in many nations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any other colleagues who want to speak on this, but I want to thank, again, the Senator from Illinois in the other body, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for supporting this, and I urge all Members to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and though I do not have any additional speakers, I will close by simply saying that I grew up an Abraham Lincoln fan as a little boy. My mother, who did not have much formal education, nor did my father, they were both Abraham Lincoln fans and they

told us stories about Abraham Lincoln. This obviously whetted my appetite, and I became an Abraham Lincoln guy who read everything that I could get my hands on about Lincoln.

It is obvious from all of the comments that we have heard that Indiana, Illinois, and I guess we have to add Kentucky, have great memories and great fondness for the legacy of Abraham Lincoln, who would probably be considered a great communicator. We did not talk so much about people being communicators then. Now we talk about communication skills and abilities; but I guess he could communicate so much in just a few words, in things like the Lincoln Gettysburg Address and other comments that he made.

The one quote that I often like to suggest that Lincoln made was about education. He said that "education makes a man easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave." So as we put resources into budgets for education, I always try to remember Abraham Lincoln.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 858, a bill to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

History recognizes Abraham Lincoln as one of this Nation's greatest and most visionary Presidents. Born in rural Kentucky, Lincoln rose from humble roots to the highest office in the land. He was renowned as a masterful orator and legislator. He led our country through its greatest internal crisis, our Civil War, with a decisiveness balanced with humanity. In 1863, Lincoln issued the revolutionary Emancipation Proclamation, freeing all slaves in the South. And he professed himself committed to rebuilding our Nation into a strong, united entity through a generous, practical reconstruction program in the South.

Tragically, Lincoln never had the opportunity to act upon his vision for Reconstruction. Just 5 days after Lee's surrender at Appomattox, Lincoln was shot at nearby Ford's Theater. He died of his wounds the next morning. An outpouring of grief swept across the Nation, with thousands meeting his funeral train at every stop.

Abraham Lincoln embodied the principles and qualities our Nation values most highly. He was scrupulously honest, forthright, and moral. In all matters of governance, he made decisions based on his desire to do the greatest good for the largest number of people. He was utterly committed to the fair treatment of all Americans and to healing the wounds of our internal divisions.

As a Member of Congress, I strive to emulate Lincoln's example. In doing so, I am deeply proud to say that I am deeply proud to say that I am carrying on a family heritage. I can trace my own ancestry back to Lincoln himself; our families lived in the same part of Kentucky. His portrait hangs in my office as a constant reminder of his noble spirit and eloquent example.

The Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission was established in 2000 to inform the public about the impact Abraham Lincoln had on the development of our Nation and to identify the best possible ways to honor his accomplishments. The Commission has already done a great deal of excellent work and looks

forward to doing much more. Under the original legislation, however, the Commission is scheduled to expire this year—3 years before the actual Lincoln Bicentennial in 2003. This legislation would extend the Commission's life through the bicentennial it was established to celebrate.

Just last month, I was deeply honored to be appointed to the Commission's advisory board. It will be my privilege to work with my fellow board members and the Commission to educate our Nation about my kinsman and role model.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 858 and honoring the legacy of Abraham Lincoln. Without his leadership, our Nation would not be the strong, unified United States we are today.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, as Representative for the 17th Congressional District in Illinois, a district encompassing Springfield, Illinois, where Abraham Lincoln got his political start, I pledge my support for the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission.

Abraham Lincoln first came to Illinois in March of 1830, and like so many of us he came to love the beautiful state, its good people, and its bountiful opportunities. Abraham Lincoln was a patriotic man and a courageous leader. He led our Nation through one of the darkest times in its history, and helped to shape it into the great country that it is today.

The Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission is dedicated to preserving and honoring the legacy of Abraham Lincoln. It will provide education to the American public about President Lincoln's accomplishments, as well as striving to honor his works.

I encourage everyone to visit Illinois and see the many sites commemorating President Lincoln, not only in Springfield, but throughout the state. It is important to continue to urge Americans to learn about the history of our Nation and the people who have made it so great. Abraham Lincoln is one of the most important figures who contributed to this rich history of which we are so proud.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senator RICHARD J. DURBIN's bill, S. 858, to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission and to inform the American public about his selfless dedication and sacrifice to our country.

It is my privilege to represent Illinois in the House of Representatives just as Abraham Lincoln did more than a century and a half ago. I am honored to share this association with one of our nation's greatest lawyers, legislators, and presidents.

Toward the end of this decade, on February 12, 2009, we will recognize the 200th anniversary of President Lincoln's birth. Passage of this bill authorizes the Bicentennial Commission to explore the best possible ways to honor his lasting accomplishments.

Our state slogan, "Land of Lincoln" reflects how proud Illinoisans are of his enduring contribution to America's unity and strength. His home in Springfield, Illinois is a National Historic Site administered by the National Park Service, and his tomb in Oak Ridge Cemetery, also in Springfield, is among the most visited sites in our state.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator DURBIN for introducing this legislation to make certain that a hero to all in my home state of Illinois and throughout the nation is honored appropriately. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to

vote for S. 858, authorizing the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission to help preserve the memory of his noble vision, statesmanship and humanity forever in American history.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 858.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TEMPORARY AUTHORITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL HUNGER CENTER TO AWARD BILL EMERSON AND MICKEY LELAND HUNGER FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2474) to require that funds made available for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships be administered through the Congressional Hunger Center, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2474

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL HUNGER CENTER TO AWARD BILL EMERSON AND MICKEY LELAND HUNGER FELLOWSHIPS.

Notwithstanding the Congressional Hunger Fellows Act of 2002 (section 4404 of Public Law 107-171; 2 U.S.C. 1161), funds appropriated for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the purpose of providing the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships shall be made available to the Congressional Hunger Center for the purpose of awarding the fellowships, except that any such funds provided in excess of \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 2003 or \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 2004 shall be appropriated to the Congressional Hunger Fellows Trust Fund established by such Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2474, a bill that provides for the continuation, for 2003 and 2004, of a fellowship program honoring our colleagues, the Honorable Bill Emerson and the Honorable Mickey Leland.

Last year, Congress authorized the Congressional Hunger Fellows Program

as a part of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. This provision was included in both the Committee on Agriculture bill and the law as a memorial to the Honorable Bill Emerson, a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the Honorable Mickey Leland. The purpose of the fellowships is to develop and train future leaders of the United States in humanitarian service.

The law establishes an independent agency in the legislative branch of the U.S. Government, creates a board of trustees to supervise and direct the program, establishes a Congressional Hunger Fellows trust fund in the Department of the Treasury that will provide funds from the interest to help run the program, and authorizes \$18 million for the fund.

While the necessary process to establish a congressional Hunger Fellows Program has begun, the process is not complete. H.R. 2474 allows the current process to continue utilizing the Congressional Hunger Center just until the program authorized by the farm bill is completed. These fellowships provide a way to continue the legacy established by our former colleagues Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland and move towards achieving the valued goal of training future leaders of the United States in humanitarian service, goals I know Members share with me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the wife of the late Congressman Bill Emerson, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and his successor, for introducing this legislation; and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2474.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2474, which requires that funds made available for the Bill Emerson National Hunger Fellowship and the Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellowships are to be awarded through the Congressional Hunger Center. This piece of legislation is needed to ensure that funds already appropriated to provide hunger fellowships in the fiscal year 2003 are able to be used for that purpose. In addition, it will ensure that funds made available in fiscal year 2004 are also available for these fellowships.

In the farm bill, we created the Congressional Fellows Hunger Act of 2002, which authorizes \$18 million to a trust to be used as an endowment to provide domestic and international hunger fellowships. The program is overseen by a board of trustees, which only recently was appointed. Because of the time needed to establish the program as envisioned by the authorizing language, the funds provided for the fellowships in the fiscal year 2003 agricultural appropriations act are not available. This bill will allow those funds to be used by the Congressional Hunger Center for hunger fellowships.

The Congressional Hunger Center was formed in 1993 with a mandate to

lead, speak, and act on behalf of the poor, the hungry, and the victims of humanitarian emergencies both on a domestic and international level. The Congressional Hunger Center, through its leadership development programs and its education, research, and advocacy programs has, as of 2002, graduated over 500 antihunger leaders who address hunger at the community, national, and international levels.

The fellowships originally awarded by the Congressional Hunger Center and codified in the Congressional Fellows Hunger Act of 2002 were designed, as we have heard, to honor the memories of Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland, who, during their careers in public service, were deeply interested in helping those in need by their words and by their actions. Bill Emerson, the distinguished late Representative from the eighth district of Missouri, and George T. Mickey Leland, the distinguished late Representative from the 18th district of Texas demonstrated their commitment to solving the problem of hunger in a bipartisan manner.

Providing the \$3 million in funding to the Congressional Hunger Center for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 will ensure that the spirit of these two leaders will live on through the fellowships by making sure that there will be a future generation of leaders who will pursue careers in humanitarian service related to hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Texas for his support and leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who has carried on the fight against hunger here in the United States and around the world that her late husband, Bill Emerson, was so well noted for. I thank her for that work.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for yielding me this time and for the graciousness which he has shown, as well as that of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), in allowing us to make the corrections on the legislation that will permit the Hunger Fellows to proceed with the remarkable work that they do.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), because this bill also goes through IR, and I want to thank Kevin Kramp and Lynn Gallagher from the Committee on Agriculture, and Frank Record from the Committee on International Relations, because without their great assistance we would not be here today.

I also want to thank both the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for the wonderful words they had to say about my late husband, Bill Emerson, and the commitment he had throughout his lifetime to prevent hunger wherever it is found.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill is critical for the future of the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships. The funding for the 24 Bill Emerson National Hunger Fellows and the 50 Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellows will expire, as my colleagues have said, unless this legislation passes.

These 39 Fellows fight hunger and poverty worldwide. They each earn just \$10,000 helping nutritionally vulnerable populations in urban and rural communities get food. For example, the Emerson Fellows assist low-income communities in getting access to fresh fruits and vegetables, as well as helping to do the same for Federal nutrition programs for school-aged children and the elderly. The Leland Fellows work with national and international agencies and faith-based groups to get school lunches to over 300 million children overseas.

In their work, the Fellows are constantly faced with things that we do not normally see on a daily basis, threats of terrorism, crime, AIDS, and, most recently, SARS, while helping the communities in which they are living formulate solutions to ending hunger and poverty.

For the past 3 years, many may know that agricultural appropriations and private foundations have funded the Emerson-Leland Fellows through the Congressional Hunger Center. As my colleagues have mentioned, the farm bill did authorize an endowment for the Congressional Hunger Fellows program, which incorporated the current Fellows program operated by the Congressional Hunger Center. But because operating funds for the endowment are not yet in place, the Congressional Hunger Center is left without operating funds to recruit for their future classes. This legislation will allow the program to continue while we establish the endowment.

So, again, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and my good colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who helps co-chair the Congressional Hunger Center, for all the work that they do in helping a problem that should not exist but, sadly, it does, and, hopefully, one day soon, we will find a means to make certain that no person on Earth goes hungry.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time, and I also applaud his incredible work on behalf of the hungry around the world and here in the United States. I also want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia, for bringing this bill so quickly to the House floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2474, authorizing the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships and urge its swift passage by this House. I want to acknowledge the leadership of my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and to thank her for her many contributions to ending hunger here at home and abroad. She has honored the memory of her husband and our former colleague, Bill Emerson, in whose honor the National Hunger Fellowships at the Congressional Hunger Center are named.

I have had the privilege of working closely with the gentlewoman from Missouri over the past few years, first when we helped create the Global Food for Education Initiative, known as the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, and now when we serve together as the co-chairs of the Congressional Hunger Center. I admire her leadership and determination, and I hope to learn a great deal more from her about how best to end hunger, honor America's farmers, and contribute to increasing food security for all nations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2474 will correct a simple error in last year's farm bill reauthorization that authorized funding for the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships, but inadvertently channeled the monies to the Congressional Hunger Center's endowment rather than through the Center's program budget. Passage of H.R. 2474 will ensure that the two fellowship programs are administered and funded through the Congressional Hunger Center for fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004.

□ 1100

This adjustment will allow for the endowment to have enough time to build so it may sustain funding for the Congressional Hunger Center over the long term without interrupting the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships program in the short term. I also thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member on the subcommittee for agricultural appropriations, for including the appropriate allocations for these hunger fellowships in the fiscal year 2004 agriculture appropriations bill. I also would like to express my appreciation to Jim Dyer, the majority staff director for the Committee on Appropriations, for his help and support on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, today I have had the privilege of meeting the newest class of Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellows who are in Washington for their initial orientation. The Congressional Hunger Center received 155 applicants for these fellowships, which were narrowed to 50 finalists, and 15 young men and women were chosen to receive these fellowships.

The Leland Fellows will work for 2 years on hunger issues, including a 1-year field placement in countries throughout South Asia, sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. The class of 2003-2005 will work in Thailand, Uganda, Malawi, Ethiopia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Guatemala, Bangladesh, Mexico, Mauritania, and in East Africa. Their field placements include national and international nongovernmental organizations, private commercial organizations, and bilateral and multilateral agencies. They will spend their second year in the headquarters of the organizations that sponsor their field placements where they will focus on policy-making to address the root causes of hunger.

I know that our friend and former colleague, Mickey Leland, is looking down on these dedicated young people and is proud that the work they are doing in his name will create future leaders in the fight on hunger and poverty.

The Bill Emerson National Hunger fellows Program annually selects around 20 participants who work for 6 months in rural and urban community-based organizations across the country involved in fighting hunger at the local level. Their 6 months is spent in national nonprofit organizations engaged at the national level in antihunger and antipoverty work. This year, 24 men and women will represent the 10th class of Emerson Fellows.

Together, these two hunger fellowship programs, administered and coordinated by the Congressional Hunger Center, are having a significant impact on the fight to end hunger in America and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and our former colleague Tony Hall, who were instrumental in establishing the center 10 years ago. Congress can take great pride in the support for the Congressional Hunger Center and the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowship programs. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2474.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is a good program. It has the kind of leadership and oversight from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) that we in Congress appreciate very much. I urge support of the bill. I thank the chairman for his leadership in this endeavor.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2474. The Congressional Hunger Center was established 10 years ago with a mission of fighting hunger by developing leaders. They have been doing that ever since.

When I think of the Congressional Hunger Center, I think of my good friend Ambassador Tony Hall. It was Tony who first got me involved in fighting hunger. In 1984, he persistently encouraged me to travel to the Horn of Africa to witness the devastation of the famine. As many of you know, that experience changed my life.

Many of the Congressional Hunger Center fellows are having similar experiences right now. There are Bill Emerson fellows who are having life-changing experiences in 12 locations across the country and Leland International Fellows in 15 locations throughout the world. The combination of the life-changing practical and the policy experiences will equip these young people to be active leaders on hunger issues wherever they may go.

One of the program's most committed international fellows is Robert Oliver Davila. Robert was a Peace Corps volunteer in Africa for three years. He joined the first class of international fellows after being a manager at the Worcester County Food Bank. Robert visited schools all over Ethiopia helping them implement the World Food Programme Global School Lunch Program. Robert monitored and evaluated the impact of the program on the lives of children, families and communities. Robert is now working with the Global School Feeding Support Unit in the Strategy and Policy Division of the World Food Programme.

Sarah Boron, from Dennison University in Ohio, helped develop a model to assess food and farm issues at Food for Lane County in Eugene, Oregon. Sarah is now helping local groups form food policy councils through the Community Food Security Coalition.

Many of us who have supported the Congressional Hunger Center over the years have maintained a vision of self-sufficiency for the organization in the future. As some of you know, Congress has been providing the bulk of the Hunger Center's operating budget each year through annual appropriations. Last year, the dream of self-sufficiency came closer to being a reality.

In the 2002 Farm Bill, Congress authorized an endowment to move the Hunger Center's fellows programs toward self-sufficiency. Unfortunately, when the appropriations committee provided funding for the newly authorized endowment, the Congressional Hunger Center was not able to access any funds for operating the fellows program.

H.R. 2474 will allow the Congressional Hunger Center to access the funds it needs to operate the fellows program, equipping people like Roger and Sarah to become leaders in fighting hunger. Equally important, this legislation does not detract from the vision of an endowment that allows the fellows program to operate self-sufficiently.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation, which makes the technical corrections necessary to allow the Congressional Hunger Center fellows program to continue uninterrupted, growing leaders to fight hunger around the world.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2474 requesting that funds be made available for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships to be administered through the Congressional Hunger Center.

The Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Fellowships provide an opportunity for young people to invest their time, energy, and dedication to the cause of fighting hunger around the world. The fellowship was established in memory of the outstanding contributions of the Honorable Bill Emerson and the Honorable Mickey Leland both of whom were former members of Congress.

Each year approximately twenty participants are selected to participate in the highly selective Emerson and Leland Fellowship program. The fellows spend the first six months of their internship working on local level hunger issues, primarily through community food banks and local advocacy initiatives. The fellows then spend another six months in Washington, D.C. working with national organizations involved in the anti-hunger and poverty movement. This unique and challenging opportunity embodies the ideals and legacy of both Mr. Leland and Mr. Emerson.

Mickey Leland in addition to serving as a respected representative of the 18th Congressional District in Texas, Mr. Leland also served as a renowned yet humble humanitarian bringing both national and international attention to several causes including hunger and famine. With a "heart as big as Texas", Mickey Leland served as an active voice for social change. I am proud to follow him as a representative of the 18th District. And Bill Emerson over the span of five decades, contributed significantly to the strengthening of U.S. public policy and the process to achieve common sense solutions to legitimate real world problems, namely hunger. Thus the Emerson/Leland Fellowships provide an opportunity for young people to continue in the footsteps of these revered statesmen.

Therefore, it is in the spirit of the work of both Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson that this Congress would like to administer funds secured from the 2003 and 2004 fiscal years for the Emerson/Leland Fellowship through the Congressional Hunger Center. The Congressional Hunger Center is a unique non-profit, anti-hunger leadership organization. The mission of the center is to train and develop individuals who feel they can serve in either a domestic and/or international capacity to become leaders in the fight against hunger and effectively bridge the gap between service and public policy. The Congressional Hunger Center serves as a lasting tribute to all those who work to eradicate hunger but especially Mickey Leland, who was one of the Center's founding members. As such, it seems only natural that the Emerson/Leland Fellowship Program receives its funding through the Congressional Hunger Center.

Mickey Leland once said: "I cannot get used to hunger and desperate poverty in our plentiful land. There is no reason for it, there is no excuse for it, and it is time that we as a nation put an end to it." And while we cannot easily put an end to hunger, we can certainly do our part both individually and collectively to take an active role in helping to increase awareness and action around global hunger.

Therefore, I stand in full support of H.R. 2474 and hope that my Congressional colleagues will also express their support for this resolution as well.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2474, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2474, the bill just considered, and on S. 858, the bill considered immediately previously.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANT SERVICE PROVIDED BY FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE ON OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 49) recognizing the important service to the Nation provided by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 49

Whereas, during the terms of President Dwight David Eisenhower and the era of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, it became apparent that the development of external markets was needed to ensure the financial viability of the agricultural sector of the United States;

Whereas the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture was established on March 10, 1953, to develop and expand markets for, and improve the competitive position of, United States agricultural commodities and products;

Whereas the Foreign Agricultural Service has represented agricultural interests of the United States during a period of great expansion of United States agricultural exports from less than \$3,000,000,000 in 1953 to over \$50,000,000,000 in 2002;

Whereas the number of organizations engaged in the public and private partnership established by the Foreign Agricultural Service to promote United States agricultural exports has grown significantly, with market development and expansion occurring in nearly every global marketplace; and

Whereas March 10, 2003, was the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Foreign Agricultural Service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress recognizes the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture and its employees and partners for—

(1) cooperating with, and leading, the United States agricultural community in developing and expanding export markets for United States agricultural commodities and products;

(2) identifying the private partners capable of carrying out the mission of the Foreign Agricultural Service;

(3) identifying and expanding markets for United States agricultural commodities and products;

(4) introducing innovative and creative ways of expanding the markets for United States agricultural commodities and products;

(5) providing international food assistance to feed the hungry worldwide;

(6) addressing unfair barriers to United States agricultural exports;

(7) implementing strict procedures governing the use and evaluation of programs and funds of the Foreign Agricultural Service; and

(8) overseeing the efficient and effective use of Federal funds to carry out programs of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 49. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and I introduced this resolution to recognize the important service of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service was established to develop and expand markets for United States agricultural commodities and products. Our farmers and ranchers are the most productive in the world and produce much more than we in the United States can consume. Therefore, a vibrant export market is very important to the success of U.S. agriculture.

FAS has contributed to that success; and as of 2002, the United States agricultural exports exceed imports by more than \$12 billion. Our exports have grown significantly over the history of the FAS and now exceed \$50 billion per year.

The FAS fosters the public and private partnership that is needed to promote United States agricultural exports and to develop and expand markets around the world. At this important time when free trade negotiations are ongoing, both in the WTO and through bilateral negotiations, the FAS is essential to represent United States agriculture and ensure that the challenges facing our agricultural producers are thoroughly addressed.

Another responsibility of the FAS is to provide food aid to needy people in developing countries and to help those countries to eventually become trading partners of the United States and buy our agricultural products. The FAS and its employees provide a significant service to the farmers and ranchers here at home so they can compete in worldwide markets. I congratulate them on their achievements and look forward to working closely with the FAS as the committee continues its work to expand markets for United States agriculture.

I thank the members of the Committee on Agriculture for their support of this resolution. I also appreciate the support of the Committee on International Relations on this matter. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has been very cooperative in helping to expedite House Joint Resolution 49. I also thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I urge Members to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to recognize the role of the Foreign Agricultural Service in expanding export opportunities for America's farmers and ranchers and working to increase food security around the globe.

When FAS began its work, exports accounted for less than 10 percent of agricultural sales. Last year, 49 percent of the wheat and 54 percent of the cotton harvested in the United States was exported. By the year 2012, 98 percent of the world's population will live outside of the United States, and American agriculture will depend even more on export markets.

The men and women of the Foreign Agricultural Service have worked hard to identify and focus on the potential of growing markets such as Mexico and China where the economies are expected to grow by 5 and 7 percent respectively.

The U.S. agricultural producers are taking advantage of new trading opportunities. Between 1992 and 2002, U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico grew from \$3.8 billion to \$7.3 billion per year. And in China from .5 billion to \$2 billion. At the same period, exports to Canada have grown from \$4.9 billion to 8.7, making it our largest export market for agriculture. And all of these markets, particularly China, have a tremendous potential opportunity for U.S. producers.

The success of the programs administered by the FAS is also reflected by the increases in funding that were included for many of these programs in last year's farm bill. These include an additional \$650 million for the Market Access Program, \$308 million for Food for Progress, \$100 million for the International Food for Education Program, and \$67 million for the Foreign Market Development Program.

Rural communities depend on export for one-third of their jobs. Over the past 5 years, United States agricultural exports have averaged over \$53 billion per year, and our agricultural trade surplus has averaged over \$13 billion. This is compared to the overall trade deficit of the United States of over \$500 billion. Each \$1 billion in exports supports 15,000 American jobs. This means U.S. agricultural exports are supporting over 800,000 jobs, 50,000 in my home State of Texas alone. Many of these jobs are on farms or ranches, but even more of them are in transpor-

tation, storage, marketing, trade services, and food processing.

As a representative of some of the rural communities that benefit from such jobs, I thank the men and women of the Foreign Agricultural Service for their hard work, and I congratulate the agency on its service to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time; I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this bill, as well as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 49 recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Foreign Agricultural Service at the Department of Agriculture. I have had the privilege of working with many of the FAS staff in Washington and in our embassies around the world, and on one special program in particular, the Global Food for Education Initiative, or the GFEI.

In July 2000, President Clinton announced at the Okinawa G-8 summit that the United States would initiate a \$300 million pilot program, the Global Food for Education Initiative, to provide hungry children with a daily nutritious meal in a school setting. The twin goals of the program were to reduce hunger among children and increase the number of children, especially girls, attending school. The GFEI was modeled around a series of successful FAS school feeding programs that use section 416(b) surplus commodities and that were implemented by U.S. private voluntary organizations and the World Food Program.

FAS faced a monumental task to initiate the GFEI pilot program on a very tight timeline in an accountable and effective manner. They came through with flying colors. In December 2000, the President announced that the GFEI would carry out 48 projects in 39 countries and reach about 9 million children in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean.

In February 2003, USDA published the first evaluation of the GFEI. This report documents the marked success of these school feeding projects. Hunger was reduced, parents and community organizations were empowered, and school attendance increased, especially among girls.

I do not believe this level of success would have been achieved without the diligent leadership of Mary Chambliss, Robin Tilsworth, Babette Gainor, and the rest of the FAS staff. Their belief in this program and their commitment to accountability and oversight ensured that the project lived up to the promise of the initial proposal. I encourage my colleagues to visit the FAS Web site and review the GFEI report.

I have seen these projects in action in Indonesia and Colombia, and I have had the privilege of meeting the FAS staff based at our embassies who help carry out these programs in the field.

Mr. Speaker, there are 300 million hungry children worldwide. Most do not get a chance to go to school. For the children involved in the GFEI, these school meals are often the only food that child will receive, and that meal and school may be the only stable factors in their precarious and uncertain lives.

In last year's farm bill, the GFEI became permanent when the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program was established. It received \$100 million for fiscal year 2003, a reduction from the pilot program, but an allocation which I hope will increase in the future.

Every single Member of the other body called upon the President to keep the McGovern-Dole Program in the capable hands of the FAS, a resounding endorsement if ever I heard one.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the FAS and its staff for their commitment to use our farmers' productivity to help end world hunger. I congratulate them on a half century of fine work, and I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

□ 1115

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This recognition of the Foreign Agricultural Service is well deserved. The work that they conduct around the world in promoting American agriculture is vitally important. It is even more important following the passage of the Trade Promotion Authority in the last Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 49.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 49, the joint resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PRIME MINISTER TONY BLAIR

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1511) to award a congressional gold medal to Prime Minister Tony Blair.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1511

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDING.

The Congress finds that Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom has clearly demonstrated, during a very trying and historic time for our 2 countries, that he is a staunch and steadfast ally of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design, to Prime Minister Tony Blair, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to maintaining the security of all freedom-loving nations.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 3 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege today to be able to move this bill awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Throughout our history, there has probably been no country that the United States has had a closer relationship with than Great Britain. Certainly we share certain immutable, transcendent values. Throughout our history we have stood together in a number of noble causes, probably dramatically manifested during World War II when Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt stood together to defeat the forces of fascism and Nazism. But there is probably no British Prime Minister who has been there when America needs him more than Tony Blair.

Certainly during the Clinton administration, it was Prime Minister Blair who stood shoulder to shoulder with President Clinton in the war in Kosovo against Serb aggression, against the dictator Milosevic. But nothing more illustrated the unique relationship between the United States and Britain and the immense courage and dedication of Tony Blair than what happened after our Nation was attacked on September 11, 2001. The first foreign leader to come to this country to express his regrets while the smoke was still there, while the flames were still burning, visited the World Trade Center, visited New York and came here to our Nation's capital was British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

When President Bush addressed a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001, just 9 days after the brutal attack on the World Trade Center, it was Prime Minister Blair who sat here in the gallery expressing his solidarity with the United States. On that evening, President Bush said, "Once again we are joined together in a great cause and we are so honored the British Prime Minister has crossed an ocean to show his unity of purpose with America. Thank you for coming, friend."

Indeed, Tony Blair has been a friend of the United States but, just as important as that, he has been a friend and supporter of democratic values. He realizes the unique nature and relationship of the bonds between the United States and Britain and indeed between the United States and Europe. He has been a strong friend of the United

States. Certainly in the recent war against Iraq, it was Tony Blair who resisted pressure both from the media, his own party and his own parliament to stand up and be with the United States.

For all those reasons, and I am sure this debate will go on for a while, probably longer than we anticipated it would today, I stand in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, who is the cosponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this legislation that awards the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor Congress can award, to Prime Minister Tony Blair. Past recipients include Presidents George Washington and Harry Truman; heroic figures such as Charles Lindbergh, Rosa Parks, and Mother Teresa; and Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who led England through the dark hours of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, just as Prime Minister Churchill stood with President Roosevelt to defeat the Nazis, Prime Minister Blair has offered steadfast support for the United States since the terror attacks of 9/11. The American people will never forget that the Prime Minister traveled across an ocean to be in the gallery of the House in a sign of solidarity with our country as President Bush addressed our Nation after the terrorist attacks.

More recently, prior to the war in Iraq, the Prime Minister and his U.N. envoy, Sir Jeremy Greenstock, worked tirelessly to exhaust every diplomatic channel to build consensus in the United Nations. It was Prime Minister Blair who tried to bridge differences with our traditional European allies up until the wee hours before the war began. Additionally, Prime Minister Blair pushed our own administration to use its political capital to fully engage in the Middle East peace process.

While that effort continues to face very substantial obstacles, most notably the unceasing suicide attacks against Israel citizens, the Prime Minister deserves credit for putting Middle East Peace on the table as does the Administration for its efforts to implement the "road map."

While the Prime Minister has demonstrated considerable political courage in recent months, his stand with our country should not be surprising.

As a political leader in Britain the Prime Minister has spent this life leading the Labour Party out of oblivion and into its current dominant position in the Parliament.

At age 30 he was elected to Parliament. Later as a member of John Smith's shadow cabinet he worked to transform Labour into a party tough on crime and while still committed to its social causes.

After being elected Labour leader in 1994, Blair moved the party to the political center and redrafted the party constitution in his image of "New Labour"—much like President Clinton successfully moved the Democratic party to a position where it has won the popular vote in the last three Presidential elections.

As leader of the Labor Party, the British people rewarded the Prime Minister with a landslide victory in 1997, ending 18 years of conservative rule. At 43, Blair became the youngest Prime Minister since 1812. As Prime Minister, he has continued to change his country for the better. He has taken on the right to hereditary positions in the House of Lords, allowed the de-evolution of Scotland and Wales, and implemented a massive investment program in the areas of health care and education.

For the Prime Minister, education is the best economic policy and his government has followed this commitment.

I have great admiration for the Prime Minister's commitment to governing from the middle ground rather than trying to divide his country by playing to extreme groups on either side of the political spectrum.

Mr. Speaker, Congress could find no more deserving recipient of this high honor than Prime Minister Blair. In fighting terrorism, standing with the U.S. against Saddam and with the U.S. for Middle East peace, he has truly shown what it means for Britain to be our staunchest ally.

A recent Washington Post article well characterized Prime Minister Blair's current standing in the world. "After the terrorist attacks of September 11, he has found himself playing a pivotal role in reshaping international relations and winning points for standing on principle, even from some of his most vehement critics."

I recognize that some of my colleagues had strong reservations about the war in Iraq and I respect their opinions, but I urge that all Members stand and support this award in recognition of Tony Blair the man, as a leader of an inclusive political movement that has benefited all Britons.

Mr. Speaker, the deaths of six more British soldiers in Iraq this week remind us of the common sacrifice our troops are making serving side by side around the world. This is just one more example of the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in recognition of the man who has contributed so much to upholding this common bond.

I would like to note that this bill passed the Senate unanimously with 78 cosponsors and that we have 290 Members of the House that have cosponsored this important legislation. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) and all who have worked to pass and to

get this bill to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me at the outset commend the ranking member the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the tremendous assistance she has given me on this as she has on so many other issues that come before our subcommittee and also the work that she does for the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I should bring out is that on a personal level, I had the privilege of working with Prime Minister Blair several years ago on the Irish peace process. I saw firsthand at that time the sense of vision that he had, the sense of daring he had and the courage he had to do the right thing and the fact that he was the first British Prime Minister in history to be able to bring a settlement, to bring an agreement involving all the parties in the north of Ireland. To work with the Republic of Ireland and also to work closely with the United States is just one more demonstration of his courage and his ability to stand up and do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the awarding of this gold medal now. We have awarded gold medals to many people in our history since 1776, but on only one occasion have we ever awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor to a sitting head of state: Nelson Mandela, when he was 80 years old and in his last months in office. I suppose it is possible that these are the last months in office for Prime Minister Blair, but that is not clear just at the moment.

At this moment he is fighting for his political future against accusations that he misled the public about British intelligence findings on Iraq. Mr. Blair's Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, was brought up before the Foreign Affairs Select Committee in the House of Commons yesterday. He was asked, among other things, why Mr. Blair's influential January dossier on Iraq's capabilities was so reliant on the uncredited 12-year-old writings of an American graduate student. Today Alastair Campbell, his doctor of spin, will be up there and he will be answering accusations that it was he who inserted in a dossier the astonishing information that Iraq not only possessed fully developed, operational chemical and biological weapons but was capable of delivering them within 45 minutes of a command order. Foreign Secretary Straw said yesterday there were substantial errors. He said that lessons have been learned, but he blamed the demands of the media. That very media, of course, made sure that the false papers issued by Prime Minister Blair's government deceived others

around the world as well as the Britons. The influential information and errors may have even influenced Members of this body.

If this award to Mr. Blair is appropriate, it is either too late or too soon. If the medal had been awarded when it was first introduced, before these deceptions were discovered, it would have had smooth sailing. If it were brought up later, perhaps Mr. Blair will have cleared his name. At this moment, however, we are prejudging and perhaps trying to influence the outcome of some very serious investigations going on in Britain. We are trying to prop up Mr. Blair. The White House has sent up another one of those rubber stamp bills. I do not dispute that he needs propping up. His job rating at home is minus 13 which means his disapproval exceeds his approval by 13 points. What I dispute is whether the Congressional Medal of Honor should become a prop in the strategy of the British Prime Minister to regain his people's trust.

I ask the Members of this body to consider carefully whether they wish to risk cheapening the Congressional Medal of Honor by awarding it to an embattled politician. Let us not rush to judgment. Let us revisit this resolution another day. Even Winston Churchill was not awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor at any point in his tumultuous political career, though there were times when it would have come in quite handy. His medal was posthumous. With all due respect, Prime Minister Blair is not Winston Churchill.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Without getting into all of the merits or demerits of the gentleman's statement, I would note that if there is one person in the world who does not care what his poll ratings are, it is Prime Minister Blair. The fact that his disapproval numbers may be high is exactly one of the reasons why he has demonstrated courage. He stands up for what is right. He is not concerned about the naysayers. He is not concerned about the tides of public opinion as they may be that day.

I would just again remind my colleagues that when the United States was at its darkest moment on September 11, 2001, the one leader who stood with us more than anyone else was Prime Minister Blair. He continues to stand with us. He can be proud of his record and we can be proud of our record if we do indeed award him this honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, since September 11 our Nation has faced very trying times. For the first time in decades we have been threatened on our very own soil. We

have seen American lives and the lives of others tragically lost. Proud symbols of the American dream and our prosperity have also been lost.

□ 1130

But thankfully the American spirit was not. We have seen heroes rise from the dust where the World Trade Center towers once stood. American willpower and determination have united a Nation precisely when evildoers sought to divide us. We are resilient, proud, and since that fateful day, determined as ever. One nation, the United Kingdom, has stood proudly with us, shoulder to shoulder and shown solidarity and support as we vowed to end terrorism worldwide. The United States has no better friend than the United Kingdom and its leader, Prime Minister Tony Blair. Since day one, he has been a steadfast supporter of America in the war on terrorism and the ensuing campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq.

In recognition of his unconditional support of our Nation, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in passing legislation to award Tony Blair the Congressional Gold Medal. There are no words to express America's deep-felt appreciation towards Mr. Blair; and while this award esteems a well-deserved honor to Mr. Blair, it hardly scratches the surface at how grateful we are for his support and the support of his country. The Congressional Gold Medal has a long history of recognizing military leaders, from its first recipient, George Washington, to Mother Teresa, Prime Minister Winston Churchill and current leaders like then-General Colin Powell and now Secretary of State.

Prime Minister Blair has certainly demonstrated the bravery, the dedication and conviction to join this elite group of awardees. Moreover, he has shown himself to be a true friend; and for that I commend him, and I look forward to voting "yes" on H.R. 1511.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am genuinely moved by the breadth of spirit of my colleagues in the great praise they are heaping on this man of the left who presides proudly over a socialized health system and does so much else to show that government has an important positive role in our life, and I appreciate this kind of bipartisanship. Perhaps it will develop a certain trans-Atlantic quality and some of what they so vigorously praise in England might creep into their views about maybe doing something for the American people along the lines of what Mr. Blair does domestically for the British people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), who has been a leader in trying to formulate an appropriate American approach to some important questions.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution today, awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to a great leader of a great country who is and has been a great ally of ours. But it is true that Prime Minister Blair, as President Bush, both have a credibility problem regarding weapons of mass destruction. And it is interesting to see how England is dealing with this problem. They are dealing with it forthrightly, openly. The Parliament has held hearings. Two members of the British Cabinet who resigned in protest have testified. The Prime Minister has subjected himself to questions and they are dealing with this, I believe from a far, it seems to be a very open process, a very forthright process; and the public in England will get the information they need to make a judgment about whether their intelligence was on the mark, whether the intelligence was given to their leaders based upon what they thought the leaders might want to hear. Was the intelligence misused by the British leadership? Was it inaccurate? And I think they have dealt with it very forthrightly.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is not happening in this country. We are not seeing the administration stepping forward to deal with the growing credibility gap that has arisen because we cannot find the weapons of mass destruction. We know that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and he used them in the past against his own people in a very murderous way, no question about it; but we cannot find them now. We may find them next week, and I hope we do because our credibility is on the line; but we need a full accounting of how we have dealt with this issue. We need to know where those weapons are. We need to maintain safe custody of them. We need to dismantle them. If they are buried in the desert or given to another country, we need to know what is going on and make sure that they cannot be used by anybody else in the future that has evil intent.

But we also need a full accounting of our intelligence operation. What were our leaders told? I know what I was told, Mr. Speaker. I was told publicly and privately by the leading senior advisors to the President, with great certainty I was told that Saddam Hussein last fall had weapons of mass destruction, at the very time it turns out that the Defense Intelligence Agency was circulating a memo that there was no credible evidence that Saddam Hussein then had weapons of mass destruction.

That is not the public comments nor the private assurances that Members of Congress or the American public were being given at the time of the President's Rose Garden speech September 26, 2002, and several other statements made. Was the President told what the intelligence agencies thought he wanted to hear? Did the President demand just one side of the story? We need an accounting of what has happened. Our credibility is at stake. If we are ever

again to embrace the notion of preemptive use of military force which may be necessary in an age of terror when we are dealing with an adversary who does not have a country to defend or a capital city to defend, if we are ever going to use a preemptive strategy again, we must know our intelligence is accurate; otherwise, the doctrine of preemption is unusable.

If we are going to keep this country safe, we have to know what happened. We have to know how well or how poorly our intelligence operation functioned. We need an accounting. We are not getting it from the international relations committee, which last week refused to call for documents. We are not getting it on the floor with the intelligence bill because amendments to have an investigation have been ruled out of order. We have got a document dump at the intelligence committee. I am going to go over and look at those documents, but I do not think that is enough. We need to have an accounting. We need to know what happened.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is really interesting listening to how certain people on the other side who are trying to turn this into a debate of weapons of mass destruction are raising the issue of credibility when their statements themselves seem to be at least lacking some credibility, to put it mildly. I would just emphasize we are talking about what was known and what was not known.

Let us go back to last September when Vice President Gore said based at the time he was Vice President, he had absolutely no doubt that Iraq had an advanced program of weapons of mass destruction and those weapons were hidden throughout Iraq. That was Vice President Gore based on his access to intelligence. Just last month, President Clinton said he does not in any way fault President Bush on the issue of weapons of mass destruction because that is exactly what he was told when he was President of the United States. Just last Friday in the New York Times, Kenneth Pollack who was probably leading spokesman in the Clinton administration on the issue of Iraq said there was absolutely no doubt among any of the intelligence agencies in the world nor in the United States nor in the Clinton and Bush administrations that there were indeed weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

And it really is ironic that we have to look to a British foreign minister to stand with our government and give the United States the presumption of the doubt over Saddam Hussein when certain Members of the opposition party do not show that same level of support that Prime Minister Blair is showing, which I think is very significant; and it also demonstrates more than ever why Americans have such a high opinion of Prime Minister Blair.

I would also say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who was heaping

praise on the Republicans for trying to set up this trans-Atlantic relationship with the British and was hoping that perhaps this may manifest itself here on the floor, I would also remind the gentleman and ask him if he supports the fact that Tony Blair is bringing the Labor Party from the left to the right and is certainly being criticized by those in the left in Britain. I wonder if he will also share that in his party and move his party more toward the center.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I very much agree with many of the specifics, but the gentleman misstates British politics when he says he has moved them from left to the right. Blair would himself repudiate that. What he has done is to move them from a position that he thought was too far to the left to a more mainstream position, but still very much on the left, still very much socialized medicine. So, yes, I think that the direction that the Labor Party has moved in, which is very much a reasonable and responsible position on the left, is a good one; but to characterize that as having moved to the right, I think Mr. Blair would give back his gold medal if the price of accepting it was to become a rightist in the gentleman's mind.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say that the same critics in Britain who are criticizing Tony Blair's policy on the war would in fact be saying that he is moving his party to the right. So really I was quoting the equivalent critics in the British Parliament who are equivalent to those in this House. Those who oppose Blair's policy on Iraq, very similar to those on the other side who are opposing President Bush's policy on Iraq, are the same ones who are saying that he is moving his party toward the right. So I was just really quoting some of the ideological kinsmen of some of the opponents here today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman once again misstates British politics because two of his sharpest critics were people who were in his government supporting his moves on domestic policy, supporting his repositioning towards New Labor. Two, Robin Cook and Claire Short, they resigned from the government specifically over Iraq. So the notion that criticism of his position on Iraq is also criticism of his movement towards the New Labor position is simply factually incorrect.

Mr. KING of New York. Reclaiming my time, it is very accurate. In fact, anyone who knows Claire Short, and I have known her for over 20 years, can say she was in the far left of the Labor

Party. She was in the Blair cabinet very reluctantly, and she was one of those who was critical not just of his war policy but also of his domestic policies.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. What about Robin Cook? Who was the foreign minister and who resigned only over misuse of intelligence and not over anything domestic.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, actually this has turned into the House of Commons. This is great. But reclaiming my time, I would say that the overwhelming, absolutely categorically overwhelming majority of those in the Labor Party who are opposed to Tony Blair resent also the fact that he is moving the party towards the center.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would that also be true of the British public, which was opposed to his going to the war?

Mr. KING of New York. Reclaiming my time, the beauty of Tony Blair is unlike certain politicians he does not follow the polls. The fact is he stands up for what is right. In the fullness of time he will be vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to begin first by agreeing with the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that Tony Blair has been historically courageous in Northern Ireland in helping to reconcile two sides that for 500 years have not been able to see eye to eye, and he deserves enormous historic credit for that. And on the issue of Iraq, but for Tony Blair, but for Tony Blair's insistence, President Bush would have never gone to the United Nations. It was he, Tony Blair, who made the precondition to his support that the United States would go to the United Nations in order to secure a vote, and for that he deserves enormous credit.

But at the same time in England, Great Britain, the Parliament right now, there is an ongoing investigation of the information that was used as to justification for the war in Iraq; and it is to the credit of the Parliament, it is to the credit of Tony Blair, that he is accepting the responsibility of the examination of the information which was used with regard to the weapons of mass destruction that was produced by the intelligence community in Great Britain and in the United States as a rationale for the war. It is to the credit of Tony Blair that he is accepting that examination.

In our country, just the opposite is the case. There are essentially three options that the American people, the British people are now presented with. One, that the intelligence was correct, that the weapons of mass destruction

existed, and that the weapons of mass destruction are now in the hands of al Qaeda, Baathist separatist activity groups, other terrorist groups, or in Syria. All of those options are horrific and not a consequence that we thought would be a result of this war.

Secondly, that the intelligence was plain wrong right from the beginning. There was never any information and that they botched it right from the beginning. That is horrible.

Or, third, that the intelligence was correct; but they were told, the intelligence community, to change the information, to change the information. They were told deliberately to alter it in order to argue that there were weapons of mass destruction, that Vice President CHENEY did visit the CIA, did try to influence the intelligence community to change the information, to leave out key documents. In Britain they are now looking at that very issue. They are being told that the information with regard to the uranium from Africa was not correct, that the academic paper that was used rather than real intelligence was wrong and should not have been relied upon. We need the same kind of examination in our country.

There is now sufficient evidence that is being produced that there has been a compromise of the total intelligence package that the Congress should have had but, more importantly, that the American people should have had as the basis of their judgment.

I voted for the resolution last October. I voted for it, and I believe that the American people and this Congress deserve all of the information. We need a blue ribbon commission to examine all of the intelligence that was used. England is doing it right now. Tony Blair is accepting that examination. We should have the courage in our own country to give all of the information to the American public. The intelligence in this country is right now not complete with regard to what our government knew before we voted on the floor of this Congress.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that there was another option left out and that is the option that Vice President Gore spoke about last September, that the weapons are there, the weapons are hidden, and we will find them.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Can we anticipate a gold medal for Vice President Gore too? Are you going to give a gold medal to Al Gore too, anybody who helps you out?

Mr. KING of New York. Reclaiming my time, I would say to the ranking member if he wants to introduce that legislation and obtain 290 signatures,

certainly we will give it consideration at that time. We are very open-minded. We are very liberal on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, Members should speak for themselves about being liberal on this side of the aisle.

Let me try to draw the debate back to what we had initially anticipated, which was to honor Tony Blair with a Congressional Gold Medal and discuss exactly why we were able to secure 290 co-sponsors for this legislation. It is because Tony Blair represents all that is good.

□ 1145

It is because of that that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE), a distinguished member of our committee, introduced this legislation and worked very hard, along with our friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) to gather 290 signatures, and under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the chairman of the subcommittee, that we are here today. That means that this House will go on record as supporting, with a strong bipartisan vote, exactly what Tony Blair means to the process and what he means to our country.

We have had a special relationship with Great Britain for so many years, after we got the initial argument out of the way some 200 plus years ago, and since that time have worked harmoniously with Great Britain, no matter who was in charge over here, or who was in charge over there. And here we have a situation where the Prime Minister of the Labor Party is being supported by a Republican Congress and a Republican President, because of what he brings to our relationship and what he means to all of us.

I think all of us were thrilled when almost a week after the terrible events of September 11, 2001, when President Bush spoke to the Nation from this very spot and said, America has no truer friend than Great Britain. And then, looking up to Tony Blair in the gallery right up behind me, and said, "Thank you for coming, friend," meaning not just the Prime Minister, but all of his countrymen. That is the special relationship that we enjoy through good times and bad with Great Britain.

My family on my dad's side was from England, and I have a great deal of respect for their traditions, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for their current leadership.

So despite all of the arguments about weapons of mass destruction, despite all of the differences that we displayed over Iraq, it was Great Britain in the presence of Tony Blair who came to our defense. It was Tony Blair who made a special trip over to the United States to bring us condolences and talk about unification and working together

with Great Britain, and yes, it was Tony Blair who defied public opinion, who did not stick his finger up in the wind and see which way the wind was blowing, to say that he was going to do something right and support the United States in our efforts against the brutal dictator, Saddam Hussein.

For that and many, many other reasons, he deserves these accolades, and he deserves this Congressional Gold Medal. I urge all of my colleagues to support this meaningful tribute to a great world leader, Tony Blair.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Tony Blair is an embattled politician, as many people are. He will be facing an election within some period of years from his right wing, and he will be defending the positions that he holds. He is a strong defender of a continuation of socialized medicine. He believes that global warming should be addressed by international treaty. I support the British position on allowing gay and lesbian people to serve in the military. So there is a great deal about Tony Blair's record which seems admirable, and I am glad to see my Republican colleagues setting aside what might be some minor differences to them to intervene in a British election by basically giving him this big boost. I am not sure that their fellow conservatives in England are quite so happy.

I do want to say, though, that I differ with those who suggested that somehow we should not have used this to debate the question of whether or not Americans ought to know whether intelligence was misused or how it was misused. I agree there would be better places to debate it. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has consistently done everything possible to keep that debate off the floor. The intelligence authorization will be coming up, and that would have been a good time to debate it. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), had an amendment that would have allowed a debate on whether or not to have a select committee. We cannot have that debate today at the regular ordered time because the Republican leadership ordered the Committee on Rules to kill it.

So yes, I will agree; I saw this and said, let us use this as a chance to at least have some debate on this issue, since the Republican leadership will not allow it. In fact, what I most admire about Tony Blair right now is that as the Prime Minister and the head of the House of Commons, he has not even tried to use his control to shut off a debate. Unlike the Republican administration and the Republican leadership here, Tony Blair is allowing the British people and the British political system to have a thorough debate about the extent to which there was misuse of evidence on weapons of mass destruction, and I envy the British. I do not just envy them the Gold Medal, I envy them the fact that de-

mocracy is functioning in England today on this critical question of whether and to what extent intelligence was misused in a way that is not being allowed to happen in America.

Now, the gentleman from New York managing this bill referred to the article by Kenneth Pollack. I will submit Mr. Pollack's article for the RECORD, because he said I am sure there were weapons of mass destruction, and he goes on in that article to be very critical of this administration's misuse of the evidence. It is a very interesting article, and I appreciate once again the gentleman citing it, because he talks about very important questions about the misuse of intelligence, the exaggeration, the manipulation. This is an administration that argued, in part, that the weapons of mass destruction were a major reason to go to war, and that a Rosanna Danna Banana "nevermind" is not an appropriate response in a democracy.

That is what we are getting. We are getting from them bait and switch: Let us go to war because of weapons of mass destruction, and now it is because, well, he was a terrible man. Yes, he was a terrible man. Terrible people are killing people in the Congo. Terrible people run Liberia. Terrible people run Burma. If, in fact, we are going to become the ones that go to the rescue of people misused and abused by their government, there are a lot more that we can go to.

Weapons of mass destruction was the critical argument used to justify a war, and it now appears that they were grossly exaggerated. The very article by Kenneth Pollack that the gentleman from New York cited is in fact harshly critical of this administration for its misuse of that.

So thanking Tony Blair because he came to the President's defense at a tough time is a reasonable thing to do. Going to Tony Blair's defense in a tough time for him, that is a reasonable thing to do. Certainly politicians are not unused to helping each other out in tough times and reciprocating.

But let us look at the contrast. I wish, in addition to the Gold Medal for Tony Blair, we were doing something for the American people. I would just propose to my friends on the other side, given your admiration for Tony Blair, a simple proposition: Let us duplicate here in the United States the procedures that are now being undertaken in the British Parliament, let us give the American people the same exposure to an open debate and investigation that the British people are giving. Let us do something for the American people while we give Tony Blair the Gold Medal, and thus show respect for democracy in our own country.

(By Kenneth M. Pollack)

WASHINGTON.—Where are Iraq's weapons of mass destructions? It's a good question, and unfortunately we don't yet have a good answer. There is hope that the capture of Abid Hamid Mahmoud al-Tikriti, Saddam Hussein's closet aide, will provide the first solid

clues. In any event, the mystery will be solved in good time; the search for Iraq's nonconventional weapons program has only just begun.

In the meantime, accusations are mounting that the Bush administration made up the whole Iraqi weapons threat to justify an invasion. That is just not the case—America and its allies had plenty of evidence before the war, and before President Bush took office, indicating that Iraq was retaining its illegal weapons programs.

As for allegations that some in the administration may have used slanted intelligence claims in making their case against Saddam Hussein, they seem to have merit and demand further investigation. But if the truth was stretched, it seems to have been done primarily to justify the timing of an invasion, not the merits of one.

The fact that the sites we suspected of containing hidden weapons before the war turned out to have nothing in them is not very significant. American intelligence agencies never claimed to know exactly where or how the Iraqis were hiding what they had—not in 1995, not in 1999 and not six months ago. It is very possible that the “missing” facilities, weaponized agents, precursor materials and even stored munitions all could still be hidden in places we never would have thought to look. This is exactly why, before the war, so few former weapons inspectors had confidence that a new round of United Nations inspections would find the items they were convinced Iraq was hiding.

At the heart of the mystery lies the fact that the Iraqis do not seem to have deployed any stocks of munitions filled with nonconventional weapons. Why did Saddam Hussein not hit coalition troops with a barrage of chemical and biological weapons rather than allow his regime to fall? Why did we not find them in ammunition dumps, ready to be fired?

Actually, there are many possible explanations. Saddam Hussein may have underestimated the likelihood of war and not filled any chemical weapons before the invasion. He may have been killed or gravely wounded in the “decapitation” strike on the eve of the invasion and unable to give the orders. Or he may have just been surprised by the extremely rapid pace of the coalition's ground advance and the sudden collapse of the Republican Guard divisions surrounding Baghdad. It is also possible that Iraq did not have the capacity to make the weapons, but given the prewar evidence, this is still the least likely explanation.

The one potentially important discovery made so far by American troops—two tractor-trailers found in April and May that fit the descriptions of mobile germ-warfare labs given by Iraqi defectors over the years—might well point to a likely explanation for at least part of the mystery: Iraq may have decided to keep only a chemical and biological warfare production capability rather than large stockpiles of the munitions themselves. This would square with the fact that several dozen chemical warfare factories were rebuilt after the first Gulf War to produce civilian pharmaceuticals, but were widely believed to be dual-use plants capable of quickly being converted back to chemical warfare production.

In truth, this was always the most likely scenario. Chemical and biological warfare munitions, especially the crude varieties that Iraq developed during the Iran-Iraq War, are dangerous to store and handle and they deteriorate quickly. But they can be manufactured and put in warheads relatively rapidly—meaning that there is little reason to have thousands of filled rounds sitting around where they might be found by international inspectors. It would have been log-

ical for Iraq to retain only some means of production, which could be hidden with relative ease and then used to churn out the munitions whenever Saddam Hussein gave the word.

Still, no matter what the trailers turn out to be, the failure so far to find weapons of mass destruction in no ways invalidates the prewar intelligence data indicating that Iraq had the clandestine capacity to build them. There has long been an extremely strong case—based on evidence that largely predates the Bush administration—that Iraq maintained programs in weapons of mass destruction. It was this evidence, along with reports showing the clear failure of United Nations efforts to impede Iraq's progress, that led the Clinton administration to declare a policy of “regime change” for Iraq in 1998.

In 1995, for example, United Nations inspectors found Russian-made ballistic-missile gyroscopes at the bottom of the Tigris River; Jordanian officials intercepted others being smuggled into Iraq that same year. In July 1998, international inspectors discovered an Iraqi document that showed Baghdad had lied about the number of chemical bombs it had dropped during the Iran-Iraq War, leaving some 6,000 such weapons unaccounted for. Iraq simply refused to concede that the document even existed.

These episodes, and others like them, explain why many former Clinton administration officials, including myself (I was on the staff of the National Security Council in the 90's), agreed with the Bush administration that a war would likely be necessary to prevent Iraq from acquiring nuclear and other weapons. We may not have agreed with the Bush team's timing or tactics, but none of us doubted the fundamental intelligence basis of its concerns about the Iraqi threat.

As for the estimates the Bush administration presented regarding Iraq's holdings of weapons-related materials, they came from unchallenged evidence gathered by United Nations inspectors (in many cases, from records of the companies that sold the materials to Iraq in the first place). For instance, Iraq admitted importing 200 to 250 tons of precursor agents for VX nerve gas; it claimed to have destroyed these chemicals but never proved that it had done so. Even Hans Blix, the last head weapons inspector and a leading skeptic of the need for an invasion, admitted that the Iraqis refused to provide a credible accounting for these materials.

And it wasn't just the United States that was concerned about Iraq's efforts. By 2002, British, Israeli and German intelligence services had also concluded that Iraq was probably far enough along in its nuclear weapons program that it would be able to put together one or more bombs at some point in the second half of this decade. The Germans were actually the most fearful of all—in 2001 they leaked their estimate that Iraq might be able to develop its first workable nuclear device in 2004.

Nor was it just government agencies that were alarmed. In the summer of 2002 I attended a meeting with more than a dozen former weapons inspectors from half a dozen countries, along with another dozen experts on Iraq's weapons programs. Those present were asked whether they believed Iraq had a clandestine centrifuge lab operating somewhere; everyone did. Several even said they believed the Iraqis had a covert calutron program going as well. (Centrifuge and calutron operations allow a country to enrich uranium and produce the fissile material for a nuclear bomb.)

At no point before the war did the French, the Russians, the Chinese or any other country with an intelligence operation capable of collecting information in Iraq say it doubted

that Baghdad was maintaining a clandestine weapons capability. All that these countries ever disagreed with the United States on was what to do about it.

Which raises the real crux of the slanted-intelligence debate: the timing of the war. Why was it necessary to put aside all of our other foreign policy priorities to go to war with Iraq in the spring of 2003? It was always the hardest part of the Bush administration's argument to square with the evidence. And, distressingly, there seems to be more than a little truth to claims that some members of the administration skewed, exaggerated and even distorted raw intelligence to coax the American people and reluctant allies into going to war against Iraq this year.

Before the war, some administration officials clearly tended to emphasize in public only the most dire aspects of the intelligence agencies' predictions. For example, of greatest importance were the estimates of how close Iraq was to obtaining a nuclear weapon. The major Western intelligence services essentially agreed that Iraq could acquire one or more nuclear bombs within about four to six years. However, all also indicated that it was possible Baghdad might be able to do so in as few as one or two years if, and only if, it were able to acquire fissile materials on the black market.

This latter prospect was not very likely. The Iraqis have been trying to buy fissile material since the 1970's and had never been able to do so. Nevertheless, some Bush administration officials chose to stress that one-to-two-year possibility rather than the more likely four-to-six year scenario. Needless to say, if the public felt Iraq was still several years away from acquiring a nuclear weapon rather than just a matter of months, there probably would have been much less support for war this spring.

Moreover, before the war I heard many complaints from friends still in government that some Bush officials were mounting a ruthless campaign over intelligence estimates. I was told that when government analysts wrote cautious assessments of Iraq's capabilities, they were grilled and forced to go to unusual lengths to defend their judgments and some were chastised for failing to come to more alarming conclusions. None of this is illegal, but it was perceived as an attempt to browbeat analysts into either changing their estimates for shutting up and ceding the field to their more hawkish colleagues.

More damning than the claims of my former colleagues has been some of the investigative reporting done since the war. Particularly troubling are reports that the administration knew its contention that Iraq tried to purchase uranium from Niger was based on forged documents. If true, it would be a serious indictment of the administration's handling of the war.

As important as this debate is, what may ultimately turn out to be the biggest concern over the Iraqi weapons program is the question of whose hands it is now in. If we do confirm that those two trailers are mobile biological warfare labs, we are faced with a tremendous problem. If the defectors' reports about the rates at which such mobile labs were supposedly constructed are correct, there are probably 22 more trailers still out there. Where are they? Syria? Iran? Jordan? Still somewhere in Iraq? Or have they found their way into the hands of those most coveted—Osama bin Laden and his confederates?

Nor can we allow our consideration of weapons of mass destruction and politicized intelligence to be a distraction from the most important task at hand: rebuilding Iraq. History may forgive the United States if we don't find the arsenal we thought we

would. No one will forgive us if we botch the reconstruction and leave Iraq a worse mess than we found it.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to celebrate the purpose of the Medal, which is the great leadership of Tony Blair. The world needs civilized leaders. The world is a scary place. There are a lot of things going on, and all that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing. Good men are not infallible. Mistakes can be made. But good men acting on good judgment, doing the best they can with what they have is what we are celebrating here today.

Tony Blair as Prime Minister has been a great friend to our country, which has a special relationship, of course, with the United Kingdom, of which we are very proud, and an especially strong relationship in the area of intelligence. He has been a great friend with President Clinton when he was President of our country, and with President Bush. Who is currently the President of our country.

I think that friendship has gone through a lot of activity in the past several years, and Tony Blair has been there standing strong. He is a proud person to be associated with, in my view. I am pleased that the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE), the gentleman from New York (Chairman KING), the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and others have had the good sense to bring this forward at this time, and I thank them for doing it, and I urge strong support.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said at the outset, it is a great honor for me personally to be able to stand here and move this legislation today. I must say that I am sure some of my Irish ancestors are appreciating the improbability of this moment that I would be making such an impassioned defense for a British Prime Minister.

The fact is, Tony Blair transcends national politics. He transcends pettiness and partisanship, and that is what we have tried to do here. Yes, obviously, there are differences between Members on this side of the aisle and certain policies of Tony Blair. We are not talking about his policies per se; we are talking about his courage, we are talking about his unique sense of dedication to democratic values and the fact that he is such a close ally of the United States, and that does transcend whatever differences there may be, and that should also transcend

whatever differences we might have in recognizing the greatness of an individual and realizing the uniqueness of a very special relationship.

But, if I could just add in closing, because I know there is going to be a record of this and we have gone over different debates, I would just thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for introducing the full column by Mr. Pollack. I would stand by that, and I would say that anyone reading that, any balanced person reading that would see that as an affirmation that weapons of mass destruction did indeed exist, and also honest differences as far as nuclear weapons. It is all there. I will allow the public to look at that, to read it, and come to their judgment. It certainly went far beyond as far as being reasoned, as far as being rational, some of the overheated rhetoric that has been coming forth from others here. And that to me is the type of debate we should be having, an intelligent debate.

Also, I would say there is a difference between a parliamentary system and the system that we have. Indeed we fought a revolution in 1776 to establish our type of government.

But in conclusion, let us get back to the main point. Tony Blair is a unique world leader, an outstanding world leader, a long and dear and absolutely loyal friend of the United States. For that, Mr. Speaker, he deserves this Gold Medal as much as any world leader ever has. I stand with him. I would hope that the overwhelming majority of this Congress would stand with him, stand with the United States Senate in acknowledging the uniqueness and the unique loyalty and sense of courage that Tony Blair has demonstrated.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1200

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I would be willing to stand with the Senate on this if we could stand with them on the child tax credit. Can we make some kind of deal here on standing with the Senate?

Mr. KING of New York. Reclaiming my time, I would say that when Tony Blair is here, that if we can arrange a private meeting with the ranking member from Massachusetts, I am sure he can impart unique wisdom to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and that would really mean that the Prime Minister has earned his gold medal.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation for a number of reasons. First, to force the American people to pay tens of thousands of dollars to give a gold medal to a foreign leader is immoral and unconstitutional. I will continue in my uncompromising opposition to appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution—a Constitution that each member of Congress swore to uphold.

Second, though these gold medals are an unconstitutional appropriation of American tax

dollars, at least in the past we have awarded them to great humanitarians and leaders like Mother Theresa, President Reagan, Pope John Paul II, and others. These medals have generally been proposed to recognize a life of service and leadership, and not for political reasons—as evidenced by the overwhelming bipartisan support for awarding President Reagan, a Republican, a gold medal. That these awards have generally gone to these types of otherwise deserving individuals is why I have many times offered to contribute \$100 of my own money, to be matched by other Members, to finance these medals.

I sense that this current proposal is different, however. No one is claiming that British Prime Minister Tony Blair has given a lifetime of humanitarian service like Mother Theresa, or demonstrated the historical leadership of a Ronald Reagan. No one suggests that British Prime Minister, leading the avowedly socialist Labour Party, has embraced American values such as freedom and limited governments and imported those to Great Britain—as Margaret Thatcher had attempted before him. No, Tony Blair is being proposed for his medal for one reason: he provided political support when international allies were sought in advance of America's attack on Iraq. Does this overtly political justification for awarding this medal not cheapen both the medal itself and the achievements of those who have been awarded it previously?

I find it particularly odd that this Republican-controlled Congress would nominate one such as Tony Blair to receive this award. His political party is socialist: Britain under Blair has a system of socialized medicine and government intervention in all aspects of the commercial and personal lives of its citizens. Socialism is an enemy of freedom and liberty—as the 20th century taught us so well. It is the philosophical basis of a century of mass-murder and impoverishment.

In May, a British television poll found that Prime Minister Blair is the most unpopular man in Great Britain. A brief look at his rules leaves little question why this is so. He has eroded Britain's constitutional base—recently abolishing the ancient position of Lord Chancellor without any debate. He has overseen a massive expansion of government with the creation of costly “assemblies” in Wales and Scotland. He has also overseen changes in Britain's voting system that many have claimed has opened the door to widespread voting fraud. In short, he is no Margaret Thatcher and certainly no Winston Churchill. Yet today Congress is voting to give him its highest honor.

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to be generous with the people's money. I believe the politicization of this medal, as we are seeing here today, really makes my own point on such matters: Congress should not be spending the people's money for appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution. When it does so, it charts a dangerous course away from the rule of law and away from liberty. I urge a “no” vote on this unfortunate bill.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1511, to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Tony Blair, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest honor Congress can bestow to civilians and foreign leaders in recognition of their outstanding and enduring contributions to the

United States. It is fitting that we consider Prime Minister Blair for this award in the wake of a challenging and historic period for our two nations.

Upon the terrorist attacks of September 11, Prime Minister Blair was the first leader to rush to America's side to provide assistance. His expression of solidarity assured us that we were not alone in the world as a victim of terrorism, and that attacks on our soil were also an assault on the sovereignty of Great Britain, which lost more of its own citizens in the World Trade Center than any other foreign nation. In a very difficult time for our country, Mr. Blair has courageously demonstrated that the U.K. is our staunchest and most steadfast ally by helping us lead the coalition of democratic nations in the defense of our mutual security from terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Together with Great Britain we have made progress toward dismantling the global network of state sponsored terrorism. However, despite considerable public opposition and political fallout in his own country, Prime Minister Blair never wavered from his commitment to the United States and the international coalition to determine whether the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq presented an imminent threat to its neighbors and our troops based on the Middle East. Under the Prime Minister's leadership, Great Britain contributed troops and meaningful support for Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. As British troops fought shoulder to shoulder with American troops in Iraq, Mr. Blair made it clear all along that the U.K. shared our values and principles for the mission, particularly when he said, "We go to liberate not conquer . . . and the only flag which will be flown in that ancient land is their own."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Prime Minister Tony Blair's extraordinary leadership and his nation's enduring commitment to our mutual support of liberty and democracy. I am proud to support H.R. 1511 to authorize the President, on behalf of Congress, to award the Gold Medal to Prime Minister Blair. I also wish to thank the people of Great Britain, the members of the royal armed forces, and their families for their shared commitment and many sacrifices for the preservation of democracy and liberty in a world allied against terror.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great disappointment that I cannot be present today to speak and vote in favor of H.R. 1511, a bill to award Prime Minister Tony Blair the Congressional Gold Medal. I introduced this legislation on March 31 and have since been working with my colleagues to obtain the necessary 290 cosponsors for floor action. I would like to commend Chairman OXLEY and the Financial Services Committee, as well as Rep. RICHARD BAKER and Rep. CAROLYN MALONEY for their tireless efforts in getting this bill to the floor today.

As we emerge successfully from Operation Iraqi Freedom, it is important to remember that we did not fight this war alone. The brave men and women of the British military have fought and died, side by side, with our American soldiers. Just yesterday, 6 British soldiers were killed in an attack north of Basra. Great Britain, under the leadership of Tony Blair, has paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Prime Minister Blair has ignored political expediency and risked his own career to stand up for what he knows is right. Operation Iraqi

Freedom has freed millions of Iraqis from the oppression of Saddam Hussein's brutal dictatorship. The Operation has ousted a regime bent on securing and then distributing weapons of mass destruction to those who would use them against the United States, our friends, and the people of Iraq. Despite attempts by many of our "allies" to thwart this noble effort, Prime Minister Blair and Great Britain have remained strong and active players in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I am deeply honored to play a role in awarding Prime Minister Tony Blair the Congressional Gold Medal and I thank my colleagues in the House of Representatives for joining me.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation to award Mr. Blair with the Congressional Gold Medal. I would like to recognize Mr. Blair's—and Britain's—longstanding staunch support of our nation's democratic ideals.

Whether one supported or opposed the war in Iraq, it is true that under Blair's leadership, Britain has provided extensive military support in the war in Iraq. He has argued passionately and consistently about the threats Saddam Hussein posed in the Persian Gulf and ultimately to the Western world. Honoring Prime Minister Blair with the Congressional Gold Medal would be a fitting tribute to him, the people of Great Britain, and the thousands of British troops who fought valiantly alongside American soldiers in Iraq. We now have a historic opportunity to reaffirm our Nation's friendship with Great Britain, and our mutual commitment to freedom and democracy.

I hope that the occasion of Mr. Blair being awarded the Congressional Gold Medal will be an opportunity to invite Mr. Blair to address a joint session of Congress. I have worked with my colleague Mr. ROYCE to encourage our Congressional leaders to invite Mr. Blair to do so, and I can think of no occasion more fitting. In light of Mr. Blair's enduring friendship with the United States, I look forward to hearing his views on the future of Iraq and the Middle East.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1511.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR FREEDOM IN HONG KONG

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 277) expressing support for freedom in Hong Kong.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 277

Whereas Hong Kong has long been the world's freest economy, renowned for its rule

of law and its jealous protection of civil rights and civil liberties;

Whereas the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration explicitly guarantees that all of Hong Kong's freedoms, including press freedom, religious freedom, and freedom of association, will continue for at least 50 years;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China pledged to respect Hong Kong's Basic Law of 1990, which explicitly protects freedom of speech, of the press and of publication, of association, of assembly, of procession, of demonstration, and of communication;

Whereas the Basic Law also explicitly protects freedom of conscience, religious belief, and of religious expression;

Whereas Hong Kong's traditional rule of law, which has guaranteed all of these civil rights and civil liberties, is essential to its continued freedom, and the erosion of that rule of law bodes ill for the maintenance and expansion of both economic freedom and individual civil rights;

Whereas in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 Congress declared: "The human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong. A fully successful transition in the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong must safeguard human rights in and of themselves. Human rights also serve as a basis for Hong Kong's continued economic prosperity.";

Whereas since Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the People's Republic of China on July 1, 1997, the Hong Kong authorities have changed the system of electing representatives to the Legislative Council, added appointed members to District Councils, invited the central government to reverse Hong Kong courts, and declined to permit the entry of some American visitors and other foreign nationals whose views are opposed by the People's Republic of China;

Whereas, despite the provisions of the Basic Law which call for a gradual and orderly process toward democratic election of the legislature and chief executive, and which call for universal suffrage, the Government of the Hong Kong SAR and the People's Republic of China have stymied this process;

Whereas the traditional liberties of Hong Kong's 7,000,000 people are now immediately threatened by Hong Kong's proposed "Article 23" laws, which were drafted under strong pressure from the Government of the People's Republic of China, dealing with sedition, treason, and subversion against the Chinese Communist Party, and the theft of state secrets;

Whereas the proposed legislation would give the Hong Kong Government discretion to imprison individuals for "attempting to commit" the undefined crime of "subversion"; would criminalize not only membership in, but even attendance at meetings of, organizations not approved by Beijing; and would threaten freedom of religion, membership in authentic trade unions, political activity of all kinds, and a wide range of public and private expression;

Whereas the proposed legislation would give Hong Kong's Secretary for Security, an appointee of the Government of the People's Republic of China, broad authority to ban organizations it deemed in opposition to the national interest, thereby threatening religious organizations such as the Falun Gong and the Roman Catholic Church;

Whereas under the proposed legislation such basic and fundamental procedural rights as notice and opportunity to be heard could be waived by the appointee of the Government of the People's Republic of China in

Hong Kong if honoring these rights "would not be practicable";

Whereas the People's Republic of China's history of arbitrary application of its own criminal law against dissenters, and its pattern of imprisoning and exiling those with whom it disagrees, provide strong reasons to oppose the expansion of Beijing's ability to use its discretion against Hong Kong's freedoms;

Whereas similar subversion laws in the People's Republic of China are regularly used to convict and imprison journalists, labor activists, Internet entrepreneurs, and academics;

Whereas broad segments of the Hong Kong community have expressed strong concerns about, and opposition to, the proposed new laws;

Whereas those members of Hong Kong's Legislative Council elected by universal suffrage oppose the proposed new laws, but are powerless to stop them against the majority of votes controlled directly and indirectly by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the scheduled consideration of these proposals to restrict Hong Kong's freedoms in the Legislative Council on July 9, 2003, makes the threat to its people clear and imminent; and

Whereas it is the duty of freedom loving people everywhere to stand with the people of Hong Kong against this dangerous erosion of its long-held and cherished rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns any restriction of the freedom of thought, expression, or association in Hong Kong, consistent with the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992;

(2) recognizes that because Hong Kong exercises considerable influence in international affairs, as a developed economy, financial center, trading entrepot and shipping center, reductions in the existing freedom of the Hong Kong people would be of global significance;

(3) urges the Hong Kong Government and the People's Republic of China to withdraw the proposed implementation of Article 23 of the Basic Law insofar as it would reduce the basic human freedoms of the people of Hong Kong;

(4) calls upon the People's Republic of China, the National People's Congress, and any other groups appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China to leave all revisions of Hong Kong law to a legislature elected by universal suffrage;

(5) urges immediate elections for the Legislative Council of Hong Kong according to rules approved by the Hong Kong people through an election-law convention, referendum, or both;

(6) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to fully respect the autonomy and independence of the chief executive, the civil service, the judiciary, the police of Hong Kong, and the Independent Commission Against Corruption; and

(7) calls upon the United States Government, other governments, the people of the United States, and the people of the world to support freedom in Hong Kong by—

(A) making clear statements against any limitations on existing human freedoms in Hong Kong; and

(B) transmitting those statements to the people and the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 277, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hard work that the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has put into this, along with, obviously, the leadership of the Committee on International Relations that have made it possible, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for this resolution to come forward in a timely basis.

Timeliness is critical here. Time is of the essence because of what the Chinese Communist regime is seeking to do precisely in these weeks in Hong Kong. It seems as though, Mr. Speaker, tyranny knows only one modus operandi, to repress the people by any means necessary to prevent dissent. We have seen this all too clearly with the dictator only 90 miles off our shores here, off the shores of the United States. And now a bastion of freedom in the face of one of the most tyrannical regimes in the world is facing a dire threat. Hong Kong may soon have its important freedoms destroyed by the so-called People's Republic of China, the PRC.

In an act of complete cowardice and desperation, the PRC has prepared new legislation called article 23 of the Basic Law which seeks to severely restrict the freedoms of the people of Hong Kong. The communist government in Beijing is pressuring the local government in Hong Kong to pass this legislation before July 9. Freedom of the press and freedom of expression are in great jeopardy because of this legislation. The actions of the Chinese regime fly in the face of promise made by Beijing of "one country, two systems," a 50-year commitment that was made to the world to preserve Hong Kong's respect for human liberties. But a mere 6 years after the British handed Hong Kong to the Communist Chinese, we see that the totalitarianism has no patience. It cannot stand to see the failures of its regime in the very face of the shining example that Hong Kong has been of freedom and civil liberties.

The elimination of freedom of speech holds countless dangers. For example, the recent SARS outbreak in China and many parts of the world was hastened in fact by the PRC's inability to

deal with the truths. The regime's lies and deception hamstrung the world from dealing effectively with the crisis. The truths about the epidemic's extent were unclear; totalitarianism simply could not face or did not know how to face reality. Now, this created a grave health threat in Hong Kong and really for the rest of the world.

Freedom of speech, Mr. Speaker, is important for every aspect of life. It protects individual citizens from the deception that we saw in the example of the SARS crisis by offering multiple important sources of information. The PRC claims that this law it is seeking to impose on the people of Hong Kong is a means to ensure its national security. The rest of the world rightly sees it for what it is, an attempts to roll back liberties that Hong Kong has to thwart any pressure for greater liberties throughout the rest of China.

Now, if the world does not stand up to the PRC now, this will only be the beginning of the tightening of its totalitarian grip on the people of Hong Kong. The United States Government has an obligation to stand with the people of Hong Kong. The State Department must not fail to show the outrage of the American people at the destruction of the most basic liberties which have survived up to now on the island of freedom that is Hong Kong.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), and the Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for their strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving moments of my life in a very sad sense was the 1st of July, 1997, when I was present in Hong Kong with our then-Secretary of State Madelyn Albright as the British flag came down and the flag of Communist China went up. It was a sad moment for all of us who believe in free and open and democratic government and in human rights across the globe.

The people of Hong Kong over the decades have made an enormous contribution to the economic and cultural life of the Asia-Pacific region, and they set the standards for efficiency and honesty and integrity in government. Hong Kong has been enormously helpful to us in the war on terrorism, particularly in cracking down on the use of banks in the Asia-Pacific region to launder funds for the benefit of terrorists.

But Hong Kong's hard-earned international reputation is being severely damaged by the government's pursuit of so-called article 23 antiseditious legislation.

This resolution before us expresses our strong concerns and reservations

regarding these dangerous trends. And I hope that our passage of this legislation will influence consideration of article 23 by the legislature of Hong Kong.

This insidious bill proposed by the government in Hong Kong goes a long way towards giving the chief executive appointed by a Beijing-packed committee broad authority to ban organizations if they are prohibited to function in mainland China for "national security" reasons.

If this legislation in Hong Kong should pass, it is very likely that the government of Hong Kong will immediately face pressure from Beijing to ban the Falun Gong movement. Hong Kong representatives of evangelical Christians, labor unions, human rights organizations will find that they may also be banned in Hong Kong, as American labor activist Harry Wu was prohibited from entering Hong Kong just last year.

The ability of targeted organizations, perhaps I should say persecution organizations, to obtain a public hearing can be waived by the Hong Kong chief executive if he deems such public hearings as not practicable.

Mr. Speaker, Hong Kong's strength is its commitment to the rule of law. The legislation proposed by the Hong Kong Government calls that commitment into serious question. The democratic forces in Hong Kong, including my good friend Martin Lee, are fighting for Hong Kong's democratic future and its free and open way of life. We in this body must support their battle.

Our resolution has the strong support of both the Democratic and Republican leadership of our House, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), and many, many co-sponsors on freedom in Hong Kong, raises a sober question for all of us to ponder. How does a state balance a need to protect itself from acts of sedition with the equally important need to protect the civil liberties of its citizens?

This very same issue arose in the early days of our own Republic, in the year 1798 to be exact. The Adams administration and the Federalist-controlled Congress used the excuse of the extreme revolutionary fervor coming across the Atlantic from France to pass a series of legislative measures known collectively as the Alien and Sedition Act. These measures were seen as effectively nullifying the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Public uproar was such that Congress repealed one of the measures and allowed the rest to die a natural death through expiration.

The point here is that all governments, as we are acutely aware of after the tragic events of September 11, have the imperative to protect their institutions and citizens from sedition, treason, and terrorism.

The question raised, however, is does article 23 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, to be considered by the Hong Kong Legislative Council this coming July 9, go beyond legitimate security needs? Does it, like the Alien and Sedition Act, threaten the civil liberties of the body politic as a whole? There are disturbing indications that the answer to these questions is an affirmative "yes."

The American Congress expressed its clear concern for the preservation of human rights for the people of Hong Kong through adoption of the U.S.-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992. When Hong Kong ended British rule on July 1 of 1997 and was returned to the sovereignty of the Chinese people, an important pledge was given. That pledge was that for the next 50 years under a "one-country, two-systems" formula, Hong Kong would continue to independently exercise those economic and political freedoms which had evolved there over time.

Those who feared the worst on that July day now almost 6 years ago, the sounds of jack boots in the street of Hong Kong found that their fears were largely unfounded. There was no immediate descent of the Bamboo Curtain. Instead, however, like drops of water falling upon a rock, there has been a slow erosion of those democratic qualities which made Hong Kong unique.

American citizens of certain political or philosophical persuasions have been denied entry. An internationally respected Hong Kong newspaper whose owners turn their eyes towards Beijing have fired its most effective and outspoken journalists.

An American citizen released from a Chinese prison found the attitude of the administration at the Hong Kong university where he taught so hostile that he relocated to the United States. Ever so slowly, the rock of freedom is being washed away by these slow, but steady, drips of tyranny.

Article 23 in its present form is a major step in that erosion. This view is held not only by the overwhelming majority of the American Congress. Internationally respected Hong Kong leaders, including political leaders like Martin Li, and religious leaders like Roman Catholic Bishop Joseph Zen have reached the same conclusion, that article 23, as it is presently constructed, will open the door to a slow, steady decline of liberty in Hong Kong. The Hong Kong men and women in the street have also voiced their concerns over the implementation of article 23 and its corrosive effect on the right to peaceful assembly, such as is annually done on the streets of Hong Kong on June 4, the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Mr. Speaker, as a symbol of hope for the future of China, Hong Kong has great significance beyond that of a small urban enclave of international trade and commerce.

□ 1215

What happens there is closely watched in Taiwan, in Beijing and in greater Asia beyond. A slow twilight, sunset of liberty in Hong Kong, therefore, will have repercussions and very negative ones far beyond its own borders.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield as much time as she might consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader who has spent her professional life fighting for human rights and specifically fighting for human rights for the people of Hong Kong.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations for yielding the time and for his tremendous leadership.

What an honor it is to be on the floor today with my friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chair, I understand, of the Committee on International Relations, and with the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), two champions of human rights every place in the world. By their leadership and their tireless energy, boundless I would say, on behalf of freedom, they have set an example, freed people, made the world a freer place, and we are all in their debt.

I am pleased to join my colleague the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) as well as we speak to the issue of the preservation of freedom in Hong Kong. So it is with appreciation to all of my colleagues here present on the floor and to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), who is one of the authors of the resolution, that I join in calling for the preservation of freedom in Hong Kong, keeping promises made to the people of Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, when the Sino-British Joint Declaration was initiated in 1997, it guaranteed the preservation of freedoms basic to life in Hong Kong. Just 5 years later, those freedoms, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of association, are under assault.

The House must act today to make clear to the Hong Kong government and to the People's Republic of China the seriousness with which the United States views any action that would subvert the promise of human rights contained in the joint resolution.

The draft provisions to implement Article 23 of Hong Kong's basic law would give Beijing the ability to determine what types of organizations could exist in Hong Kong and which views could be expressed. Many of us received a delegation led by Martin Lee, the very distinguished democracy advocate in Hong Kong, just a few weeks ago,

where they expressed their concern and the impact that this action would have on Hong Kong, as we have known it, as a dynamic society where business has flourished because information has been able to flow freely.

This action is a significant threat to Hong Kong's autonomy and to the freedoms that make it a center for the exchange of information and ideas. It is an even greater concern because the movement toward popular democracy, as required under the basic law, has not begun.

I commend President Bush on the administration's forceful opposition last Thursday to the Article 23 proposal. The administration statement emphasized that: "Hong Kong's special status, endorsed by the United States under the Hong Kong Policy Act, depends on the local authorities' protection of human and civil rights and the preservation of the territory's autonomy. The United States opposes any law that threatens the territory's unique identity, including the current version of Article 23 legislation." That is from the President's statement.

Hopefully, after leaders in Hong Kong and Beijing reflect seriously on those words and the strong sentiments contained in the legislation we are considering today, they will move to amend the proposal to preserve the freedom of the people of Hong Kong that they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the leadership again of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) in introducing this legislation. I was pleased to join him in doing so.

The Committee on International Relations has provided an opportunity for the House to go on record in favor of the preservation of human rights in Hong Kong in opposition to actions that threaten them. I urge overwhelming adoption of this measure to underscore our commitment to the cause of freedom in Hong Kong.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my good friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Today, I rise in strong support of the Hong Kong resolution. I doubt many of us in this Chamber will forget the Cold War and the United States' dedication to protect any country threatened by a Communist regime.

Today, I ask, have we forgotten the image of that one Chinese student blocking a barrage of tanks or the hurriedly erected plaster Lady Liberty proudly emulating our own Statue of Liberty displayed so prominently as a symbol of the Chinese people's desire to be free? How can we ever forget the hundreds of Chinese martyrs killed on that warm June night in Tiananmen Square 14 years ago?

Because we are a Nation that does not forget the human tragedy and sufferings committed by Communist regimes in the last century, we cannot watch silently today as the freedoms enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong are being stripped away.

Prior to 1997, Hong Kong was not only an economic powerhouse, it served as a beacon of hope that one day rule of law, transparency and a republican form of government would be a reality in the People's Republic of China. However, rather than adopting Hong Kong's free society, China now flexes its oppressive muscles over Hong Kong themselves, depriving them not only of the freedom of speech, religion and association agreed to by the British and Chinese Government in 1997, but these freedoms that are guaranteed because they are inalienable and endowed to all members of the human race. As our President has said, that freedom is a right of every person and the future of every Nation.

Today, I rise to join in solidarity with the often lonely voice of Hong Kong's Bishop Joseph Zen, who is a tireless advocate of the people of Hong Kong and a vocal fundamental critic of the Chinese government's disregard of the fundamental rights of the governed. Bishop Zen risks his own life by speaking with moral authority, and his commitment to protect the dignity of each human person should be supported.

Congress must send a clear message to the Chinese Government that we expect them to abide by the premise of Hong Kong's basic law which grants gradual progress towards the democratic election of the legislature and chief executive. Furthermore, the United States must continue the fight against communism, an oppressive regime that denies each individual his or her dignity and holds countries that violate human rights accountable.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution because it protects what America has, what America stands for and what Hong Kong does not want to lose, the gift of freedom.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for his important resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we reverse the balance of our time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While we are waiting for the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the prime author of this legislation, to arrive here let me just again reiterate a few things.

I like many others have followed the ongoing human rights abuses by the People's Republic of China, and many of us had hoped, and this hope is now at grave risk, that Hong Kong might avoid the same kind of repressive regime visited upon it that other people in the People's Republic of China live with and endure each and every day.

Our hope is that the Chinese Government, especially with its work in the

WTO, with its attempt to join the world leaders as a major player, that it would respect the democratic rights of Hong Kong and learn from it. Hong Kong can be a beacon for them not only economically, but also in the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The dictatorship in Beijing really has nothing to fear but fear itself by giving in, it seems to me, to basic and fundamental human rights.

Over time, if the PRC were to do that, they certainly would be respected, but if they do the opposite, they will be held in contempt, and what this resolution says, it is a cautionary flag, do not do it, do not bring the repressive policies that you have foisted upon your own people to the people of Hong Kong. The PRC has already promised, as we all indicated earlier, that there would be at least a 50-year hiatus where at least a semblance of freedom would be experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), my friend and colleague.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of H. Res. 277, expressing the sense of this House in support of freedom in Hong Kong. Hong Kong is a jewel. We are all admirers of Hong Kong on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans.

Hong Kong has had for years what is probably the freest economy in the world, and along with that they have had civil rights and civil liberties of which Hong Kongers themselves have been jealously protective. Nothing has changed in that respect except that under the one country-two systems formula the government of the People's Republic of China is getting ahead of themselves by many decades.

They promised 50 years, and instead, they are now seeking to replace the traditional civil law of Hong Kong with a subversion law, with a national security law that will take away fundamental rights of speech, association, membership in labor unions, journalists doing their job. The scope, the breadth, the discretion given to the executive in this proposed law is absolutely breathtaking, and we feel compelled for this reason because these legal changes are imminent in Hong Kong to express ourselves in support of the people of Hong Kong.

An article in the South China Morning Post just this Saturday reported on a controversy ignited by two causes here in America: first, this resolution, the fact that it has been reported by the Committee on International Relations and has come to the floor; and second, a White House statement in support of freedom in Hong Kong. In response to these modest congressional and presidential expressions of support for freedom, noting that the Article 23 legislation being considered in Hong Kong "could harm local freedoms and autonomy over time," a spokesman for

the foreign ministry in the People's Republic of China said that other nations should not interfere in the debate about free expression in Hong Kong because it is an "internal affair."

With all due respect to the PRC foreign ministry, the freedom of people to think, to express themselves, to belong to organizations, to associate with others is not an internal affair. It is a fundamental human right. The human dignity of the people of Hong Kong is of itself sufficient reason to approve this resolution, but if that were the sole justification for this resolution, then we would probably be considering thousands like it.

A second reason we act today is because it is in the interests of the United States to do so. In the Hong Kong Policy Act, approved unanimously by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President on October 5, 1992, the United States declared that, "Hong Kong plays an important role in today's regional and world economy. This role is reflected in strong economic, cultural and other ties with the United States that give the United States a strong interest in the continued vitality, prosperity and stability of Hong Kong."

Our law also declares that "support for democratization is a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy. As such, it naturally applies to United States policy toward Hong Kong. This will remain equally true after June 30, 1997," that of course being the date of the handover from the British to the Chinese of the territory of Hong Kong.

Finally, the law says, "The human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the United States and are directly relevant to United States interests in Hong Kong. A fully successful transition in the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong must safeguard human rights in and of themselves.

"The United States should play an active role, before, on, and after July 1, 1997, in maintaining Hong Kong's confidence and prosperity, Hong Kong's role as an international financial center, and the mutually beneficial ties between the people of the United States and the people of Hong Kong."

That is why we are here today. If we think back to the time prior to the handover, prior to 1997, we were assured that this could not happen, that it would not happen, and yet through an excretion of changes in the law, through inroads that are being made on the traditional freedoms that Hong Kongers have enjoyed, so slowly perhaps as to be imperceptible but now this one fell swoop suddenly very noticeable, the PRC is taking away the freedom of one country-two systems, that was guaranteed in 1997.

□ 1230

Our former colleague, Connie Mack, warned us in 1994, on the 10th anniversary of the Sino-British Declaration on

the question of Hong Kong, of the failure of the Communist Government of China to respect the declaration, even as of that date: "Immediately after signing the Joint Declaration, the PRC started working on the Basic Law, Hong Kong's post-1997 'mini-constitution.' The Basic Law was enacted not by Hong Kong's Legislative Council, the Legco, but by Beijing's rubber stamp National People's Congress that contravened the Joint Declaration. It subordinates the Legco to a Beijing-appointed executive; assigns a power of judicial interpretation to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, rather than to Hong Kong's courts; and it requires a law against 'subversion,' a concept unknown in the common law."

It is that illegitimate law against subversion that today the House revisits. This is what is about to take place in Hong Kong. If the world is silent, as this interruption, as this deprivation of freedom moves forward, then our liberties, too, will be at greater risk.

Hong Kong is a jewel for the entire planet. It is our hope that the freedom that Hong Kong has traditionally enjoyed will spread northward throughout the People's Republic of China, that that will be the ultimate result of one country, two systems, not the other way around. But what is happening now, as we meet here today, is that this island of freedom is being weighted down by the long-standing rule of the Communist Party in the People's Republic of China; that the law is simply a tool of the party itself and not independent.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the careful consideration that this Chamber is giving to this resolution. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations for bringing this resolution to the floor in a timely fashion, and I expect that all of our colleagues will vote in support of freedom at this important time in both China's history and our own.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H. Res. 277, a resolution supporting freedom and democracy in Hong Kong.

Throughout its modern history, Hong Kong has stood as a beacon of freedom and stability. With the Hong Kong people's ingenuity and hard work, the territory became a stable and prosperous democracy.

Since Hong Kong's 1997 change of status, the citizens of Hong Kong have faced the challenge of maintaining their civil liberties and democratic self-governance. While the Basic Law guarantees Hong Kong fifty-years of self-governance and freedom, the Beijing-appointed government of Hong Kong has been working to limit freedom in the territory.

I strongly support the goals of H. Res. 277. As a long-time friend and supporter of Hong Kong, I believe we must continue to support the Hong Kong people's efforts to preserve and advance the cause of freedom and democracy. I applaud the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for sponsoring this resolution and I will continue to work with my colleagues

to protect and advance freedom, democracy, and the rule of law in East Asia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has expired.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time having expired, the question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 277.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT ESCALATION OF ANTI-SEMITIC VIOLENCE WITHIN PARTICIPATING STATES OF OSCE IS OF PROFOUND CONCERN AND EFFORTS SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO PREVENT FUTURE OCCURRENCES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) expressing the sense of the Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 49

Whereas the expressions of anti-Semitism experienced throughout the region encompassing the participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) have included physical assaults, with some instances involving weapons or stones, arson of synagogues, and desecration of Jewish cultural sites, such as cemeteries and statues;

Whereas vicious propaganda and violence in many OSCE States against Jews, foreigners, and others portrayed as alien have reached alarming levels, in part due to the dangerous promotion of aggressive nationalism by political figures and others;

Whereas violence and other manifestations of xenophobia and discrimination can never be justified by political issues or international developments;

Whereas the Copenhagen Concluding Document adopted by the OSCE in 1990 was the first international agreement to condemn anti-Semitic acts, and the OSCE participating States pledged to "clearly and unequivocally condemn totalitarianism, racial and ethnic hatred, anti-Semitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds";

Whereas the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly at its meeting in Berlin in July 2002 unanimously adopted a resolution that, inter

alia, called upon participating States to “ensure aggressive law enforcement by local and national authorities, including thorough investigation of anti-Semitic criminal acts, apprehension of perpetrators, initiation of appropriate criminal prosecutions and judicial proceedings”;

Whereas Decision No. 6 adopted by the OSCE Ministerial Council at its Tenth Meeting in Porto, Portugal in December 2002 (the “Porto Ministerial Declaration”) condemned “the recent increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the OSCE area, recognizing the role that the existence of anti-Semitism has played throughout history as a major threat to freedom”;

Whereas the Porto Ministerial Declaration also urged “the convening of separately designated human dimension events on issues addressed in this decision, including on the topics of anti-Semitism, discrimination and racism and xenophobia”;

Whereas on December 10, 2002, at the Washington Parliamentary Forum on Confronting and Combating anti-Semitism in the OSCE Region, representatives of the United States Congress and the German Parliament agreed to denounce all forms of anti-Semitism and agreed that “anti-Semitic bigotry must have no place in our democratic societies”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) officials of the executive branch and Members of Congress should raise the issue of anti-Semitism in their bilateral contacts with other countries and at multilateral fora, including meetings of the Permanent Council of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Twelfth Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to be convened in July 2003;

(2) participating States of the OSCE should unequivocally condemn anti-Semitism (including violence against Jews and Jewish cultural sites), racial and ethnic hatred, xenophobia, and discrimination, as well as persecution on religious grounds whenever it occurs;

(3) participating States of the OSCE should ensure effective law enforcement by local and national authorities against criminal acts stemming from anti-Semitism, xenophobia, or racial or ethnic hatred, whether directed at individuals, communities, or property, including thorough investigation and prosecution of such acts;

(4) participating States of the OSCE should promote the creation of educational efforts throughout the region encompassing the participating States of the OSCE to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes among younger people, increase Holocaust awareness programs, and help identify the necessary resources to accomplish this goal;

(5) legislators in all OSCE participating States should play a leading role in combating anti-Semitism and ensure that the resolution adopted at the 2002 meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Berlin is followed up by a series of concrete actions at the national level; and

(6) the OSCE should organize a separately designated human dimension event on anti-Semitism as early as possible in 2003, consistent with the Porto Ministerial Declaration adopted by the OSCE at the Tenth Meeting of the OSCE Ministerial Council in December 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitism is a deadly disease of the heart that leads to violence, cruelty, and unspeakable acts of horror. The anti-Semite is, as Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel grimly wrote last week, an ideological fanatic and pathological racist: “An anti-Semite is someone who never met me, never heard of me, yet he hates me.”

While we all are aware and deplore the hate crimes and cowardly acts that are committed routinely by Hamas and their like-minded murderers, what is new, Mr. Speaker, is the enormous surge in anti-Semitic acts and the resurgence of hatred for Jews in Europe, the United States, and in Canada.

Just a brief look, Mr. Speaker, of some of the startling statistics makes the point. In France, for example, there was a 600 percent increase in anti-Semitic acts from the year 2001 to the year 2002. Thankfully, the French have moved with new legislation designed to not only chronicle and get a better handle on how often these hate crimes are occurring, but they are also trying to stop them.

The Anti-Defamation League, Mr. Speaker, did a survey that also showed a spike in five other countries of Europe. They found that 21 percent of the people in those five countries had strongly anti-Semitic perspectives or views. The ADL also looked at the United States and found that 17 percent of our own people in the United States had strong anti-Semitic views. If you extrapolate that, Mr. Speaker, that is about 35 million Americans. That is up 5 percent from just 5 years ago.

H. Con. Res. 49 recognizes this dangerous and alarming trend, condemns this ancient-modern scourge, and calls on each of the 55 countries that make up the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to take concrete steps to eradicate anti-Semitism. The resolution before us today is an unequivocal condemnation of violence against Jews and Jewish cultural sites, racial and ethnic hatred, xenophobia and discrimination, as well as persecution on religious grounds wherever it occurs.

The resolution calls on all the states of the OSCE to ensure effective law enforcement and prosecution of individuals perpetrating anti-Semitic violence as well as urging the parliaments of all those states to take concrete legislative action at the national level. We are encouraging, Mr. Speaker, the creation of education efforts to counter these anti-Semitic stereotypes and the attitudes that we are seeing increasingly among younger people. We are calling for an increase in Holocaust awareness programs, and seeking to identify necessary resources to accomplish these goals.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Commission on Security and Coopera-

tion in Europe, I chaired a congressional hearing and three international summits on anti-Semitism within the last year alone. Joined by my good friend and colleague from the German Bundestag, Gert Weisskirchen, at the three special summits, and my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who I thank as well for his good work on this, these summits have focused on this rising tide of anti-Semitism.

The summits, Mr. Speaker, were held in Berlin, in 2002; in Washington, in December of 2002; and in Vienna, earlier this year, in February. We heard from world renowned leaders, including Rabbi Israel Singer, President of the World Jewish Congress; Ambassador Alfred Moses, Abraham Foxman and Ken Jacobson of the Anti-Defamation League; Mark Levin from the NCSJ; Rabbi Andrew Baker of the American Jewish Committee; Dr. Shimon Samuels, director of the Weisenthal Center located in Paris; and many others, Amnesty International and other human rights' organizations, all of whom made very powerful statements about this alarming rise of hate directed towards Jews.

Let me just quote for my colleagues what Dr. Samuels said, very briefly: “The Holocaust, for 30 years, acted as a protective Teflon against blatant anti-Semitic expression. That Teflon has eroded, and what was considered distasteful and politically incorrect is becoming simply an opinion. But cocktail chatter at fine English dinners can end as Molotov cocktails against synagogues. Political correctness is also ending for others, as tolerance for multiculturalism gives way to populist voices in France, Italy, Austria, Denmark, Portugal, and the Netherlands. These countries' Jewish communities can be caught between the rock of radical Islamic violence and the hard place of a revitalized Holocaust-denying extreme right. Common cause must be sought between the victimized minorities against extremism and against fanaticism.”

Dr. Jacobson pointed out, and I quote, “Sadly, some European leaders have rationalized anti-Jewish attitudes and even more violent attacks against Jews as nothing more than a sign of popular frustration with events in the Middle East. Something to be expected, even understandable, they say.”

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing more and more about this idea of pretext; that there is a disagreement with the policies of the Israeli Government, that somehow that gives license and an ability and permission for some people to hate the Jews themselves. We can disagree, as we do on this House floor. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and I have been working on this for years, and of course the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). We disagree on some issues, but anti-Semitism? We do not hate. We do not use that as a pretext,

as a front to promote hatred. That is exactly what is happening in Europe, in the United States, and in Canada.

Let me point out too that, as a result of these summits, we have come up with an action plan. Mr. Weisskirchen and I have signed it, it has been agreed to by our commissions, and we are trying to promote it among all our States. Again, education, trying to get parliaments to step up to the plate, and trying to make a meaningful difference to mitigate and hopefully to end this terrible anti-Semitism.

Last week, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and I joined Rudy Giuliani in Vienna for an OSCE assembly focused on anti-Semitism. We have been doing it in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, but now the OSCE itself has taken up this important cause. And it will be followed up with a meeting, most likely in Berlin next year, to focus on anti-Semitism so that we rally the troops all over the world, starting with Europe, the U.S., and Canada to say "never again."

Let me also point out to my colleagues, and I thought his statement said it all, when Abraham Foxman, who gave riveting testimony at our Berlin conference, pointed out just recently in the Jerusalem Post, just a couple of days ago, and I would like to close with his statement, he said "Anti-Semitism is surging in the world to the extent unprecedented since the end of World War II. Europe must take seriously the ideology of anti-Semitism coming out of the Arab and Islamic world. It must denounce the deliberate targeting of Jews by terrorist groups, whether it be al Qaeda or Hamas. It must denounce the vicious anti-Semitic material in the Arab press and educational systems and call on Arab leaders to do something about it. It must understand that the Holocaust happened not only because Germany was taken over by the Nazis, who developed a massive military power to conquer most of Europe, but also by the complicity—active and passive—of other Europeans. Today, the great threat comes from the combination of the ideology of hatred with Islamic extremists to acquire weapons of mass destruction." And then he bottom lines it and says, "Let Europe never again be complicit in developments of this kind."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to go on record in a bipartisan way, Democrats, Republicans, Conservatives, Moderates, and Liberals to say anti-Semitism, never again, and we need to do it strongly today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of the resolution.

First, I want to commend my dear friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of our delegation to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, for his life-

long indefatigable and passionate advocacy of human rights, and his powerful opposition in all fora to anti-Semitism. We are all in his debt.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), of the Committee on International Relations, for moving this legislation so expeditiously to the floor. And I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the ranking Democrat on our OSCE delegation, for his outstanding work on behalf of all of the causes that the human rights community is interested in.

Mr. Speaker, as the only survivor of the Holocaust ever elected to Congress, I am acutely aware of the dangers of allowing anti-Semitism to go unchecked. The horrors of the Holocaust in World War II began with anti-Semitism. Growing up in Europe in the 1930s, I saw firsthand the horrendous results of anti-Semitic rhetoric, leading to the nightmare of anti-Semitic violence, and, ultimately, to the mass murder of 6 million innocent men, women and children.

Mr. Speaker, today, anti-Semitism in Europe, as well as in a number of other places in this world, is approaching the appalling levels that I personally experienced in the 1930s.

□ 1245

We cannot, we must not, and we will not sit idly by and ignore the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic rhetoric and anti-Semitic violence.

Our resolution notes that expressions of anti-Semitism in some European countries range from vicious propaganda to physical assaults, from the burning of synagogues to the desecration of cemeteries. Since the 1990 Copenhagen Concluding Document, a number of resolutions have been adopted by OSCE condemning anti-Semitism. In that spirit, I welcome this effort.

Our resolution urges officials of our executive branch and Members of Congress to raise the issue of anti-Semitism in their bilateral and multilateral meetings with all foreign government officials where appropriate and to condemn in the strongest possible terms not only anti-Semitism but racial and ethnic hatred, xenophobia, discrimination and religious persecution of all types. We urge all member countries of the OSCE to ensure effective law enforcement by local and national authorities against criminal actions stemming from anti-Semitism and other types of racial hatred.

Most importantly, our resolution calls upon all States to promote educational efforts to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes and to dramatically increase Holocaust awareness. Our best ammunition in this fight against anti-Semitism is education.

Mr. Speaker, the battle against this age-old and horrendous mental sickness will not be easily won, but I believe the recognition of the problem

and the call for actions to deal with it is the first critical step. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation which serves to eliminate the outrage of hate-filled anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be in the company of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) in cosponsoring this resolution. I rise in support of its passage and ask my colleagues to vote in its favor as well.

Mr. Speaker, one of the essential lessons of the Holocaust is that words lead to murder, that the teaching of contempt and acceptance of bigotry and anti-Semitism can lead to genocide. Today, over 50 years after the horrors of the Holocaust, anti-Semitism has again become a disease spreading throughout the world. In recent years I have witnessed its resurgence, particularly through my work relating to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and legislative efforts concerning religious freedom in Europe.

At the commission, resolution after resolution, statement after statement are filled with the rhetoric of hatred, using the international fora to further promote and generate support for an anti-Semitic agenda, an agenda which condemns a freedom-loving people and a democratic nation, while many times legitimizing those regimes that torture, oppress, and subjugate their own people.

As the previous chair of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and as the current chair of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, and as cochair along with my colleague and friend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) of the Congressional Task Force on Anti-Semitism, I have pressed European officials to take concrete steps to monitor, investigate and prosecute to the fullest extent of the law crimes that are borne out of hatred for the Jewish people.

In January of this year, for example, Jewish leaders in France came to me with concern and anxiety about the increasing example of vandalism and personal attacks against rabbis in that country. I immediately called on the French foreign ministry officials and French parliamentarians to address this grave matter.

The situation in France, however, is only a microcosm of a growing problem that is sweeping throughout many OSCE states. While I will not delve into details because my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), have already done

so, I will simply note, as has been said, we must learn the lessons and the mistakes of the past, or we are condemned to repeat them.

This is why it is imperative that we take immediate action to prevent further escalation of anti-Semitism and related violence, to help ensure that the evil of the Holocaust will never again be allowed to exist.

As Eli Wiesel, a Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace laureate has said, "A destruction, an annihilation that only man can provoke, only man can prevent." We can help prevent a repetition of history, and we can begin here today by voting in favor of this resolution. Let us adopt House Concurrent Resolution 49 and convey the commitment of the U.S. House of Representatives to work with our allies to confront and combat anti-Semitism and eradicate it from its roots.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the Helsinki Commission, who has demonstrated a passionate commitment to human rights and on all of the issues that that commission works with.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). There is no Member of this body who has done more in his lifetime to fight anti-Semitism than the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and I congratulate him for his effective leadership against anti-Semitism here and around the world.

I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of our OSCE delegation. I have the honor of being the ranking Democratic member. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who will be speaking shortly, is one of the commissioners. We have made the fight against anti-Semitism a top priority of our delegation. We have been effective in making it a top priority within the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

We have done that because we have seen a rise of anti-Semitism, physical assaults on individuals solely because they are Jewish, desecration of Jewish cultural sites, propaganda in the media have all been on the rise. We must have a zero tolerance policy about anti-Semitism.

The OSCE Helsinki Commission provides a unique opportunity for us to fight anti-Semitism. It not only has in its membership all of the countries of Europe, Canada and the United States, but it has the participation of our Mediterranean partners, which include Israel, Egypt and Jordan. The OSCE Helsinki Commission has had a history of effectively dealing with human rights issues, so that is why the United States leadership has been effective in bringing about the forums to deal with anti-Semitism. I know there was just a meeting in Vienna that the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

HASTINGS) participated in. We adopted in the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly last year a very strong resolution against anti-Semitism as a result of the U.S. leadership, and we have signed a letter of intent with Germany to spell out specific actions that we need to take in order to fight anti-Semitism.

We can never justify anti-Semitic actions by international developments or political issues. We need to have an action plan to fight anti-Semitism. We need to have strong laws that are adopted by our member states and enforced. We need to speak out against anti-Semitism as parliamentarians. Silence is not an option. As all my colleagues have expressed, we need educational programs for our children. The resolution says we need to create educational efforts throughout the region encompassing the participating states of OSCE to counter anti-Semitic stereotypes and attitudes among younger people, increase Holocaust awareness programs, and help identify the necessary resources to accomplish this goal. Our children are our future. In many of these states, we are finding there are counterproductive programs promoting anti-Semitism.

We need a proactive agenda. This resolution puts this body on record in strong support of our resolution within OSCE to continue our commitment to support action plans to stamp out anti-Semitism. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has been a champion not only of the fight against anti-Semitism but on behalf of all human rights causes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their extraordinary leadership on this important issue and so many others.

We are experiencing the worst outbreak of anti-Semitism in Europe since the end of Holocaust in 1945. Just under 60 years have passed since the defeat of Hitler and now swastikas have reappeared in Europe. They can be found sprayed on Jewish schools, drawn on gravestones in a desecrated Jewish cemetery, painted on the wall of a synagogue, and stitched on the flags of anti-Israel demonstrators, and in the hearts and minds of the people who attack rabbinical students and Jewish athletes.

When we allow intolerance and hatred to fester and flourish, we are faced with tragic consequences. Put simply, hatred, violence and prejudice must not be tolerated. Countries must speak out against anti-Semitic acts, but rhetoric is not enough. Words will not restore the hundreds of Jewish cultural and religious sites which have been

burned, desecrated and destroyed throughout Europe, and words alone will not prevent these tragedies from happening again.

Governments and institutions must condemn these acts as we do today, and they must ensure effective law enforcement against them. They must also promote tolerance education for their children. There is no question teaching children about the horror and tragedy of the Holocaust and other tragedies will create a generation of youth who are less likely to commit hate crimes and who are more likely to mature into adults who will envision and work towards peaceful world relations.

When this body passes H. Con. Res. 49, we will be spending a strong message to the world that anti-Semitism must be confronted and must be eradicated. I thank both leaders, particularly the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his extraordinary life commitment to ending anti-Semitism and for world peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who has been throughout his congressional career and prior to that an indefatigable fighter for human rights.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me this time, and before I go forward, I would be terribly remiss if I did not point out that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has spent his lifetime in the struggle that some of us come to with equal passion, but not the clarity that he brings to the issue.

I also am happy to support the resolution offered by the chairman of the Helsinki Commission and to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his continuing work in the area of human rights and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) as being a stalwart champion for human rights.

□ 1300

As Chairman SMITH has already mentioned, last week he and I had the privilege to represent the United States at the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's conference on anti-Semitism. A footnote right there. That conference came about because the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), myself and others on the Helsinki Commission along with colleagues in Europe brought it to the attention of the parliamentary assembly by way of resolution which we will introduce yet another resolution for follow-up purposes when we are in Rotterdam 1 week from now. But it was in this body that that conference's seed was planted. The conference, which was the first of its kind,

provided the OSCE's 55 member states and NGOs with an opportunity to discuss ways in which governments can work to combat anti-Semitism within their borders and abroad.

Today's resolution is an important symbolic statement of the House that the United States will not stand idly by while many European governments neglect a rise in anti-Semitism. We must work with our allies and not hesitate to apply pressure when needed to ensure that governments properly address increases in anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination.

A few years ago, there were hopes that anti-Semitism was gradually declining and restricted to fringe elements such as neo-Nazis, white supremacists and certain conspiracy theorists. However, recent developments throughout much of Europe and the Middle East suggest that there is a resurgent anti-Semitism with a much broader base and message that resonates at an alarming level. Many European leaders have formally recognized the resurgence of anti-Semitism in their countries and have begun to take the necessary steps to stop this spreading virus. But still, more must be done to ensure that what occurred to the Jewish and minority communities in Europe during World War II will never happen again.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the fight against bigotry and xenophobia is an ongoing struggle as many of us know from our own personal experience. Last week when the gentleman from New Jersey and I were in Vienna, we heard from a woman whose name is Rosalia Abella of the Ontario Court of Appeals. As she noted in one of the more poignant statements made at that conference, "Indifference is injustice's incubator." Indeed it is.

Now is the time for the United States to be vocal and now is the time for the House to be active as it is today under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California. Today is not a day for complacency. If we remain silent, then there will be no tomorrow. We cannot legislate morality, we cannot legislate love, but we can teach tolerance and we can lead by example.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Smith-Cardin-Lantos resolution. I am a cosponsor of this resolution because I am deeply concerned about the surge of anti-Semitism in Europe and throughout other parts of the world, but particularly in Europe.

This is not a problem that simply can be monitored. It must be actively and aggressively dealt with, for we must never forget that just 60 years ago, Europe saw the worst scourge of systematic, government-ordained hatred, violence and murder in the history of mankind, in what was an unbelievable Holocaust.

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has recognized and condemned anti-Semitic violence in its member states. At its parliamentary assembly in July 2002, the OSCE resolved to aggressively enforce laws and investigate anti-Semitic criminal acts. It is important that the United States openly support the OSCE's resolution and actively encourage it to address hatred and prevent violence in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, there are several topics on which the United States and Europe disagree. There must be no disagreement, however, on the absolute right of the Jewish people to practice their religion freely and to live in peace and prosperity. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe should not only investigate anti-Semitic crimes but also promote and facilitate discussions that address the root causes of xenophobic hatred.

I encourage my colleagues and the administration to take advantage of bilateral meetings with our European counterparts to reaffirm our deep commitment to the prevention of violence in Europe.

I again thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge its adoption.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for sponsoring this crucial piece of legislation. I am very aware of the danger of being inactive about the threat of anti-Semitism. It was anti-Semitism that was responsible for the horrors of the Holocaust, the most horrible crime committed against the Jewish people ever. Sadly, I have to say here today that nearly 60 years after the end of World War II, anti-Semitism in Europe, in many of the OSCE member states, is on the rise again. Once again we witness evil propaganda, physical attacks against Jews, the burning of Jewish sites and the desecration of synagogues. We must not stand aside and ignore this grave escalation of anti-Semitic violence and hatred.

This resolution addresses this threat. It particularly calls on administration officials and Members of Congress to focus on anti-Semitism in their bilateral and multilateral meetings. It calls upon OSCE member states to swiftly bring anti-Semites to justice and to focus on educational endeavors to fight anti-Semitic stereotypes.

I would also like to point out that this piece of legislation is similar to a resolution I introduced last year. House Resolution 393 also addresses the anti-Semitic threat in the OSCE region. It urges European governments to provide security and safety of the

Jewish communities, to prosecute and punish perpetrators of anti-Semitic violence, and to cultivate a climate in which all forms of anti-Semitism are rejected.

I was proud that my colleagues in Congress joined me in sending this message to the European Union, but we must go further. Anti-Semitism continues to fester throughout the OSCE region. This resolution is the right follow-up to my legislation that passed in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of anti-Semitism is looming large and our fight against it is far from over, but I believe that recognizing this problem and taking action is critical. I therefore urge all of my colleagues to strongly support House Resolution 49 sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey. I would ask them all to vote for this resolution unanimously. I want to thank the gentleman from California again for his work on this resolution and all my colleagues in bringing this to the House floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California as I have over the years on many human rights issues, and this is a human rights issue. Racism, religious hatred, these are things that decent people must condemn and we must unite in our strong opposition wherever this type of vile behavior and vile thought patterns emerge. We must recognize that there are, however, people who exploit these type of negative feelings and this type of racial hatred. Anti-Semitism is perhaps the epitome of this ignorance and irrationality and mindless hatred and it is again raising its ugly head both in Europe and in the United States.

Let us note that over 10 years ago, a major political figure in the United States referred to New York City as "Hymietown." What is important is the fact that he was winked at and that for 10 years after that statement, he still remained a recognized leader. That did tremendous harm in America's black community. It sent a horrible message to young blacks and we are paying some of the price of an increased anti-Semitism today in our black community by mistakes that we made 10 years ago by not condemning that and other types of horrible remarks that should never have been made or accepted in our political debate.

In Europe today, we see that same kind of winking going on. Oh, yes, people are ignoring statements that are being made that are totally unacceptable to people who believe in civilized behavior and are opposed to this type of vile hatred, the vile hatred in relationship to their fellow man. This is an alarm bell today. I am very proud to stand here with the gentleman from

California and the gentleman from New Jersey ringing the alarm bell. We are not going to sit idly by and wink at an increase in this level of hatred towards our Jewish friends nor towards any other minority in the Western democracies. The Western democracies, our friends in Europe, just like we in the United States, have to remain vigilant and it is up to us as leaders of this society and the democratic leaders in Europe to call to task those who would wink and would not condemn this type of vicious trend in their society. We can cut it short now. Let us stand together united against anti-Semitism and all such hatred.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in terms that we do not usually use on this floor but in terms that may be familiar to our friends in Europe, in the American context, I am a man of the left. I voted against the war in Iraq. I will vote for the resolution later about Israel's right to respond to terrorism, but I will put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tom Friedman's article urging them to think about prudence and restraint. I think the settlements are by and large a mistake. And I speak today in defense of this resolution, specifically to others on the left in Europe, many of whom have in my judgment been morally deficient in the obligation we have to speak out against prejudice and injustice across the board. Those who hold to liberal values have no moral right to put an ideological screen between victims and those values, and those on the left who use an excuse of a disagreement with the policy of the Sharon government or the Bush government or anybody else as a reason to be soft on anti-Semitism betray liberalism and betray its values.

By the way, with regard to the government of Israel, let me speak to the people on the left. I disagree with some aspects of its policy, but I staunchly defend its right to exist. But even more important, by every value that I as a liberal hold dear, the government and society of Israel is quite morally superior to any of its neighbors, and to focus only on those aspects of disagreement and to ignore its longstanding commitment to civil rights and civil liberties, in fact I think our society, the United States, has a good deal to learn from the society of Israel about how you deal with external threats and still show a respect for civil liberties.

I thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this forward and the gentleman from Illinois for his support. I want to reiterate as a man on the left who shares a great deal of both general values and specific policy prescriptions with many on the left in Europe, I am appalled at those who fail to carry out our liberal principles fully and across the board. A vigorous and ongoing condemnation of anti-Semi-

tism is a requisite part of that commitment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the most recent conference that was held in Vienna, I just want to again thank the great work that Ambassador Minikes did, our Ambassador to the OSCE. He has worked very, very hard to help put together that anti-Semitism conference. He did an outstanding job. Ambassador Cliff Sobel, our Ambassador to the Netherlands, also worked very hard on it as well, as did many others in the State Department. It was a joint effort. Again I want to thank Rudy Giuliani for the good work he did in leading that.

Let me just also say that, Mr. Speaker, next week in Rotterdam we will have an OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and I plan on offering another resolution on anti-Semitism at that and hopefully we continue not only this dialogue but this outrage that we are expressing about intolerance. The more we raise our voices, the more we have mutually reinforcing policies, including good law, good law enforcement and hopefully a chronicling of these misdeeds so that law enforcement knows that they do indeed have a problem. This has been a particular problem in Europe, where hate crimes are committed and they are not attributed to the hate crimes that they represent.

□ 1315

The more we chronicle, the more we will see that there is an explosion of anti-Semitism in Europe. This is a good resolution. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and I thank the gentleman and chairman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for moving this bill expeditiously through the committee and for his strong support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations and a fighter for human rights.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for putting this before our body.

I grew up hearing about anti-Semitism from my grandparents and my parents, things that I could not believe could have ever happened; but the anti-Semitism acts that they spoke of seemed like historic oddities to me, something from a distant time and a distant place. I never dreamed, never dreamed that anti-Semitism could ever rear its ugly head again during my lifetime or the lifetime of my children.

Especially after World War II, I thought Europe and the rest of the world had learned a very important and valuable lesson. I ran for Congress so that I could speak out against issues

that I thought were horrific; and anti-Semitism, and its continued existence on this planet, is certainly something that I wish to speak out against. I am glad that we are condemning anti-Semitism in no uncertain terms and putting the United States Congress on record and speaking out forcefully against this horrible scourge and plague.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time for purposes of yielding the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Helsinki Commission for yielding me this time. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this very important resolution.

This is about anti-Semitism. But more broadly than that, it is about hate. It is about the human inclination from time to time to hate others who are different, to discriminate against others who are different, who have a different color of skin, who have a different religion, who have a different national origin. More human violence perhaps has been perpetrated in the name of those distinctions and prejudices and hate than any other.

It is important that we regularly and strongly and without equivocation speak out against those who would perpetrate and spread hate in our world, in our country, in our communities.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, for their leadership on this issue. It is an appropriate statement for us to make as the representatives of a free and tolerant people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this debate to end without adding my voice in support of the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished fighter for human rights.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, many people thought that the Holocaust cleansed the Western world of anti-Semitism, that the catastrophe, the mass murder, and the genocide in the Holocaust caused the civilized world or at least the Western part of the civilized world to recoil in such horror that anti-Semitism would

not be a major problem again. We now know that maybe it did that for a generation or two, but that the scourge of anti-Semitism is returning in great and terrible force in its ancient homeland of Europe and other places.

Today we have two major problems of anti-Semitism: in Europe and in the Muslim world. It is very appropriate that we adopt this resolution today to ask the governments of Europe through the OSCE and individually to crack down on anti-Semitism, to speak out against it, to act against it because many of the governments of Europe, many of the parts of the political left in Europe and elsewhere as well as the right have not done so. They ought to do so. And this resolution is fitting and appropriate to adopt today for that purpose.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 49, expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

I begin by praising the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe for their conference this past weekend devoted to the issues of anti-Semitism and how to combat it. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is the largest regional security organization in the world with 55 participating countries from Europe, Central Asia, and North America. The OSCE has a comprehensive and cooperative approach to security, stressing preventative diplomacy and human rights.

The conference last weekend was the first high level OSCE conference devoted specifically to the issue of anti-Semitism. Over 400 government and nongovernment officials attended.

The conference took place at Vienna's Hofburg Palace. This same location is where Hitler stood, 65 years ago, proclaiming Austria's annexation to a cheering crowd of thousands. Sixty-five years later, what can we say about tolerance and diversity in Europe? What can we say about Human Rights worldwide? Specifically, 65 years after the beginning of the worst genocide in our time, what can we say we have learned about anti-Semitism and the horrors of racial hatred?

Much has changed since then. Yet today there are both overt and subtle versions of anti-Semitism, in the United States and abroad. Physical assaults, arson at synagogues and desecration of Jewish cultural sites are occurring. Unfortunately, government officials are not speaking harshly enough against them.

The conference on anti-Semitism opened a day after the Romanian Government retracted an earlier claim that "there was no Holocaust" on Romanian soil. In Greece, a recent newspaper cartoon had one Israeli soldier telling the other, "we were not in Dachau concentration camp to survive, but to learn."

France has experienced a six-fold increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the space of a year. In Poland, the word "Jewish" is used as a term of abuse for Polish soccer fans. In other parts of Europe, claims are made that Jews had forewarning of the September 11th

attacks at the Pentagon and World Trade Towers.

The existence of anti-Semitism has played throughout history as a major threat to freedom. Participating states of the OSCE should unequivocally condemn anti-Semitism, racial and ethnic hatred and xenophobia, and they need to be loud and clear in their message.

We cannot allow future generations to be taught a distorted view of history. Prejudice must be rooted out of textbooks, governments must speak out against these wrongdoings, and anti-Semitic actions must be classified as hate crimes. We also need to ensure effective law enforcement. Finally, we must promote the creation of educational efforts and we must increase Holocaust awareness. I abhor and stand against all forms of hatred.

If action had been taken in the 1930s, many lives could have been saved. There are so many lessons of history that need to be learned, lest they not be repeated. For that reason I support H. Con. Res. 49.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker: I will reluctantly vote in favor of this legislation, partly because it is simply a sense of Congress resolution. But I am concerned about this bill and the others like it we face with regularity on the floor of Congress. We all condemn violence against innocents, whether it is motivated by hatred, prejudice, greed, jealousy, or whatever else. But that is not what this legislation is really about. It is about the Congress of the United States presuming to know—and to legislate on—the affairs of European countries. First, this is the United States Congress. We have no Constitutional authority to pass legislation affecting foreign countries. Second, when we get involved in matters such as this we usually get it wrong. H. Con. Res. 45 is an example of us getting it wrong on both fronts.

This legislation refers to the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe as if it is a purely home-grown phenomenon, as if native residents of European countries are suddenly committing violent crimes against Jews. But I think we are only getting part of the story here. What is absent from the legislation is mention of the well-reported fact that much of the anti-Jewish violence in Europe is perpetrated by recent immigrants from Muslim countries of the Middle East and Africa. Reporting on a firebombing of a Synagogue in Marseille, France, for example, the New York Times quotes the longtime president of that region's Jewish Council, Charles Haddad, as saying, "This is not anti-Semitic violence; it's the Middle East conflict that's playing out here."

Therefore, part of the problem in many European countries is the massive immigration from predominantly Muslim countries, where new residents bring their hatreds and prejudices with them. Those European politicians who recognize this growing problem—there are now 600,000 Jews in France and five million Muslims—are denounced as racist and worse. While I do not oppose immigration, it must be admitted that massive immigration from vastly different cultures brings a myriad of potential problems and conflicts. These are complicated issues for we in Congress to deal with here in the United States. Yes, prejudice and hatred are evil and must be opposed, but it is absurd for us to try to solve these problems in countries overseas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 49.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on three of the motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

- S. 858, by the yeas and nays;
 - H.R. 2474, by the yeas and nays;
 - H.J. Res. 49, by the yeas and nays.
- Proceedings on other postponed questions will resume later.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 858.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 858, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 2, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Bishop (GA)	Buyer
Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Calvert
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Camp
Akin	Blackburn	Cannon
Alexander	Blumenauer	Cantor
Allen	Blunt	Capito
Andrews	Boehrlert	Capps
Baca	Boehner	Capuano
Bachus	Bonilla	Cardin
Baird	Bonner	Cardoza
Baldwin	Bono	Carson (IN)
Ballance	Boozman	Carson (OK)
Ballenger	Boswell	Carter
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Case
Barton (TX)	Boyd	Castle
Bass	Bradley (NH)	Chabot
Beauprez	Brady (PA)	Chocola
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Clay
Bell	Brown (OH)	Clyburn
Bereuter	Brown (SC)	Coble
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Cole
Berman	Burgess	Collins
Berry	Burns	Cooper
Biggart	Burr	Costello
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Cox

Cramer	Hyde	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)	Udall (NM)	Weldon (PA)	Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas (OK)
Crane	Inslee	Neugebauer	Terry	Upton	Weller	Boehler	Gephardt	Lynch
Crenshaw	Isakson	Ney	Thomas	Van Hollen	Wexler	Boehner	Gerlach	Majette
Crowley	Israel	Northup	Thompson (CA)	Velazquez	Whitfield	Bonilla	Gibbons	Maloney
Culberson	Issa	Norwood	Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wicker	Bonner	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Cummings	Istook	Nunes	Thornberry	Vitter	Wilson (NM)	Bono	Gillmor	Markey
Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Nussle	Tiahrt	Walden (OR)	Wilson (SC)	Boozman	Gingrey	Marshall
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Tiberi	Walsh	Wolf	Boswell	Gonzalez	Matheson
Davis (CA)	(TX)	Obey	Tierney	Wamp	Woolsey	Boucher	Goode	Matsui
Davis (FL)	Janklow	Olver	Toomey	Waters	Wu	Boyd	Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Ortiz	Towns	Watson	Wynn	Bradley (NH)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (TN)	Jenkins	Osborne	Turner (OH)	Watt	Young (AK)	Brady (PA)	Goss	McCollum
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (CT)	Ose	Turner (TX)	Waxman		Brady (TX)	Granger	McCotter
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Otter	Udall (CO)	Weldon (FL)		Brown (OH)	Graves	McCreery
Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Owens				Brown (SC)	Green (TX)	McDermott
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Oxley				Brown, Corrine	Green (WI)	McGovern
DeGette	Jones (NC)	Pallone	Paul	Sensenbrenner		Burgess	Greenwood	McHugh
Delahunt	Jones (OH)	Pascrell				Burns	Grijalva	McInnis
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pastor				Burr	Gutierrez	McIntyre
DeLay	Kaptur	Payne	Baker	Fletcher	Saxton	Burton (IN)	Gutknecht	McKeon
DeMint	Keller	Pearce	Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Shadegg	Buyer	Hall	McNulty
Deutsch	Kelly	Pelosi	Brown-Waite,	Hayworth	Skelton	Calvert	Harman	Meehan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kennedy (MN)	Pence	Ginny	Hunter	Smith (WA)	Camp	Harris	Meek (FL)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	Conyers	John	Stenholm	Cannon	Hart	Meeks (NY)
Dicks	Kildee	Peterson (PA)	Cubin	Kolbe	Tauzin	Cantor	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Petri	Everett	Larsen (WA)	Weiner	Capito	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Doggett	Kind	Pickering	Flake	Renzi (FL)	Young (FL)	Capps	Hayes	Michaud
Dooley (CA)	King (IA)	Pitts				Capuano	Hefley	Millender-
Doolittle	King (NY)	Platts				Cardin	Hensarling	McDonald
Doyle	Kingston	Pomroy				Cardoza	Hergert	Miller (FL)
Dreier	Kirk	Porter				Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller (MI)
Duncan	Kleczka	Portman				Carson (OK)	Hinchee	Miller (NC)
Dunn	Kline	Price (NC)				Carter	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Edwards	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)				Case	Hobson	Miller, George
Ehlers	Kucinich	Putnam				Castle	Hoefel	Mollohan
Emanuel	LaHood	Quinn				Chabot	Hoekstra	Moore
Emerson	Lampson	Radanovich				Clay	Moran (KS)	Holden
Engel	Langevin	Rahall				Clyburn	Holt	Moran (VA)
English	Lantos	Ramstad				Coble	Honda	Murphy
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Rangel				Cole	Hooley (OR)	Murtha
Etheridge	Latham	Regula				Collins	Hostettler	Musgrave
Evans	LaTourette	Rehberg				Cooper	Houghton	Myrick
Farr	Leach	Reyes				Costello	Hoyer	Nadler
Fattah	Lee	Reynolds				Cox	Hulshof	Napolitano
Feeney	Levin	Rodriguez				Cramer	Hyde	Neal (MA)
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)				Crane	Inslee	Nethercutt
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)				Crenshaw	Isakson	Neugebauer
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)				Crowley	Israel	Ney
Forbes	Linder	Rohrabacher				Culberson	Issa	Northup
Ford	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen				Cummings	Istook	Norwood
Fossella	LoBiondo	Ross				Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Rothman				Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Frelinghuysen	Lowey	Roybal-Allard				Davis (CA)	(TX)	Oberstar
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Royce				Davis (FL)	Janklow	Obey
Gallely	Lucas (OK)	Ruppersberger				Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Olver
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Rush				Davis (TN)	Jenkins	Ortiz
Gephardt	Majette	Ryan (OH)				Davis, Jo Ann	John	Osborne
Gerlach	Maloney	Ryan (WI)				Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Ose
Gibbons	Manzullo	Ryun (KS)				Deal (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Otter
Gilchrest	Markey	Sabo				DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Gillmor	Marshall	Sanchez, Linda				DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
Gingrey	Matheson	T.				Delahunt	Jones (NC)	Pallone
Gonzalez	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta				DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Pascrell
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Sanders				DeLay	Kanjorski	Pastor
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin				DeMint	Kaptur	Paul
Gordon	McCollum	Schakowsky				Deutsch	Keller	Payne
Goss	McCotter	Schiff				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kelly	Pearce
Granger	McCreery	Schrock				Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy (MN)	Pelosi
Graves	McDermott	Scott (GA)				Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Pence
Green (TX)	McGovern	Scott (VA)				Dingell	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Green (WI)	McHugh	Serrano				Doggett	Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)
Greenwood	McInnis	Sessions				Dooley (CA)	Kind	Petri
Grijalva	McIntyre	Shaw				Doolittle	King (IA)	Pickering
Gutierrez	McKeon	Shays				Doyle	King (NY)	Pitts
Gutknecht	McNulty	Sherman				Dreier	Kingston	Platts
Hall	Meek (FL)	Sherwood				Duncan	Kirk	Pomroy
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus				Dunn	Kleczka	Porter
Harris	Menendez	Shuster				Edwards	Kline	Portman
Hart	Mica	Simmons				Ehlers	Knollenberg	Price (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Simpson				Emanuel	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Slaughter				Emerson	LaHood	Putnam
Hayes	McDonald	Smith (MI)				Engel	Lampson	Quinn
Hefley	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)				English	Langevin	Quinn
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)				Eshoo	Lantos	Radanovich
Hergert	Miller (NC)	Snyder				Etheridge	Larson (CT)	Rahall
Hill	Miller, Gary	Solis				Evans	Latham	Ramstad
Hinchee	Miller, George	Souder				Farr	LaTourette	Rangel
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Spratt				Fattah	Leach	Regula
Hobson	Moore	Stark				Feeney	Lee	Rehberg
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Stearns				Ferguson	Levin	Reyes
Holden	Moran (VA)	Strickland				Filner	Lewis (CA)	Reynolds
Holt	Murphy	Stupak				Foley	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Honda	Murtha	Sullivan				Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)
Hooley (OR)	Musgrave	Sweeney				Ford	Linder	Rogers (KY)
Hostettler	Myrick	Tancredo				Fossella	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)
Houghton	Nadler	Tauscher				Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Hoyer	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)				Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Hulshof	Neal (MA)					Frost	Lowey	Ross
						Gallely	Lucas (KY)	Rothman

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—23

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1342

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

TEMPORARY AUTHORITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL HUNGER CENTER TO AWARD BILL EMERSON AND MICKEY LELAND HUNGER FELLOWSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2474, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2474, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Baker	Bereuter
Ackerman	Baldwin	Berkley
Aderholt	Ballance	Berman
Akin	Ballenger	Berry
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Biggert
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Bass	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Beauprez	Bishop (UT)
Bachus	Becerra	Blackburn
Baird	Bell	Blumenauer

Roybal-Allard Slaughter
 Royce Smith (MI)
 Ruppertsberger Smith (NJ)
 Rush Smith (TX)
 Ryan (OH) Snyder
 Ryan (WI) Solis
 Ryun (KS) Souder
 Sabo Spratt
 Sanchez, Linda Stark
 T. Stearns
 Sanchez, Loretta Strickland
 Sanders Stupak
 Sandlin Sullivan
 Schakowsky Sweeney
 Schiff Tancredo
 Schrock Tanner
 Scott (GA) Tauscher
 Scott (VA) Tauzin
 Sensenbrenner Taylor (MS)
 Serrano Taylor (NC)
 Sessions Terry
 Shaw Thomas
 Shays Thompson (CA)
 Sherman Thompson (MS)
 Sherwood Thornberry
 Shimkus Tiahrt
 Shuster Tiberi
 Simmons Tierney
 Simpson Toomey

Towns
 Turner (OH)
 Turner (TX)
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)

[Roll No. 314]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldwin
 Ballance
 Ballenger
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bass
 Beauprez
 Becerra
 Bell
 Bereuter
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggart
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Burgess
 Burns
 Burr
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carson (IN)
 Carson (OK)
 Carter
 Case
 Castle
 Chabot
 Clay
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole
 Collins
 Cooper
 Costello
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crane
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart, L.

Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)

Sabo
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrock
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson

Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Turner (OH)
 Turner (TX)
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett (SC) Flake
 Bishop (GA) Fletcher
 Brown-Waite, Franks (AZ)
 Ginny Hayworth
 Chocola Hunter
 Conyers Kolbe
 Cubin Larsen (WA)
 Everett Renzi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1351

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Congressional Hunger Center to award Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships for fiscal years 2003 and 2004."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 313 I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANT SERVICE PROVIDED BY FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE ON OCCASION OF ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 49.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 49, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

NOT VOTING—25

Barrett (SC) Flake
 Brown-Waite, Fletcher
 Ginny Franks (AZ)
 Cantor Hayworth
 Chocola Hunter
 Conyers Kolbe
 Cubin Larsen (WA)
 DeMint Linder
 Everett Miller (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1400

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I was attending Congressman Bob Stump's funeral service today and missed votes on the following measures:

1. On motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 858—Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Extension Act, roll No. 312. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

2. On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2474—to require that funds made available for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships be administered through the Congressional Hunger Center, roll No. 313. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

3. On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.J. Res. 49—recognizing the important service to the Nation provided by the Foreign Agriculture Service of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of its 50th anniversary,

roll No. 314. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to a meeting with President Bush at the White House, I unfortunately missed three recorded votes on the House floor earlier today.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that had I not been unavoidably detained at this meeting, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 312 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 858); "yes" on rollcall vote No. 313 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 2474); and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 314 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.J. Res. 49).

□ 1400

CALLING ON CHINA TO IMMEDIATELY AND UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE DR. YANG JIANLI

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 199) calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China immediately and unconditionally to release Dr. Yang Jianli, calling on the President of the United States to continue working on behalf of Dr. Yang Jianli for his release, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 199

Whereas according to the United States Department of State's 2002 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China, the Government of the People's Republic of China has "continued to commit numerous and serious [human rights] abuses", including "instances of . . . arbitrary arrest and detention, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process";

Whereas according to the 2002 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China, "the country's criminal procedures were not in compliance with international standards", "the lack of due process in the judicial system remained a serious problem", and "authorities routinely violated legal protections in the cases of political dissidents";

Whereas Dr. Yang Jianli, an internationally renowned scholar, prodemocracy activist, and President of the Foundation for China in the 21st Century, is an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence into the United States;

Whereas Dr. Yang Jianli has been detained incommunicado by the Government of the People's Republic of China since April 26, 2002, when he was arrested for reportedly entering China with false or incomplete identity documents;

Whereas according to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights Resolution 1997/38, "prolonged incommunicado detention may . . . itself constitute a form of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment", which is prohibited by international law;

Whereas Dr. Yang Jianli has been deprived of his basic human rights by being denied access to legal counsel and contact with his wife and two children (who are United States citizens), and has also been denied his right to trial within a reasonable time or to release;

Whereas on May 7, 2003, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention ex-

pressed the opinion that "[t]he non-observance of Mr. Yang Jianli's right to a fair trial is of such gravity as to give his deprivation of liberty an arbitrary character. Therefore, his arrest and detention is arbitrary being in contravention of Article 9 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and of Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights"; and

Whereas the arbitrary imprisonment and the violation of the human rights of United States citizens and permanent resident aliens by the Government of the People's Republic of China are sources of continuing, grave concern to the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) condemns and deplores the incommunicado detention of Dr. Yang Jianli, and calls for his immediate and unconditional release;

(B) condemns and deplores the lack of due process afforded to Dr. Yang;

(C) strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to respond to the repeated requests by Members of the House of Representatives for information about Dr. Yang's whereabouts and condition; and

(D) strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider the implications for the broader relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China of detaining permanent resident aliens of the United States without providing them access to legal counsel or family members; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States—

(A) should make the immediate release of Dr. Yang Jianli by the Government of the People's Republic of China a top concern of United States foreign policy;

(B) should continue to make every effort to assist Dr. Yang Jianli and his family while discussions of his release are ongoing;

(C) should make it clear to the Government of the People's Republic of China that the detention of United States citizens and permanent resident aliens and the infliction of human rights violations on these groups are not in the interest of the Government of the People's Republic of China because they create obstacles to improved bilateral relations and cooperation with the United States; and

(D) should reiterate the deep concern of the United States regarding the continued imprisonment of Dr. Yang Jianli and other United States citizens and permanent resident aliens whose human rights are being violated, and discuss their legal status and immediate humanitarian needs with the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think as every Member of this body knows, the PRC and its leadership in Beijing would love to be regarded as a respected member of the international community. In pursuit of that goal, however, the PRC has sought and obtained membership in the World Trade Organization; and it has lobbied and received the Beijing Olympics of 2008. However, trade volume alone, and there has been a great deal of trade volume particularly between the U.S. and China, is not really a measure of success, I would say to my colleagues. What really determines the quality of a country is how it treats its own citizens, and how it respects fundamental human rights.

History shows that some very unsavory regimes held the Olympic games. We all remember the Nazi Olympic Games prior to the Second World War, but holding a game, having trade, having the air of respectability does not necessarily mean that it is a respectable regime.

The government of Beijing has an enormous way to go, I would respectfully submit, to earn the international respect that it craves. The Chinese government, and I consider it to be a dictatorship, but if they really hope to earn respectability in the eyes of the world, they need to make some very needed fundamental changes, and there is a case in point that we raise today, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for bringing this resolution before us today.

Dr. Yang Jianli is a compelling case. H. Res. 199, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) highlights the case of this U.S. lawful permanent resident who has been unjustly detained incommunicado inside China since April 26, not of this year, but of last year, 14 months. Mr. Yang was arrested for reportedly entering China with false or incompletely identifying documents, has been denied access to counsel, contact with his wife Christina Fu and their two children, Anita and Aaron, and his right to a trial within a reasonable time.

Frankly, Beijing remains more concerned about the research, at least that is our belief, that the internationally respected scholar Dr. Yang, who was conducting studies regarding labor unrest in China, rather than how he got into the country. It is all about what he was studying.

Dr. Yang's research points to the dark side of the Chinese economic miracle, the so-called workers' paradise, where the working class remains the main victim of unemployment and forced early retirement due to the restructuring of State-owned enterprises. That then is Dr. Yang's major sin in Beijing's eyes. He was documenting the anger of workers directed at party bosses mired in personnel greed and corruption despite their official pledge to serve the people.

Beijing's loss of face in this case has only been compounded by the recent determination by the United States Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, which found that Mr. Yang's detention is arbitrary and in direct contravention of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. As the U.N. working group has so clearly pointed out, the continued arbitrary detention of this man is not the action of a great nation which seeks the full respect of the international community.

The U.S. House of Representatives today is sending a clear, not ambiguous, message to the government of Beijing: Let Dr. Yang go, let him come home to his wife, his children. His wife is here with us and his children are on the floor of this House right now.

We care about this man. We care about it in a bipartisan way, Democrats and Republicans. A lot divides us in this Chamber. The case of Dr. Yang unites us.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for moving this resolution forward so expeditiously, but I particularly want to commend my dear friend and distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for his outstanding leadership on this resolution and indeed on all human rights issues.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House addresses one human rights case that is unfortunately part of a much larger trend in modern day China. Over the past several years, the Chinese government has deliberately targeted naturalized Americans born in China and Chinese citizens permanently residing in the United States for harassment and imprisonment in the People's Republic of China.

Instead of, as one would expect, welcoming Chinese-American talent, the People's Republic of China is sending the message to the Chinese diaspora that it returns to China at its own considerable risk.

Mr. Speaker, in the case addressed in this resolution, Dr. Yang Jianli is a scholar and a leader of a prominent human rights organization. He is a permanent legal resident of the United States. He returned to the People's Republic of China in April of last year, and he has been detained incommunicado ever since that time. He has a wife and two children in the United States, all of whom are American citizens, and he has been unable to communicate with his family since the moment of his detention. He has been denied access to legal counsel.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that Dr. Yang be released and allowed to return

to his family in the United States as soon as possible. I would also urge the executive branch of our government to make his release a priority. Until Dr. Yang is released, an ominous shadow will lie over U.S.-Chinese relations. It is absolutely incomprehensible and insane that this great nation of 1.2 billion people should keep an American citizen, the father of two small American children, incommunicado in a Communist prison in China.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for introducing this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Does the gentlewoman from Florida seek unanimous consent to control the balance of the time?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the chairman of the House Policy Conference.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding me the time.

I too rise in strong support of H. Res. 199 calling on the government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Yang Jianli.

Dr. Yang is being imprisoned for his love of democracy and his love of country. As a tireless fighter for human rights and democracy in China, Dr. Yang has remained faithful to his conscience and to his cause, even at the risk of imperiling his career and his life.

Nearly 15 years ago, after studying in the United States for 4 years, Dr. Yang suspended his graduate studies and returned to the land of his birth, to China, to support the students who were working for democracy in Beijing. On June 4, 1989, he watched as the tanks rolled in Tiananmen Square and narrowly escaped himself while his fellow students and activists were imprisoned and executed.

Throughout this ordeal his wife Christina Fu did not know if he was even alive. Today, Christina is being tortured in a living hell once more because once again she does not know whether the Chinese Communist Party will return her husband alive.

Her husband's imprisonment violates all of the procedures and rules that the PRC has set out in law, and it confirms our worst fears, that when it comes to the denial of human rights, nothing in the People's Republic of China has really changed since 1989.

Today's totalitarian regime continues to view freedom and liberty as dangerous threats to the existing order and acts accordingly, punishing democracy activists like Dr. Yang with ruthless impunity.

He is a permanent resident of the United States. His family lives here. His wife Christina is with us in the Chamber as are his children Aaron and Anita. I have met with Christina and with his family many times over the last several months, and we have tried in every way to send our concerns to the rulers in Beijing. This American family deserves to have their father back, and this man, whose human rights are being abridged by the PRC's violation of its own laws and every international covenant that it had signed, deserves basic fairness.

Dr. Yang has been held incommunicado in the People's Republic of China for over 13 months, incommunicado, meaning that nobody can talk to him. We cannot get the State Department to talk to him. We cannot see this American resident. We cannot report to his family in what condition he is. He has not been properly charged in violation of Beijing's own laws.

Earlier this month on June 4, which incidentally was the 14th anniversary of the Tiananmen massacre, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention found that China violated Dr. Yang Jianli's rights as a citizen, as a citizen of China, and violated his rights as a resident of the United States by detaining him in a Chinese prison with no access to family or to a lawyer. As a consequence of these actions, the working group concluded that China is violating the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

□ 1415

It is fitting that a U.N.-sponsored organization, with its diverse membership and international credentials, would single out the PRC for its dreadful behavior. The Working Group consisted of representatives from Algeria, France, Hungary, Paraguay, and Iran. That is right, even Iran has condemned this abuse of human rights by China. The PRC ought to be very ashamed.

The day after the U.N. report, the Communist regime responded that it had complied with Chinese law by advising Dr. Yang's family of his detention via telephone. The PRC's statements conveniently avoid the discussion of any of the specific laws that govern the detention process. While claiming it provided a notice of detention, the regime in Beijing forgot to add its own procedural law requires that the family or employer of a detained person be notified within 24 hours of a detention. That formal notice of detention has been sorely absent for months.

Moreover, while PRC law also permits detention of 37 days without a warrant in emergency situations, Dr. Yang has been illegally detained in China for more than a year. This blatant disregard for the due process of law is further evidence of the PRC's collective disdain towards the established rule of law. Despite the unambiguous text of its own laws and the

weight of international condemnation, the communist regime continues to use deceit and manipulation to strengthen its totalitarian rule.

Just as it persecutes men and women like Dr. Yang, the PRC is attempting to extend its coercion beyond. The House is also considering today House Resolution 277, legislation that I authored to condemn the PRC's crackdown on freedom of speech in Hong Kong. As the city with the strongest tradition of freedom in China, Hong Kong is an island of liberty in a sea of oppression. Preserving free speech in Hong Kong will help ensure that liberty flourishes not just for the people of Hong Kong but throughout the PRC, so that in the future we will not be on the floor with resolutions for individual heroes and heroines such as Dr. Yang Jianli.

Mr. Speaker, securing liberty in the People's Republic of China and freedom for Dr. Yang are all part of the same struggle. The Chinese Communist Party must not be allowed to forget the sacrifices made at Tiananmen Square. They must not be allowed to extinguish the message of hope that Tiananmen survivors, like Dr. Yang, convey to the people of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), for authoring this legislation; and I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for supporting freedom for Dr. Yang and freedom in China and around the world.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the author of this resolution and one of the most indefatigable fighters for human rights in this body.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we often congratulate and thank each other when we take these microphones, but I have to say that I do so here with the greatest sincerity of which I am capable. The gentleman from California, who has drawn on his own life experience to become an unabashed, unceasing opponent of oppression everywhere, is an inspiration to us.

I appreciate very much the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois, for agreeing to bring this forward with great speed and allowing us to deal with it on a timetable that we hope will give it the maximum impact in freeing this brave man from a wholly unjustified imprisonment.

To the gentleman from New Jersey, who chairs the subcommittee, he has been staunch in his advocacy; and I express my great appreciation as well to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), whose own expertise in dealing with the People's Republic of China has been built up over the years. He and my colleague, the gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), have been indispensable allies and partners in this fight.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple fight. We are saying to the government of the People's Republic of China, we understand your aspiration to be treated with all the respect due a great power. We ask you to act like one. We ask you to understand that even though there are many among us who differ with your form of government, are critical of some aspects of your society, we are prepared to recognize the fact of not just your existence but of your strength, of your power, and of your economy as it grows.

We and the Chinese Government occupy the same Earth, and that requires us to cooperate even where there are areas of disagreement. But there are limits to the extent to which this Nation, with our commitment to our basic principles, can look the other way. There are limits to the extent to which we can say economic self-interest and geopolitical self-interest preempt concern for principle. And here we have an example.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Yang's crime is that he loved too much both liberty and China. Born in China, he worked as a Chinese citizen to bring to his fellow citizens the freedom that he understands is so important. He was expelled not because he hurt anyone, not because he stole anything, not because he mistreated anyone, but because he would not bridle his love of liberty; and so he was sent away. But he could not stay away.

He has, of course, a great love for his wife and his children, and they for him. And their commitment to his cause and the dignity with which they bear the pain of their separation inspires all of us who have worked with him. Dr. Yang risked a great deal to go back to China, not to steal, not to undermine, not to cause problems, not to engage in terrorism; but to try to help people live their lives in some freedom. And he, unfortunately, had to enter illegally. We acknowledge that. Because he would not have been allowed in that society to do what he wanted to do legally.

Having apprehended him, though I wish the Chinese had a different set of rules and did not feel threatened by a man who loved liberty and wanted to preach it, they had a right to apprehend him and send him back. And maybe they would not send him back right away; they would hold him for a week, two, three, to try to discourage him. But there is no justification for having held this wholly decent man so long without allowing him to be in touch with his family, without even any formal charges, and in a way that violated the most basic human norms. As my friend from California said, even the government of Iran, not to be confused with anybody's civil liberties union, joined in the condemnation of this mistreatment.

Mr. Speaker, we say to the government of China that many of us are pre-

pared to go forward in a cooperative set of arrangements dictated by the interests of the peoples of the world, despite profound differences. We can talk about them. But when you impose with all the might of this great government of China, when you impose this incredibly harsh punishment on this solitary man, take him and keep him from his family, punish him so harshly for nothing that is a crime by any civilized standard, you drive a wedge between us. And I urge the government of China in its own interest to remove this wedge; to show that in fact the pessimists are wrong and that as you grow economically you can evolve socially, you can outgrow the total lack of self-confidence that makes you appear to quake before one lone individual committed to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the People's Republic of China to listen to this House of Representatives, to the President of the United States and the State Department, to the people of America and discontinue insisting on mistreating this brave man, not simply because it is the wrong thing to do on principle but because it is a very wrong thing to do practically. I urge the government of China to reconsider whether the enormous damage you are doing to relationships that you believe are important is worth the continued persecution of Dr. Yang. And I believe that rational people will come to the conclusion that the answer is "no."

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleagues for giving us a chance as a Nation to make this important statement of principle.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), who has worked so hard on this resolution.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo all the comments that have been made, but I want to make it clear. I want everyone to know what this gentleman has done.

To me, this gentleman is clearly a hero. We have used the word, but understand what he did. Here is a gentleman who came from China, established a very successful, very comfortable life here in America: a wife and two children living in one of our best and most beautiful suburbs of Boston; well-respected in the community, well thought of, well loved. Very easy for him to live out the rest of his life in that comfort without any real concerns. He could speak any way he wanted to speak, feel any way he wanted to feel, do any work he wanted to do. But what did he do? He took himself voluntarily from that comfort on his own to go back to China to fight for democracy.

If anyone here thinks they have the courage to do that, you are a better person than I am. I do not know that I would have the courage to do that. I wish I would, and maybe if faced with that someday, I hope I might be able to live up to those incredible standards. But I am not so sure. I am not so sure.

This is a true modern hero, fighting for what we all talk about all day long. We are here, with all of our differences, with all of our agreements and disagreements, fighting for a better democracy. That is what we are all here for. He is fighting for a simple democracy. We cannot abandon him. The fact that this resolution is on the floor obviously shows the U.S. Congress stands with Dr. Yang, stands with the principles that I think he epitomizes.

China, as a great country, has chosen to hold him without charges. There have been no charges. There is no lawyer assigned to him. No judge has heard this case. No jury has heard this case. No administrator has heard this case. His family has not been allowed to visit him. I went on an official delegation to China in January, and I was not allowed to visit him. No American official has been allowed to visit him. No doctor of the family, no representative of the family has been allowed to visit him. How can a great country ask us to treat them as a great country when they act in such a manner?

Any crime he might have committed has already been paid back to China in the 14 months he has been held in the manner he has been held. This man should be released immediately and returned to the bosom of his family and to a welcoming and, hopefully, grateful Nation of the American people because of what he has done for us.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 199, calling on the government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Yang Jianli, and calling on the president of the United States to continue working on behalf of Dr. Yang Jianli's release.

Dr. Yang Jianli is an internationally renowned scholar, Harvard graduate, and the president of the Foundation for China in the 21st Century. Dr. Yang was actively involved in the Tiananmen Square protests in 1989 and was subsequently blacklisted by the Chinese government for his participation. Following Tiananmen Square, Dr. Yang fled to the United States and earned two doctorates. Dr. Yang is a permanent resident of the United States.

On April 26, 2002, Dr. Yang entered China using a friend's passport to investigate reports of labor unrest in northern China. Dr. Yang Jianli was detained eight days later and has not been heard from since. The Chinese government will not confirm where he is being held and he has been refused access to an attorney. He has been held for more than 13 months and no charges have been brought against him. The maximum fine for entering China illegally is a one-year prison sentence. Dr. Yang has already spent more than a year in detention. I call on the Chinese government for his immediate release.

The State Department's recent report on human rights states that the government of the People's Republic of China "has continued to commit numerous and serious human rights abuses, including arbitrary arrest and detention." On June 4, a United Nations working group ruled that Yang Jianli has been illegally detained by the Chinese government and called for Dr. Yang's immediate release.

China lacks due process. Citizens continue to suffer at the hands of Chinese officials. It is time for the state-sponsored, state-led persecution in China to stop. I join the members of the House of Representatives and the international community in calling for Dr. Yang's immediate release. It is my hope that he will be released quickly and free to reunite with his wife and two children back in the United States.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1430

CONDEMNING TERRORISM INFLICTED ON ISRAEL SINCE AQABA SUMMIT AND EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE ISRAELI PEOPLE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 294) condemning the terrorism inflicted on Israel since the Aqaba Summit and expressing solidarity with the Israeli people in their fight against terrorism.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 299

Whereas Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen) announced at the June 4, 2003, Aqaba Summit, "Our goal is clear, and we will implement it firmly and without compromise: a complete end to violence and terrorism";

Whereas Prime Minister Abbas also pledged at the Aqaba Summit to establish a system based on "rule of law, [a] single political authority, [and] weapons only in the hands of those who are in charge of upholding the law and order . . .";

Whereas the Middle East roadmap begins with the assertion that "A two state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only be achieved through an end to violence and terrorism (when the Palestinian people have a leadership acting decisively against terror and willing and able to build a practicing democracy based on tolerance and liberty)";

Whereas 22 innocent Israelis nevertheless were murdered and scores wounded in three separate suicide bombings within less than a week after the Aqaba Summit, and the death toll from these terrorist actions is the equivalent of 1,100 on the basis of the United States population, nearly ten times the number of battle deaths the United States suffered in the recent Iraq War;

Whereas Palestinians are also victims of these terrorists, who undermine prospects for a just and lasting peace;

Whereas Islamic fundamentalist Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad consistently make clear their opposition to Israel's existence in any form and within any borders and their determination to use violence and terrorism to achieve their anti-Israeli, anti-Semitic goals, and Hamas leader Abdel Aziz Rantisi vowed "not to leave one Jew in Palestine";

Whereas experience with terrorism demonstrates that there can be no productive negotiations or dialogue with terrorists and that a policy based on compromise with terrorists can only be doomed to failure;

Whereas the concept of "cycle of violence", which implies moral equivalence between terrorists and their victims, should be rejected as a description of Israeli-Palestinian dynamics, since Palestinian terrorism justifies Israeli counterterrorist operations as the response of a legitimate government defending its citizens;

Whereas Israeli counterterrorist operations would cease entirely were Palestinian terrorism to cease; and

Whereas Israel has no choice but to use its own measures to fight terrorism if the Palestinians are unwilling to do so: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the harshest terms the recent terrorist actions that victimized innocent Israelis;

(2) expresses solidarity with the Israeli people as they respond to ongoing terrorist attacks;

(3) expresses sympathy to the families of innocent Israelis and Palestinians who have lost their lives;

(4) commends the President of the United States for his vision of two states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security;

(5) affirms that this vision can be fully realized only once terrorism is defeated, so that a new state may be created based on rule of law and respect for human rights;

(6) recognizes and respects Israel's right to fight terrorism and acknowledges Israel's fight against terrorism as part of the global war against terrorism;

(7) calls on all states to cease recognition of and political and material support for any Palestinian and other terrorist groups;

(8) calls on all states immediately to establish effective mechanisms to ensure that funding from private citizens cannot be directed to terrorist groups for any purpose whatsoever, including ostensible humanitarian purposes;

(9) calls on all states to provide support to the Palestinian Authority in its effort to confront and fight terror; and

(10) calls on all states to assist the Palestinian people in creating the institutions of a democratic state that will respect the rule of law and live in peace with its neighbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) opposed to the resolution?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is my resolution; and I strongly support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1(c), the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RA-HALL) to control the time in opposition to the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 294.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we marked the 1-year anniversary of the President's seminal address on the Middle East, where he underscored that "it is untenable for Israeli citizens to live in terror," and President Bush clearly outlined, "The United States will not support the establishment of a Palestinian state until its leaders engage in a sustained fight against the terrorists and dismantle their infrastructure."

At the recent summit in Aqaba, Jordan, it appeared that the vision articulated by President Bush, a vision that is embraced by Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and accepted by the Palestinian prime minister, would finally be translated into a reality. However, over the past few weeks, we have seen history repeat itself as Palestinian terrorists have conducted a series of bloody bombings and road shootings against innocent Israelis.

These acts of terrorism must be condemned in no uncertain terms. We must send a message to the terrorists that such behavior will not be tolerated, that we view such attacks through the prism of the global war against terrorism, and as such within the parameters established by the President when he underscored "you are either with us or you are with the terrorists."

The choice for the new Palestinian leadership is a simple one: end the terror. Ending the terror, however, must go beyond mere words. The resolution before us clearly acknowledges Palestinian Prime Minister Abu Mazen's reiteration at the Aqaba Summit of a "complete end to violence and terrorism."

However, such a renunciation of terror must be accompanied by concrete, verifiable steps to confront, combat, and destroy the terrorists. As long as Israeli citizens continue to be victimized by terrorists, Israel will continue to defend herself. Thus, only the full implementation of a comprehensive Palestinian anti-terrorism plan aimed

at destroying the terrorist organizations will serve as a true catalyst for peace. The focus should not and must not be on a cease-fire, which history has shown us is simply a respite to rearm. The end to terror must be unconditional, and it must be complete.

The new Palestinian leadership must arrest and hold the terrorists, not release them soon afterwards. Palestinian jails must not continue to be revolving doors from which the terrorists escape. The international community must work together to support these objectives, and a critical component of this effort is to sever all ties with any and all who cavort with terror. Specifically, if Europe is committed to the road map process, as a sponsoring party, the EU must do its part to implement it. Inherent in those responsibilities is the necessity to bypass and marginalize Arafat.

Nations must end political and material support for any Palestinian terrorist group and, in turn, divert those resources to assisting the new Palestinian leadership in fighting terror and in building "a practicing democracy, based on tolerance and liberty," as President Bush has emphasized.

These concerns, the hopes that we all hold, our obligations and the cooperation we demand of our allies, and perhaps most importantly, the friendship and solidarity we feel toward Israel, are set forth in this important and comprehensive resolution.

This resolution serves as a warning to terrorists to beware. The current peace process is not business as usual. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for his leadership on this issue, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and especially our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their commitment. I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the bus bombings and other acts of terrorism against innocent civilians wherever heinous acts of violence occur. The violence must stop. President Bush's vision of a two-state solution, two states living side by side in the Holy Land, must be implemented. I support the road map wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a very short time ago this year that this body passed a resolution commending Israel and condemning the Palestinian Authority and calling upon the Palestinians to elect new leadership. Now the Palestinians have done just that. They have elected their new prime minister,

Mahmoud Abbas. He has been in office for less than 2 months now, and now this body all of a sudden expects him to stop the violence that has raged out of hand for close to 3 years in such a short time. Prime Minister Abbas is trying very hard to negotiate an understanding among the militant groups that will end all acts of violence against Israelis. And as we speak, as we speak, a cease-fire appears to be taking hold. There appears to be such an agreement.

This process going on in the Middle East as we speak certainly needs no help from this body with this type of one-sided, inflammatory resolution for which this body is so well noted. Prime Minister Abbas must be given the time, he must be given the space, he must be given the opportunity to assert his authority and that of his new security chief Mohammad Dakhlan, with whom our own CIA and Israeli security forces have worked very well in the past, and can do so again.

Let us attempt some objectivity here, Mr. Speaker, if we are to remain the responsible super power that we are. The single most important step that the Israelis could undertake is to stop its policy of political assassinations of Palestinians unless they are proven to be ticking time bombs. Tom Friedman said in a recent column that both sides have crossed the line where self-defense has turned into self-destruction.

Is Israel better off or worse off after carrying out these assassinations? The day after it tried unsuccessfully to kill a senior Hamas leader, a suicide bomber killed 17 innocent people aboard a bus in Jerusalem, these acts occurring since the Aqaba Summit. The bomber said this act was in retaliation for the assassination attempt the previous week. Clearly the people of Israel are questioning this policy. In a poll last week by a leading Israeli newspaper, 58 percent of the Israelis polled supported ending this type of assassination policy and cooperating with the new Palestinian government to end all violence.

The fact is, the only time the Israelis have enjoyed extended periods of peace in the last decade is when the Palestinian Security Service, under Mr. Dakhlan, have cooperated with Israel and both sides spent their energy, successfully, I might note, in preventing acts of violence.

We are right today to call upon Prime Minister Abbas and his government to make greater and more efficient efforts to control the militant groups and end violence, but we also have a responsibility in order to be objective and even-handed, to ask the government of Prime Minister Sharon in this same resolution whether these policies are making Mr. Abbas's tasks easier or harder.

The people of Israel is asking this question, so should the Congress of the United States. Let us have a little balance here. Let us have a little balance

here. Let us call on the Palestinian Authority to make greater and more effective efforts against terrorists; but also, let us call on the Israeli Government to stop making Mr. Abbas's tasks more difficult. It is also time for Israel to reassess and hopefully end this process of political assassinations. We cannot allow the extremists on either side to sabotage the peace process. We cannot allow terrorists to torpedo the peace process. Let us look at some objectivity before we pass, once again, another resolution of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution which condemns the recent wave of terrorism inflicted on Israel and expresses solidarity with the people of Israel in their heroic fight against terrorism.

First, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for the gentleman's cooperation in bringing this resolution to the floor. I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the Republican leader, for his principled support, and to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, for her valued cosponsorship. The fact that these three leaders of the House have cosponsored my resolution is a powerful indication that it has strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this resolution with one basic conviction, that Israel has as much right to fight against suicide bombers and ruthless terrorists as any other free and democratic nation. At the recent Aqaba Summit, the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Sharon, made some extraordinary and historic statements. He called for a democratic state living at peace with Israel with mutual respect and shared prosperity.

In less than a week of the Prime Minister's landmark speech, 22 innocent Israeli men, women and children fell victim to suicide bombings and over 100 were wounded. Israel's response to this unprovoked carnage was the only response a self-respecting democratic state could offer. When Israel responds with counterterrorist operations against suicide bombers, some criticize it for provoking a cycle of violence.

This is an absurd and sinister argument. Let us be clear about one thing. As our resolution states, Israel would not conduct counterterrorist operations if Palestinian counterterrorism would cease. The bloodshed, the violence, the tragedy would end.

The term "cycle of violence" must be permanently retired from the lexicon of Middle East politics since it preposterously implies moral equivalence between suicide bombers and the justified response of a free and democratic nation.

Based on comparative populations, the 22 Israelis who were murdered in the days following the Aqaba Summit

are the equivalent of 1,100 Americans. Were al Qaeda again to murder over a thousand Americans, we would demand that our government take strong measures to eliminate the threat they pose. None of us would tolerate our government waiting while someone pleads with the terrorists for a temporary cease-fire.

In my recent meeting with Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Abu Mazen in Ramallah, he told me that he is opposed to terrorism. Subsequently he repeated his statement to President Bush and many others, but Abu Mazen's effectiveness as a leader will not be judged by his words, but by his deeds. Abu Mazen's political situation is unquestionably complex; but if he continues to refuse to use force against murderous terrorists, he will soon become irrelevant and his political demise will be sure to follow.

□ 1445

But should he choose to take bold action against terrorism, he will deserve and he will receive the support of this body and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution underscores the obvious. Israel's fight against terrorism is one of the front lines of the global war against terrorism. Israel's enemies are motivated by a hate-filled, sick, totalitarian ideology, as are our terrorist foes. Israel's enemies are ruthless and bloodthirsty, just like ours. If the Palestinian Authority will not or cannot destroy and defeat Palestinian terrorist groups, Israel has no choice but to take matters into its own hands. We are fighting our enemies relentlessly. Israel, under infinitely less favorable circumstances, can do nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, it is universally accepted that it is the right of all states, including the democratic state of Israel, to make the defense of its citizens its number one priority. This is the bedrock of my resolution. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. The Aqaba summit earlier this month seemed to offer hope for the road map to peace offered by President Bush. For the first time, a Palestinian leader had condemned in Arabic for the entire world to hear the use of terrorism as a solution to the problems in the Middle East. Unfortunately, terrorist groups like Hamas refuse to stop the violence. The Palestinian Authority must immediately begin to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure in the West Bank and in Gaza, because there is no chance for a Palestinian state if terrorism continues. It is in the interest of the Pal-

estinians to put an end to the violence. The victims of these attacks are not only innocent Israelis but also the Palestinian people who continue to be held down by the most radical among them. These radical terrorists communicate to the world their ultimate goal, the destruction of Israel. Any other end is unacceptable to these terrorists. Therefore, peace will not be reached until the terrorists are destroyed.

The time has come to rekindle the hope of Aqaba, to end the terrorism, to get back on the road map to peace.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished dean of the House the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to violence, killing and to the senseless murders which have been taking place in the Middle East. I also rise in support of peace. I also rise in support of the road map for Middle East peace in the hope that it will be implemented and that the United States will provide the leadership that is needed. I also rise with still some hope in my heart that we could achieve the purposes which we thought were beginning with the summit at the Gulf of Aqaba and to express the hope that we will be able to see a time coming when Israeli, Muslim, Jew, Christian and the Palestinian people can know that there is peace in the Mideast. I also look forward to the leadership of the United States in moving towards achieving the real goal of this Nation, which is peace in the Middle East so that all persons, Israelis, Palestinians and everyone else who is concerned with that area can know that there will be peace there and so that the threat to the United States and the rest of the world of terrorism will suffer a real setback of the kind all of us here hope will be achieved.

George Santayana said something that I thought was very important. He said, "He who does not learn from history is doomed to repeat it." I see that the hope that we had is being diminished both by the killings and by the fact that we are now moving away from what I had hoped would be the role of the United States in the Middle East, and that is the role of an honest broker, of a nation who could appeal to both sides to bring the killing to an end and to achieve a lasting peace negotiated by and between the parties. The Oslo process has collapsed. Eight hundred Israelis have died; 2,000 Palestinians have been killed. Twenty-two Israelis have been killed since the Aqaba summit, but about double that number of Palestinians. This is hardly the basis upon which peace can be achieved. It is also hardly the basis upon which we can say that the United States is providing the strong, the determined and the forceful leadership which is necessary to assure that both

parties do the things that are needed to achieve a real and a lasting peace to the area.

I would point out that if we do not listen to George Santayana, we have the possibility of repeating the mistakes of the past. What is it that we should be directing our attention to? Forceful, forcible, vigorous, strong efforts to achieve peace, to bring the parties together, to see to it that they talk, and to achieve the reputation amongst them of an honest, impartial broker, of a nation that is interested in seeing to it that both parties not only work together but achieve the best result of their negotiation that is possible to achieve. I do not see that in this resolution and that is the vice of this resolution. This resolution takes sides.

I am not prepared to quarrel with any of my colleagues as to who is at fault over in the Mideast. That is not the function of an honest broker. I am prepared to say that our efforts today and that our efforts as a Nation should be directed at one thing, and that is achieving peace on the basis of a reputation of honesty, decency and fairness and upon the basis of the trust of the parties in the area. I do not see this document as stimulating that kind of response. This document is one-sided. It condemns violence on one side. I hear nothing about the need for the United States to, in fact, lead toward peace or that the United States wants a termination of violence by all parties. That is clearly lacking here, but it is desperately needed. Our problem if we seek to be seekers of and builders of peace is to assure that we make possible the trust of all parties, Israelis and of Palestinians, so that we can get them to the table, a difficult task, to talk about peace, about building a peace which will last, which will give justice, equality, comfort and solace to all, men, women, children and also Israelis and Palestinians. That is absent in this resolution. It is something which must not only be in the resolutions of the Congress but it must be in the policies of the United States.

I say that I took great comfort and pleasure and pride when I saw that President Bush was getting the parties together and that he was really going to lead in this undertaking. I urge him to continue that undertaking, because in that is not only the interest of the Palestinians and of the Israelis but also of the United States. And a failure for this country to take a position which achieves the trust, the respect and the support of both parties for the negotiation is assurance that we will not have the success that we want and that we need. It also is assurance that we will not have the kind of security against terrorism which finds its seeds and which finds its roots in the kind of injustice that the people of the Mideast on both sides feel exists.

I urge us, then, to be honest brokers. I urge us, then, to strive for peace and for the trust of all persons over there

who seek that peace. And I urge us to take the steps that are necessary. This resolution is not one of those steps. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution which condemns the unconscionable terrorist attacks directed at the state of Israel since the Aqaba summit earlier this month and which expresses our solidarity with the Israeli people in the fight against terrorism. I might add that we ought to have solidarity with those Palestinians who join in the fight against terrorism.

Let me add, too, I am very proud to have joined the gentleman from California as well as the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and the majority whip in circulating a letter that was signed by more than 300 Members of this House that urges President Bush to adhere to the principles he articulated a year ago concerning the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. That letter and this resolution share this nonnegotiable demand: Any road map for peace must require the Palestinian side to unconditionally cease its campaign of terror and violence against Israel. Like the Dean of the House, my good friend, I desire to be an honest broker. But in that honesty, I need to observe what each side does. We must require the Palestinian side to unconditionally cease its campaign of terror and violence against Israel.

There are some who believe the United States and other nations must demonstrate more evenhandedness on the Palestinian question. However, Mr. Speaker, we must guard against making muddled parallelisms between justified actions by Israel and terrorist tactics that are designed only to inflame and destroy and undermine. I might say, the Prime Minister of Palestine from accomplishing the objectives articulated at Aqaba. As this resolution states, we must reject the concept of a cycle of violence as the gentleman from California has so powerfully said, because it implies a moral equivalence between terrorist and victim where no such parallelism exists. The state of Israel like every other nation on Earth has the right of self-defense and this resolution expresses American solidarity with Israel as it acts to maintain and secure its independence as a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to work to bring peace to this savaged region of the globe and achieve justice for Israel as well as justice for the Palestinian people, so many of whom have toiled under despots who only preach death and destruction.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, no man knows the battle between good and evil like the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). It is an honor to once again have worked with him on this resolution. I am proud to call the gentleman from California my colleague and my friend.

Mr. Speaker, today Israelis will wake up and go to work. They may drive their children to day care or have lunch with their friends. Israeli children will go to school and play with their classmates. We do not know which ones and we do not know where, but soon some of them will probably die. A bright light will flash, a terrifying concussion will bloom through the air, and in an instant fear, blood, panic, pain and death. And somewhere in Gaza, violent men will laugh. If this is not evil, nothing is.

□ 1500

However unfashionable this so-called "simplistic" vocabulary is among the diplomatic elite, it is honest. It is the vocabulary of the American people and their President whose moral clarity has led our Nation in our ongoing war on terror. Individuals, nations, and organizations who equivocate, who see the savagery of terrorists and the self-defense of free states as two sides of the same coin, as a cycle of action and counteraction, undermine that clarity.

Those who say Israel's self-defense is an impediment to progress completely miss the point. The destruction of Palestinian terrorism is not an impediment to progress. It is the definition of progress. Offers of temporary cease-fires by Hamas and other terrorist groups are not the solution to the problem. The point of the war on terror is not just to defeat terror, but to destroy terrorists. Murderers who take 3-month vacations are still murderers. They are still enemies of the civilized world and must be hunted and targeted as such.

Mr. Speaker, Israel's fight is our fight. Israel's liberation from Palestinian terrorism is an essential component of the global war against terror, and in that war there is no moral equivalence between aggrieved parties engaging in a so-called cycle of violence. There is only the cold-blooded murderer and the soldier sworn to defend his nation. This resolution makes that distinction and affirms American solidarity with the people of Israel and their war against terror. It makes clear that the American people acknowledge Israel's fundamental right to defend herself and that her fight against terror is our fight, and it calls on the Palestinian leadership at long last to act in the interest of their suffering people and stop the terrorists.

No more empty promises, no more games, no more points of effort. There is a war on and the terrorists are going

to lose that war. Now the only question is whether Palestinian leaders will stand with the civilized world in defiance of evil or whether they will fail like their predecessors have failed. We must not allow the Palestinian people who have been so long robbed of hope by corrupt and hateful leaders to be used as pawns to undermine this President's vision for peace.

The ascension of Palestinian Prime Minister Abbas gives us some reason to hope, but Israel and the United States must adopt a policy of trust but verify, and the only way to verify the destruction of Palestinian terrorism is the end of Palestinian terrorism, period. When the violence stops, the peace process can move forward; and until it does, Israel must defend itself. And either way, she will not stand alone because the people of the United States will never abandon their brothers and sisters in Israel or any nation that is threatened by terror.

A vote for this resolution reaffirms the House's commitment to Israel and to the moral clarity of our war on terror. So I just urge all Members to cast that vote and join Israel's heroic stand against evil.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing outrage at terrorism perpetrated by Palestinian extremists since the Aqaba Summit. The people of the United States continue to stand in solidarity with the people of Israel. But I regret this resolution is not as complete or constructive as it might be. We mourn the 22 innocent Israelis that have been killed since the summit, but over twice that number of innocent civilian Palestinians have also died as a result of military strikes from Israel. Their loss should also be explicitly recognized in such a resolution.

I sincerely wish the House had used this opportunity to offer its clear support for the President's road map to Middle East peace. This road map is not perfect, but it is currently the only legitimate way to stop terrorism and get the parties back to the path of peace. Under the road map the Palestinian Authority must crack down on terrorism, and Israel must dismantle illegal settlements and begin an end to occupation. Abandoning the road map in the wake of the recent terrorism would not help Israel. In contrast, it would reward the terrorists.

I object to the resolution's condemnation of the phrase "cycle of violence" because it is a fact for the past 2½ years we have witnessed a heart-breaking and endless cycle of terrorist attacks, assassinations, reprisals and retaliations. Since the peace process collapsed, 800 Israelis and 2,100 Palestinians have been killed. The Israeli economy has collapsed. The humanitarian crisis in the West Bank and in Gaza has intensified. Therefore, it is imperative that under the road map se-

curity cooperation would resume. This is critical because it is clear that neither prime minister, Abu Mazen nor Sharon, neither of these can stop terrorism without the other. This conflict will never end without a comprehensive political solution; and we, the United States, must lead both parties to that agreement. Otherwise Israelis and Palestinians may be doomed to a life of violence and suffering forever. It is not what these people deserve, and it is surely not what America can afford.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the ranking Democrat on the Middle East and Central Asia Subcommittee.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the old vaudeville act where the guy goes to a doctor and he says "Doctor, Doctor it hurts when I do this. What should I do? And the doctor says, 'Do not do that.'"

Every action has a reaction. And people who perpetrate violence and commit acts of violence provoke responses.

I rise in strong support of the resolution. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the author, for bringing it to us. The resolution brings something critical to our discussion about the future of the Israeli/Palestinian peace process, and that is moral clarity. We should be absolutely clear about this. Neither the Israeli soldier nor the American soldier who defends his nation by preemptively eliminating terrorists can with any decency be compared to the terrorist who intentionally sets out to murder innocent women and children on a bus or in a disco or in a pizzeria or in a shopping mall or in a supermarket or going to work in the Twin Towers in New York. Terrorism and the defense against terrorism are not a cycle of violence. Active defense against terrorism including strikes against terrorists and terrorist leaders and those who harbor them is a moral obligation of a free and democratic society. We do it because it is right, and Israel does it for the same reason.

Tempting as it may be, peace cannot be achieved through delusion, pretending that all parties to this conflict are of equal goodwill or everyone shares the belief that the two-state solution is a recipe for failure. Hamas and Islamic jihad engage in terrorism not to create the state of Palestine, but to destroy the State of Israel. Their victims are Jews not by coincidence of citizenship, but by active design. These are not just misguided militants or eager extremists, as our newspapers might label them. They are fanatical haters, murderous zealots committed to destroying both Israel and the Palestinian Authority, driving out both Jews and Christians and building an Islamic state on the ashes.

Mr. Speaker, peace may be possible; but it is not automatic. It is almost certainly impossible until these hate groups are crushed. The Palestinian

Authority cannot succeed. It cannot fulfill its mandate as the single voice of the Palestinian people. It cannot perform its historic role as the agent of Palestinian statehood as long as these groups are allowed to exist. In the words of a former Israeli prime minister, we must pursue the peace process as if there were no terrorists, and we must pursue terrorists as if there were no peace process.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, since there are colleagues on various sides of this issue who wish to speak and, given the time limits, they no longer would have the opportunity, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given an additional 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman correctly that it would be split as it was originally split, 10 minutes and 10 minutes on his side?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding the leadership concurred with the notion of an additional 20 minutes to be split 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEACH. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important debate. A good number of colleagues wish to speak on it. We waste so much time in this body on so many unimportant issues, I think an additional 20 minutes for each side is not an unreasonable request.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, speaking personally, I am in full concurrence. My problem, reserving the right to object, is that I have been informed that leadership is very concerned about the bill to follow and would like to stick with what I understood was an agreement of 20 minutes total, 10 minutes to be divided between each side. And based on that, I would be constrained to object to 20, but I am very pleased to assert 20 minutes to divide it 10 and 10.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on his reservation?

Mr. LEACH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I think for once the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I totally agree on this particular issue. I agree with what he just said about the importance of it. I agree to the extension of time as he has requested.

Mr. LEACH. Again, I am personally in full agreement, but I am informed

that this is a leadership decision and therefore would be constrained to object.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEACH. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman consult with the leadership while we take up the next 10 minutes to see if they agree to an additional 10 minutes?

Mr. LEACH. Yes. I think that is very reasonable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California making a new request?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am making the request that each side be given 10 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will clarify. Is the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) going to then yield one half of his time?

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) has 5 minutes, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 5 minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) has 10 minutes. The total times are the gentleman from West Virginia now controls 17 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa controls 5 minutes, and the gentleman from California controls 5 minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the thrust of this resolution is four-fold:

A, it reflects America's concern for terrorism as an instrument to advance political advantage.

B, it expresses sympathy to the families of both innocent Israelis and Palestinians who have lost lives in this struggle.

□ 1515

C, it commends the President for his vision of two states, Israel and Palestine, living side-by-side and, thus, implicitly affirms the peace process that the President has so wisely helped precipitate.

D, it is implicitly designed to empower the new government of the Palestinian Authority. The goal is to strengthen those who have the best chance of negotiating a long-term resolution to the Palestinian-Israeli issue.

Here let me note that at the Aqaba summit, King Abdullah of Jordan turned to the Israeli and Palestinian Prime Ministers and said, "Prime Minister Sharon, Prime Minister Abbas, I urge you today to end the designs of

those who seek destruction, annihilation, and to have the will to begin to realize our dreams of peace, prosperity, and coexistence."

This sentiment is what we ask the international community to follow. This direction is where our President, as well as the king of Jordan, is leading, and this is the direction we want this Congress also to go in.

Speaking personally, I would like to stress full support for the President's road map, for peace, but I would underscore that the road has been traversed before, but proved full of cavernous holes and multiple detours. The end is in sight. Everyone knows it will relate to a resolution along the lines of Camp David and subsequent talks at Tabba. But the slower the process, the more likely terrorists will be empowered.

The issue is speed. Three weeks or 3 months are vastly preferable to 3 years or 3 decades. The violence may not end with a political resolution, but it has no chance of ending without it.

Therefore, I think it should be the goal of this Congress to stress that violence is an evil in and of itself, but a resolution of this particular circumstance in international affairs, which is the most difficult, possibly, in the history of man, is an imperative. All of us identify with all reasonable people who are attempting all reasonable techniques to bring a resolution to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, many of us will vote for House Resolution 294 because we indeed deplore the terrorist attacks inflicted on Israel. We wish to express solidarity with the people of Israel. And we understand the necessity of the Palestinian Authority confronting and fighting terror and terrorist organizations.

I am baffled and dismayed, however, by the resolution's failure to straightforwardly endorse the effort of our government and our Quartet partners to implement the so-called "Roadmap" which, at this moment, represents Israel's best hope for ending terror and the Palestinians' best hope for achieving self-determination. We must condemn terrorism without qualification, and that is consistent with promoting the simultaneous accommodations by both sides which the Roadmap envisions. We must affirm Israel's right to defend itself, but that is consistent with urging on Israel tactics and timing that do not undermine the Roadmap initiative, as our President and our Secretary of State have recently articulated.

What this resolution fails fully to grasp is that concern for Israel's security and integrity is a major motivation for many of us, most of us, as we

push for American leadership via the Roadmap. This effort will require all of the energy and persistence and support we can muster, in this body and in our government, in the critical weeks that lie ahead.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I thank Congressman LANTOS for his leadership and determination on this issue that is a priority to so many of us in this body.

I stand here today to express my outrage and grief over the latest round of terrorist attacks in Israel since the Aqaba (Ak-a-ba) summit earlier this month.

Twenty-two innocent Israelis have been murdered since the beginning of this month and many others have been injured in three separate homicide bombings.

For most of us, September 11, 2001, forever change our way of looking at the world. We learned that even the awesome power of the United States could not protect us from terrorists bent on destruction.

It forced us into a position that Israel has been in for a very long time—trying to protect loss of innocent life against an enemy that has no reservations about killing.

I strongly believe that Israel has the right to defend itself against suicide bombings and other terrorist attacks and that the world must recognize that Israel has a right to use military means to protect its citizens and its borders.

To bring an end to terrorism in Israel and peace in the region, Prime Minister Abbas must start by living up to his agreements, including a commitment to stop this violence against civilians. That means fulfilling promises of prosecutions.

His ability to maintain the rule of law would finally demonstrate a Palestinian interest in engaging in discussions of peace.

It is my true hope that Israelis and Palestinians can one day live side-by-side in peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), my friend, the distinguished senior member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

To my friends who are concerned about this resolution, I remind them of the words of Yitzhak Rabin earlier quoted: "I will fight terrorism as if there were no negotiations. I will negotiate as if there was no terrorism."

While he will never admit it, Prime Minister Sharon in the last 3 weeks has moved to that position. Notwithstanding 17 Israelis killed in a bus bombing, other Israelis killed in two other terrorism attacks since the Aqaba statements, the Israeli government has continued with these negotiations.

The notion that the Roadmap would exist, that this process would be moving forward, that the hope that we

heard at a conference this weekend by the Dead Sea from both Arabs and Israelis about the chances of moving forward would come because the United States played a neutral role in this conflict, are terribly misplaced.

The reason that the Israelis have the courage to move forward, notwithstanding the continued terrorist attacks, is because they know that the United States Government and particularly that the Congress stands with them in this conflict.

This is a resolution that for the first time in the history of this House of Representatives recognizes a two-State solution, an independent Palestinian State, and seeks to strengthen and embolden the Palestinian Authority in governing a State without terrorism.

I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss this resolution, although I have not yet determined how I shall vote on it.

The resolution has "resolved" clauses that speak for themselves and are reasonable. In the "resolved" clauses we do see a recognition of expression of sentiment about both the Palestinian as well as the Israeli innocent people who have been killed. Also, it recognizes the Roadmap and talks about some of the goals that we all agree on.

I do have some reservations as to the "whereas" clauses which seem to be one-sided. The clause most disconcerting to me happens to be the one that people seem to be the most frantic in trying to get across today, and that is the claim that in some way, by saying that this is a cycle of violence that is going on, as it says in the "whereas" clause, that this implies a moral equivalency. It does not. The cycle of violence could well have been started, and I do believe there is a cycle of violence going on; it could be that both sides have made mistakes. That does not mean they are both morally equivalent. Who is judging the morality of it? We are judging the reality of it.

The fact is, Israel may have made some mistakes. Certainly the Palestinians have made horrible immoral decisions in terms of suicide bombings and other types of acts of terrorism. But Israel may have made some mistakes. Was Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount, in retrospect, was that not a mistake? How about the Israeli settlement policy for these last few years? I think in retrospect these things have not furthered the cause of peace; these things have created a cycle of violence, if you will.

It is our job to try to come to grips with what is going on there and end this conflict, and quit trying to say that all of the blame is on one side. Both sides have made mistakes. Let us try to be an honest broker.

Now, I will probably be voting for the resolution, because the "resolved"

clauses are things that I agree with. But I would hope that we would be honest with ourselves and try to discuss this in a way that will further the cause of peace and not just simply be one-sided.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in any of our minds of this country's strong support for the State of Israel. We have shown that time and time again. But as my colleague, the gentleman from California just indicated, neither side is totally innocent of all of the violence that has occurred over the years.

But as I look at and read this resolution, I think the question all of us have to answer, the only question that we have to answer is: Will passing this resolution further the peace process? And the answer is clearly no.

A reading of the resolution will find it lacking in one major regard and that is, there is no endorsement in this resolution of the Roadmap, the Roadmap which President Bush has worked so hard to promote to both sides; the Roadmap which was a subject of the Aqaba summit. Yes, there has been a flare-up in the hostilities since the summit. But now the House comes with a resolution which is one-sided. And again, I ask: will this resolution enhance the peace process? And I say to my colleagues, the answer is no.

Only yesterday, the Palestinian Authority agreed to a 3-month truce from any further hostilities. Many of us will say, 3 months! We want it permanent. How about 6 months? Mr. Speaker, how about taking some progress when we can get it? If this 3-month truce moves along the peace process, let us take it. And then fight for another 3 months, and another 3 months. It has to be done in small steps.

Our offices just received communications from two pro-peace Jewish groups. The first group was Americans For Peace Now, a premier Jewish organization working to enhance Israel's security through the peace process, and the second group that is questioning the wisdom of this resolution is the Israel Policy Forum, which supports American efforts at resolving the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

So I say to my colleagues, let us all answer the question together when the vote comes, and that is will a vote for this resolution enhance the Roadmap, and will it further peace in the region? And again, the conclusion I draw is that the answer is no.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lantos resolution.

The terrorist attacks against innocent Israeli citizens have increased at a horrific rate since the Aqaba summit. Palestinian terrorists are enemies of the peace process and enemies of the Jewish people. The peace process cannot move forward until all terrorist activity ceases against the State of Israel.

The murderous ways of Hamas must be stopped, and I fully support Israel's right to defend itself by any means necessary, as Israel supported our right to defend ourselves against terrorism after the attacks of 9/11.

The press reports these killings as suicide bombings. Some in our government have taken it a step further and called them homicide bombings. I think we should go one step further and call them what they really are: genocide bombings, with the intent to annihilate the State of Israel and the Jewish people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this worthy resolution.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me correct something in which I may have misspoke earlier when we were talking about an extension of time on all sides and I said that perhaps that was the only area in which the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my good friend, and I agreed. That is not the case. It was a misstatement on my part, and I do correct it, because as he has stated and as we have discussed on numerous occasions throughout our careers in this body, we perhaps see eye-to-eye on 95 percent of the issues involved in this particular area and in the Middle East. We certainly agree on the need to stop the violence. We agree on the need to end the terrorism. We agree on the strong Israeli-U.S. relationship that must always be maintained. And we certainly agree on the need for peace for all people in the region.

I must respond to some comments that were made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip of the House. He spoke quite eloquently about all of the Israeli deaths, as does this resolution refer to those numbers as well. But I never once heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) mention any type of sympathy for the innocent Palestinian deaths that have occurred since the Aqaba summit alone. The resolution mentions the 22 Israelis killed, but fails to mention the 55 Palestinians killed, the 258 Palestinians injured just since the Aqaba summit.

□ 1530

Five ambulances have been destroyed; 33 houses have been demolished and 236 damaged; 7,116 trees uprooted; 328,000 meters of cultivated land have been destroyed; 500,000 meters of land confiscated for illegal settlement; 67 private businesses destroyed; water and irrigation pipes destroyed; homes demolished; people detained, as we saw in this morning's press.

All of these actions have occurred since the Aqaba Summit against innocent Palestinians, so it is that perspective that this resolution so much fails to mention.

I would say as well in calling upon both sides to agree with what they set upon at the Aqaba Summit, yes, there have been some illegal outposts, perhaps a flag here or a pole here that has been dismantled by the Israelis. But according to Israeli sources and journalists, 12 new outposts have been constructed since the Aqaba Summit, and there are rumored to have been five additional ones yet to be discovered. This has happened since the Aqaba Summit.

I would remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that a recent poll of Christian conservatives here in the United States found that 78 percent of the Christian conservatives in this country support President Bush's vision for Middle East peace.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of areas in which all the speakers today have agreed. And certainly that makes some points of this resolution commendable.

But, again, in looking at its totality, the resolution lacks in its objectivity. It lacks, Mr. Speaker, in what I term the United States' best interest first. A lot of parallels have been drawn today between the Israeli responses to terrorism and Israel's right to defend itself and the United States' global war against terrorism and our fight against al Qaeda. I would say the main question that needs to be asked here is does the Israeli assassination policy, when there is no proven link that those assassinated are ticking time bombs, where there has been nothing judicial pending against them, there has been nothing but allegations of terrorist activity, in those type of assassinations, is that fairness? Does it promote what is justice in the region. Does it promote the United States' best interest in fairness when it is done with what is perceived to be United States approval?

Maybe there are some in the Sharon government that compare this to our fight against al Qaeda. But those educated and those that will profess some sense of fairness will view this in a different light and see that that comparison is disingenuous to say the least. Certainly, Israel has the right to defend itself against those ticking time bombs and to prevent terrorist attacks from occurring. The United States has that right to fight the global war on terrorism, to fight al Qaeda whenever and wherever we can.

But to make the comparisons between what is happening in the West Bank and Gaza by these Islamic militant groups, to compare them with al Qaeda is stretching it a bit in this gentleman's estimation. We must realize what are the true roots of the al Qaeda and the true roots of why they hate us in the Arab world. Let us look at that response before we determine if we can compare the Israeli fight against terrorism with the United States' fight against al Qaeda.

There are many countries in the world that help us in the fight against the true terrorists, which is the al Qaeda network; and it is those countries that we will continue to need their help in our coalition fight against al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, I do say to all those who are participating in this debate, it has been healthy. It has been what we have needed in this Congress for some time, and I hope that we will have the opportunity to debate this issue many more times. I have demonstrated during this debate the question that many Israelis have about the policies of their government in regard to fighting terrorism, and I think it is just as worthy a debate here in this country as it is in the country of Israel. We have that right in our democratic system. We also have the responsibility in this country to look at actions that we take as Members of Congress and resolutions we pass, to ask first and foremost what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

I referred earlier to the cease-fire that has just been announced today and appears to have taken hold. While this resolution does not have the force of law, we must, and we know as Members of this body that every word we utter and every resolution we pass has profound impact across this world. Whether they are actually the words of the law or not, they do send a message. I think this is the wrong message that the United States should be sending at this particular time, this precarious time in the Middle East. Some say this cease-fire is only temporary and it would give the militant a chance to rearm during a 3-month cease-fire. This is the time that the new prime minister with whom the United States has built a relationship, with whom the Israelis have built a relationship, for the newly installed Prime Minister Abu Mazen, who has been in office for less than 2 months, this is the time he needs to gain the political credibility, to gain the support among his own people, to further crack down on the militants without creating a civil war among the Palestinians.

Now, perhaps that is the goal of some on the other side, but that is not the goal of the United States; and it should not be the goal of the United States. But, rather, we should give the newly created prime minister, the newly installed prime minister in the Palestinian territories the time, the space, and the opportunity he needs to gather the support he needs to crack down and, indeed, make this cease-fire, however temporary in nature, of a permanent nature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that my colleagues look carefully and hard at this resolution before making up their minds and cast their votes in what in their good conscience they deem to be in the United States' best interest and in the interest of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) of the Committee on International Relations.

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very important resolution, and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE).

(Ms. MAJETTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sorrow for the victims who continue to suffer the peril of deadly attacks of terror in Israel. I also rise in solidarity alongside the Israeli people in a stance against terrorists attempting to inhibit the progress of a successful peace process. I further rise in support of the cause of democracy and freedom in the Middle East.

In order to further a road map for peace, there must be an immediate dismantling of Hamas, Islamic jihad, and all other terrorist organizations that actively threaten the lives of those who seek to dwell peacefully in this region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support this important resolution to send a message to those who would willfully threaten the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sorrow for the victims who continue to suffer the peril of deadly acts of terror in Israel. I also rise in solidarity alongside the Israeli people in a stance against the terrorists attempting to inhibit the progress of a successful peace process. Most importantly, I rise in support of the cause of democracy and freedom in the Middle East.

A year ago, in President Bush's speech in the Rose Garden, two criteria were outlined as necessary predicates for a successful agreement: First, a change in leadership of the Palestinian people, which has already taken place, and second, changes in conditions, which have not yet been accomplished. Steps are being taken on both sides to begin to implement the "Road Map," but so much must be done. There has still been no end to the ongoing violence in the region.

At the June 4th Summit in Aqaba, the new Palestinian Prime Minister pledged to end the violence and terrorism in this region "without compromise." Since that time, there have been twenty-two innocent Israelis murdered and many others injured in three separate suicide attacks. More must be done to stop this violence now.

Mere promises are not enough. While it is promising that the radical groups Hamas, the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigades and Islamic Jihad today offered to suspend attacks against Israelis for three months, I would note that Hamas members in Gaza have already raised

doubts about the deal. In order to further a "roadmap for peace," there must be an immediate dismantling of Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and all other terrorist organizations that actively threaten the lives of those who seek to dwell peacefully in this region.

I urge the House to support this important resolution to send a message to those who willfully threaten the peace process.

We will not tolerate violence nor yield to its demands.

We will continue to fully support the democratic state of Israel.

We support democracy and statehood for the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that what other democratic nations are doing also sends a message to the world community and to terrorists. For instance, I am deeply concerned about the plight of the Iranian opposition being detained in France today. I am concerned that the wrong message is being sent to the opponents of democracy and freedom when democratic nations punish supporters of democracy.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the measure before us, to stand up and speak loudly for democracy and freedom in the Middle East.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. Israel's fight against terrorism is our fight. As President Bush said, there are no good terrorists or bad terrorists, only bad terrorists.

I very strongly support this resolution standing with the people of Israel.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the daughter of a refugee from Nazi Germany, issues of anti-Semitism and the continuing terrorist violence against Israel are close to my heart.

I strongly support the resolutions debated this afternoon and commend their sponsors. There is a fleeting chance for peace in the Middle East, the first since the brutal and feckless second Intifada began almost 3 years ago. But success depends on reining in Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic jihad, and others committed to ongoing terror.

One of those others is Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat, who should be pressed or forced to step aside in order to allow the nation's government of Mahmoud Abbas to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago I accompanied President Clinton to Gaza and to Israel. Much of what he sought has been undone by the second Intifada. The escalation of violence has not only killed

people, it has all but killed hope. We need to rekindle that hope. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, friends of Israel recognize that the road map may bring opportunities for greater peace in our time; but for this effort to work, combatting terrorism must be the first step.

On June 4, 2003, Palestinian Prime Minister Abbas pledged a complete end to violence and terrorism. But Mr. Abbas says he is unwilling to use force to put an end to terrorists and terrorist groups, even while innocent Israelis continue to be murdered by suicide bombers and while the guaranteed and expected acts of retribution against his own people are carried out. That is why we offer this resolution to condemn the terrorism inflicted on Israel and express solidarity with the Israeli people. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the time I yielded back.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) has 5½ minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I do that in keeping with what I said earlier was an important debate and I believe that all Members who wish to speak on this should be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield half of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields 2¾ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unwavering support of House Resolution 294, to reaffirm strong relations between the United States and Israel and condemn the acts of terror against the Israel people.

The United States has a unique relationship with Israel, the only democratic nation in the Middle East. We must continue to support nations with similar ideological goals that share the same commitment to democratic principles. Our history of friendship spans many decades, and the United States has been the strongest advocate for ef-

forts to craft a long-term peace settlement in the region.

If the United States is truly committed to establishing a lasting peace by pursuing the road map, then we must remain true to its principles and condemn violence and terrorist attacks. We must continue our efforts in Congress to promote peace in the Middle East and maintain a strong U.S.-Israel relationship. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the resolution before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

(Mr. CARDOZA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on June 24 of last year, President Bush unveiled a new vision for bringing peace in the Middle East. I support that vision. But that vision is one that we must support through a fairness situation where we do not make equivalency between what has happened by Mr. Sharon going to the Temple Mount and the death and destruction that have been wrapped upon Israel with the terrorist threat. I support the Lantos resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, which condemns recent terrorist attacks against Israel and expresses solidarity with the citizens of Israel during this turbulent time.

On June 24 of last year, President Bush unveiled a new vision for bringing peace to the Middle East. He stated that the Palestinians must develop a new leadership, which must be committed to peace with Israel and to destroying the terrorist infrastructure. Only then would the United States consider recognition of a Palestinian state.

Since that time, the Palestinians have taken steps to establish a new leadership structure. Abu Mazen was appointed the first Palestinian Prime Minister following a bitter struggle with Yasser Arafat.

And I'm pleased to hear that—just this morning—Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Al Asqa have agreed to 3-month cessation of attacks against Israelis. That's a very positive step. But we've heard positive talk many times before. The proof will be borne out over time through deeds. Just this morning, the Israeli Defense Force disabled a large bomb in northern Israel. Clearly, the vigil for peace and security will have to be maintained.

I believe the key to the "Road Map" or any other effort to achieve lasting peace is to stay true to the principles outlined by the President last June; particularly, the necessity of combating terrorism as the first of a sequence of events.

And I believe the U.S. must remain supportive of Israel in its fight against terror until the Palestinian Authority is willing and able to carry out this responsibility.

Like my colleagues here today, I welcome the positive steps the Palestinians have taken, but we must also see decisive action to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure.

As Americans, we understand the fight against those who seek our destruction. We

stand shoulder to shoulder with Israel in their fight against those who oppose their existence.

The citizens of Israel are our allies, and we will continue to support their fight against terrorism and their government's efforts to provide safety and stability for its people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

(Mr. SANDLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 of last year, President Bush stated that the Palestinians must develop a new leadership not tainted by support for terror. The new leadership must be committed to peace with Israel and to destroying the terrorist infrastructure. Only then would the United States consider recognition of a Palestinian state. Israel is fulfilling its commitment by dismantling unauthorized outposts, releasing Palestinian prisoners, allowing Palestinians to work in Israel, and releasing funds out of the treasury.

They cannot be expected to give up counterterror measures so long as Palestinians fail to comply with their road map obligation to stop terror. Like every other sovereign nation, Israel has the right to self-defense. As long as Palestinian leaders do not aggressively go after the terrorist infrastructure, the Israeli government has the responsibility to protect its citizens against further terrorist attacks.

Merely negotiating a cease-fire is not enough. Terrorism must end. Peace demands it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my firm commitment to the safety and security of Israel and the Israeli people. One year ago, President Bush called upon the Palestinian people to put in place leadership not tainted by support for terrorism. Terrorism is the great scourge of our age, and there is little doubt that it represents an insurmountable threat to peace throughout the world, but most particularly in Israel and in the Middle East.

In order for peace to be realized, terrorist groups like Hamas and Islamic Jihad must be contained. The Palestinian leadership—with support from the rest of the Arab world—must take a firm stand against the blight of violence and death that terrorists spread wherever they commit their atrocities. The destruction of the terrorist infrastructure that threatens innocent Israelis everyday is a necessary precondition to the success of the peace process and the recognition of a Palestinian state.

While I am encouraged that the Bush administration appears to be re-engaged in the peace process, the fact that 22 innocent Israelis have been killed and many more injured in a series of suicide bombings since the summit in Aqaba, Jordan, demonstrates clearly the difficult and treacherous road to peace that lies ahead.

The sad fact is that we as a nation have too often overlooked or considered route the terror that daily threatens the peace and security of Israel. So, I ask you to consider a situation that would be better understood in our country. Think about a shopping mall or a busy street in New York, Dallas, Los Angeles, Chicago or New Orleans; and think about the

people who might be on the bus on their way to school or to work; people going about their daily business, shopping for groceries or picking up that last-minute necessity. Now imagine that someone came along with a bomb in one of those cities, or right here in Washington, DC, and created an explosion that killed 7 or 70 or 700 in one fiery blast.

What would the response be in America? We would call out the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the FBI, the police, every agency that could retaliate, whether to capture or kill the responsible person and the leaders of an organization that would seduce a young person to sacrifice his or her life for such a heinous purpose.

Yet, when Israel responded to the murder of 17 innocent Israelis by launching an attack on the leadership of Hamas, the Bush administration criticized the attack as heavy-handed and an unnecessary complication to the peace process.

We would not stand by five minutes and accept such attacks on American civilians. And we should not expect Israel to stand by five minutes and accept it either. We cannot look at the violence on both sides as though it is comparable. It simply is not the same.

Israel's attacks are always in retaliation for violence that radical terrorists—murderers or killers, to use the President's terms—have brought down upon them. Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and the al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, among others, delight in taking responsibility for a suicide bomber who walks into a cafe or disco and takes 8, 10, 20 or more innocent lives.

Like every other sovereign nation, Israel has the right to defend itself against the cowardly acts of terrorists. The United States must not be caught in the trap of thinking of Israel's response to terrorism on its soil as the equivalent of the terrorism itself. There is no doubt-ing the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution expressing our solidarity with Israel. Just as we have when the terrorist attacks were on our soil or against our national interests, we must roundly condemn the acts of terrorists in Israel, and we must continue to exert pressure on Palestinian Prime Minister Abu Mazen to use very resource at his disposal, including force, to root out terrorism and remove it as an obstacle to peace. Moreover, we must be unwavering in our support for Israel's right to defend and secure herself against such senseless violence.

If the peace process is to succeed, rather than criticizing Israel for its efforts to combat terrorism, we must offer our full support and take whatever action is necessary to ensure that Israel is free from the scourge of terrorism.

Only then will the Israeli and Palestinian people realize the promise of peace embodied in the "road map."

I have no doubt that the Israeli and Palestinian people can live side-by-side in peace and prosperity, as so many do even today throughout Israel. Yet that goal will likely never be realized unless and until terrorist organizations like Hamas, Hizbollah, Islamic Jihad, and others are removed from the equation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the House to express their full support for Israel and their continuing commitment to the eradication of terrorism wherever it rears its violent and ugly head and to vote for this important demonstration of our commitment to peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1545

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this peace belongs to the American people. This peace belongs to President William Jefferson Clinton as well the present administration. This peace belongs to all of us who have worked to ensure a just and sustainable peace. The road map must be supported.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to my colleagues that I spent 2 weekends ago in Oslo, Norway, working with women from Palestine and from Israel discussing the issue of peace.

I believe we can move forward. I am going to vote for this resolution. I believe that we can move forward, but I believe as well as we move forward we must accept the view and the understanding that as we abolish and get rid of terrorism we all believe and support an independent Palestinian State, and so I am going to associate myself with the women that I had the pleasure of being with in Oslo, Norway and will be writing a resolution to increase the number of women in the mideast peace process as we fight to secure a just and sustainable peace.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 294, condemning the terrorism inflicted on Israel since the Aqaba summit and expressing support for the Israeli people.

The Aqaba summit took place on June 4, 2003. Newly elected Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas proclaimed, "our goal is clear, and we will implement it firmly and without compromise: a complete end to violence and terrorism." This is a laudable statement, and we are happy to see the Palestinian government taking such strides towards democracy and stability for their nation.

Prime Minister Abbas pledged at the Aqaba summit to establish a system based on rule of law and a single political authority. His intentions are the beginning steps needed for the Middle East Roadmap to Peace.

The roadmap begins with the assertion that "a two state solution to the Israeli Palestinian conflict will only be achieved through an end to violence and terrorism." Prime Minister Abbas' leadership will be tested through these turbulent times, as terrorism is still rampant in the Middle East, and more people are suffering at the hands of violence.

Since that June 4 summit, less than three weeks have gone by, and already 22 Israelis are dead and scores more wounded. There have been three separate suicide bombings. When compared with our population, the death toll for the Israeli population would be equivalent to the loss of 1,100 American lives.

Palestinians are also victims of this violence as terrorists continue their attempts to undermine prospects for a lasting peace in the region. I was recently at a conference in Norway where Palestinian and Israeli women were joined by other leaders from around the world to seek a greater understanding of what must be done to secure peace in the region. Some

progress was made but I realize that there is much that remains to be done.

Peace will continue to be undermined as long as these terror attacks persist. Sadly, anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic groups are driving a wedge into the process to peace that many Palestinians and Israelis are trying so hard to build.

This is why I condemn in the harshest terms the recent terrorist acts, and express support for a peaceful and secure Israel and Palestine. I also offer my sympathy to the families of both the Israelis and Palestinians whose lives have been lost.

The roadmap to peace is a vision, not just for our generation, but for the future of Middle East stability. This vision can only be realized once terrorism is defeated, so that a new state may be created based on rule of law and respect for human rights.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, my good friend.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution because I support the road map plan for peace. Those of us who care so deeply about the State of Israel and its security know that there is no alternative to a peace plan led by the United States, but the Palestinian people must understand that in order to attain the state they justly deserve that their terrorist attacks of Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah must be defeated, and one of the ways that America helps defeat terror is to stand 100 percent behind Israel's right of self-defense.

The President was mistaken last week when he condemned Israel's right of self-defense in effect, and he made a distinguishing mark between the way the United States acts and the way Israel acts.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my friend and distinguished colleague.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, those who have opposed this resolution have opposed it for what it does not say, not for what it does.

The United States can be an honest broker and should be between Palestinians who want peace such as perhaps Abu Mazen, whose sincerity is still subject to proof, but it cannot be an honest broker with Hamas and other terrorist groups who desire genocide.

This resolution supports the road map by supporting the first preconditions for it, the disarmament of the terrorist groups, by agreement if possible, by force if necessary.

Finally, there is no equivalence between Israeli victims of premeditated murder and Palestinian victims who either were terrorists or were victims of warfare unleashed by Palestinian terrorists. This resolution strikes a proper balance, and I strongly support it.

Mr. LANTOS. May I inquire, Mr. Speaker, how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from California

(Mr. LANTOS) has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House are passionately committed to peace, and all of us in this House are passionately committed to justice. The Palestinian people are certainly entitled to an infinitely better life than what they have had for many years. The blame clearly lies with the surrounding Arab states which failed to allow them to establish civilized communities or to absorb them.

Other societies have done that. The Greeks of Cyprus absorbed the Greeks from northern Cyprus, and the people of Israel absorbed millions of their fellow nationals from all over the world.

There was a cynical attempt to perpetuate the misery of the Palestinians in refugee camps. Hopefully, with the President's vision, we will now see an end to this long, painful, tragic, misery-filled process.

To embark on that road, we must see the end of terrorism. There is no road map unless terrorism ceases, and if it does, the road map, in fact, will be implemented.

I congratulate the President for having the vision of recognizing that two states can live side by side in peace, with mutual respect and prosperity, but only if terrorism ends.

Abu Mazen, the new Prime Minister, has repeatedly indicated his opposition to terrorism. We have to help him to put an end to terrorism. He must gain control of the territory in Gaza, first in the north, then in central Gaza, then in southern Gaza and then on the West Bank, town by town, and as he does so, we will move towards peace, and the Israeli and the Palestinian people at long last will live in a civilized region.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This has been a good debate, a very healthy debate. There is no doubt that security cooperation needs to be restored between the Palestinians and Israelis. It has worked in the past. The road map now is the way to do it. Several of the speakers today have risen in support of the road map, and they will support this resolution. I cannot even find the word "road map" mentioned in this resolution, and that is a major, major problem with it.

The economies of both Israelis and the Palestinians are in dire shape. There is no question about it, and this road map, for which I have already commended and continue to salute the President for presenting it, is the way out.

Confidence building measures by both sides, coupled with stability and economic development, must occur, and it will help bring back the necessary hope that both sides so desperately need and the trust in one an-

other that is so lacking at the current time.

There are obligations of both parties under the road map. This resolution, unfortunately, points only to obligations of Palestinians and insinuates they are not fulfilling those obligations. There are obligations by the Israelis as well that are very clear. Yet they are not stated in this resolution.

We must give Prime Minister Abu Mazen, a good friend with whom I have met, the help he needs to fight terrorism and we must not allow civil war among Palestinians to occur. The road map is the way to do that. It will take time.

I salute President Bush for his personal involvement, for Secretary of State Powell's involvement, for Condoleezza Rice's involvement via her trip to the region any day now, and I salute our security people, the United States security people, our CIA and others that are on the scene in an effort to help the Palestinians restore security. That takes time. That takes patience and that takes an opportunity, that we must give and Israelis must give the Palestinians to create that security that is so vital to bring peace to this area.

I am not going to urge my colleagues to vote one way or another on this resolution. They can make up their own minds, but each colleague I would say has to look in his or her conscience and has to determine in their best opinion what is in the United States' best interests in promoting the road map to peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) has 30 seconds left.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about two subjects—violence and peace.

On point one, the Congress cannot be equivocal in condemning terrorism. On point two, this resolution unequivocally commends the President for a vision of two states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security.

This is the first President to assert legitimacy of a Palestinian state, and this resolution not only implicitly endorses the President's road map for peace but breaks affirmative ground in a congressional resolution on the Palestinian legitimacy issue.

Peace is the goal. Diplomacy, not violence, must be the means. On this basis, I urge this resolution's passage.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of security for Israel and in utter condemnation of terrorism. I cannot, however, vote for a resolution that I believe fails to advance the Middle East peace process, and it undermines hope for the Roadmap.

On May 8, 2003, I wrote President Bush commending him for his efforts to help the parties find a way out of their ongoing tragedy. This letter read in part: "I wanted to take this opportunity to applaud your efforts to reinvigorate the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. The

'Roadmap to Peace,' presented by the Quartet to the Israeli Government and Palestinian Authority, represents a welcome and desperately needed opportunity to work toward a lasting two-state solution that offers the prospect for an ordinary peace between current adversaries and with that peace, the promise of stability for the region. Such a solution is very much in our own national interest as well."

I believe the principles laid out in the Roadmap, including its emphasis on reciprocity, must continue to guide us. Ending terror is imperative, and I absolutely agree with the sentiments in this resolution decrying terror and expressing sympathy for the loss of so many lives, Israeli and Palestinian, in this conflict. However, at this critical juncture, the resolution I wish that we were voting on was one that expressed those principles while at the same time voicing solidarity toward Israel by endorsing the Roadmap as our best chance to reach the much desired destination of peace and security. This resolution fails to reflect the reciprocity that is the hallmark of the Roadmap.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

The Aqaba Summit presented one of the most promising moments in years of conflict between Israelis and Palestinians. At that summit, Prime Minister Abbas pledged his commitment to a complete end to the violence and terrorism that has devastated the region. Prime Minister Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Sharon also took the first bold step on the Roadmap to Peace by recognizing the right of one another to exist in peace.

Mr. Abbas and Sharon had just returned from Aqaba, however, when violence once again flared. There is no way the peace process can continue while terrorist organization such as Hamas continue to act with impunity in the West Bank and Gaza.

Prime Minister Abbas maintains that terror can only be stopped on moral and political grounds. He remains unwilling to use force to dismantle terrorist organizations. Under current circumstances, however, Mr. Abbas doesn't have the ability to forcefully dismantle such organizations. It is critically important that the United States, Europe, Russia, the United Nations and the Arab League renew their commitment to cut terrorism at its roots, and provide Mr. Abbas the support he needs.

International support means denying the flow of dollars to Hamas. I am a cosponsor of House Resolution 285, which urges the European Union to classify all of Hamas as a terrorist organization, and not just its military wing. I find it astonishing that a distinction would be made between the political and armed divisions of a terrorist organization.

The Arab League must also commit itself to peace in Israel by denying Yasser Arafat the funding and support he needs to maintain control over security forces in the Palestinian territories.

I continue to support an active U.S. role in the Middle East peace process because the suffering of people—destined to live on the same piece of land—is too great, and the stakes for them too high.

I support this resolution's condemnation of the recent terrorist violence that victimized innocent Israelis, as well as its expression of sympathy to the families of both Israelis and Palestinians who have lost their lives. I urge its adoption and thank the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 294, condemning the terrorism inflicted on Israel, expressing solidarity with the Israeli people, and calling on the Palestinian Authority to take immediate and effective steps to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure on the West Bank and Gaza. I also rise today to express my solidarity with all those who support the efforts towards peace between Israelis and Palestinians.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the gentlewoman from California, Representative CAPPAS. I wish to echo her reservations about this bill. The introduction of this resolution should have provided us the opportunity to restate the United States' commitment to peace, and our commitment to the President's roadmap, which lays out responsibilities for both the Israelis and the Palestinians in the pursuit of peace. The roadmap, like any negotiated plan, is imperfect. But it is supported by the President, it is supported by Israel, it is supported by the Palestinian Authority. It is the best plan that we have right now.

Having said that, I am pleased that this resolution recognizes the plight of innocent Palestinians who have been caught in a cycle of terrorist attacks and government reprisals. It also recognizes the aspiration of Palestinians to create their own state, which will live in peace and prosperity with its neighbor Israel.

I look forward to working with my colleagues here in Congress, with the Administration and with the communities in the Middle East to foster a true and lasting peace in the Middle East. I believe that peace must be the ultimate goal of the United States policy towards the region. Peace is in the national interest of Israel, the future security of a Palestinian state, and in the national security interest of the American government and its people.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 294. I am deeply saddened by the loss of lives at the hands of terrorists, and it is of great disappointment to me that the terror has escalated since the Aqaba summit. As the violence continues, even in the face of efforts by all sides to bring peace to the region, the United States must show nothing short of steadfast support for Israel as it continues to bear the entire burden of ending the violence.

The U.S. and Israel both agree that Prime Minister Abbas is the legitimate alternative to Yasser Arafat as leader of the Palestinian people. We welcome his statements acknowledging the need to stop terror both on moral and political grounds. However, the terrorist infrastructure is committed to the undermining of Prime Minister Abbas and the peace process.

Earlier this month, 22 innocent Israelis were killed and many others have been injured in continuous suicide bombings. Among the obligations in the roadmap is the responsibility of the Palestinians to stop all terror and violence against Israel. Merely negotiating a cease-fire with the terrorist groups is not sufficient. Terrorist groups can simply use this time to rearm and plan future attacks against innocent civilians. Militants must be arrested and arms collected to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure.

As long as Palestinian leaders do not aggressively go after the terrorist infrastructure, the Israeli government has the sole responsibility of protecting its citizens against further terrorist attacks. Israel has an obligation to safeguard its citizens and like every other sov-

ereign nation, Israel has the same right to self-defense. If the Palestinian Authority does not act against terrorism, Israel must.

U.S. policy needs to be supportive of Israel in its fight against terror. Just as the U.S. has the right to send soldiers around the world to fight terrorists, Israel has the same right to fight terrorism in its own neighborhood and its own capitol.

The people of Israel are confronted with the grim realities of terrorism on a daily basis. Yet the darker reality is that were it not for the successful actions Israel takes in defense of its people, terrorism against them would increase tenfold. As Israel embarks on the difficult path to peace, it is essential that her efforts to quell acts of senseless terror have the full support of the United States.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on H. Res. 294, a measure expressing solidarity with the people of Israel and condemning the terrorist attacks inflicted on them since the Aqaba Summit. The timing could not be any more ironic. Today as we consider this one-sided resolution on the Mideast, there are reports of a ceasefire taking hold that underlines the need for America to find a way to condemn violence in a way that does not favor one set of innocent victims over another. Unfortunately, this resolution does not meet this standard. Instead, this resolution, in its present form, will do more to take us away from peace than to bring us closer to an agreement that serves the needs and desires of all people in the Middle East.

That is not to say that I disagree with the text of this resolution: I condemn, in the strongest terms, all terrorist attacks against Israelis and remain committed to Israel's security and the well-being of Israeli citizens. Brutal attacks against civilians are always unacceptable and as a sovereign nation, Israel has the right to defend itself from these kinds of attacks. But, this resolution, which does not address the losses on both sides, sends the wrong message to Israelis, Palestinians, and the world community.

My concern is also that this resolution does not endorse the "roadmap" for peace, nor does it recognize the commitments and obligations that Israel must implement for the peace process to move forward. Furthermore,, it does not recognize the terrible pain and suffering that Israeli occupation and crackdown has caused in the disputed territories. We need to condemn Palestinian terrorists, but acknowledge the honorable goals of peace-loving Palestinians that want nothing more than a better life. This Congress should recognize the pain of every mother that has lost an innocent child because of violence in the Mideast, not only Israeli mothers.

Mr. Speaker I share the anger and sadness of my colleagues who have brought this resolution regarding the Mideast to the floor. But, I am convinced that this resolution will not advance the prospects for the lasting peace that we all want, which, is why I will vote against it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure. Of course we all deplore terrorism and violence that any innocents are forced to suffer. There is, sadly, plenty of this in the world today. But there is more to this resolution than just condemning the violence in the Middle East. I have a problem with most resolutions like this because they have the appearance of taking one side or the other in a

conflict that has nothing to do with the United States. Our responsibility is to the American people and to the Constitution, not to adjudicate age-old conflicts half-way around the world.

When we take sides in these far off conflicts, we serve to antagonize the people affected and end up no closer to peace than when we started. This bill makes reference to the need to have solidarity with Israel. Elsewhere people say we should have solidarity with the Palestinians and the Arabs. So, as I have said before when bills such as this are on the floor, it is sort of a contest: Should we be pro-Israel or pro-Arab, or anti-Israel or anti-Arab, and how are we perceived in doing this? It is pretty important.

But I still believe, through all these bills attempting to intervene in the Middle East, that there is a third option to this that we so often forget about. Why can we not be pro-American? What is in the best interests of the United States? We do not hear much talk of that, unfortunately.

As I keep saying when votes such as this come to the floor, the best foreign policy for the United States is noninterventionism. It is a policy American interests first, costs must less money, and is in keeping with a long American tradition so eloquently described by our Founders.

I hope the peoples of the Middle East are able to resolve their differences, but because whether they decide or not is not our business I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, even though I agree in principle on the intent of the resolution, I believe it could have been drafted differently. I intend to vote "yes" on H. Res. 294.

All of us who support Middle East peace process are aware of the fragile relationship between Israelis and Palestinians. I believe that future progress toward peace will require a real commitment on the part of Israel and the Palestinians, and the active participation of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support Israel, but I also strongly support efforts to bring about peace in the region, which will allow the Israeli and Palestinian people to live together side by side without having to endure this type of violence.

All sides of this conflict have responsibilities. Israel must take tangible steps now to ease the suffering of Palestinians and to show respect for their dignity. As progress is made toward peace, Israel must stop settlement activity in the occupied territories. Arab nations must fight terror in all forms, and recognize and state the obvious once and for all: Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state at peace with its neighbors.

There is no excuse for terrorist acts. I want to save the lives of Israelis, and I want to save the lives of Palestinians. Both are equally precious, both deserve to live in peace and security.

It is in that spirit, and with that faith, that I will continue to work with the Administration to ensure the United States remains firm in its commitment to the principles necessary to guarantee the success of the Arab-Israeli peace process.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, which condemns recent terrorist attacks against Israel and expresses solidarity with the citizens of Israel during this turbulent time.

On June 24 of last year, President Bush unveiled a new vision for bringing peace to the Middle East. He stated that the Palestinians must develop a new leadership, which must be committed to peace with Israel and to destroying the terrorist infrastructure. Only then would the United States consider recognition of a Palestinian state.

Since that time, the Palestinians have taken steps to establish a new leadership structure. Abu Mazen was appointed the first Palestinian Prime Minister following a bitter struggle with Yasser Arafat. Since assuming office, Abu Mazen has refused, however, to take concrete steps to rein in the terrorists in any way. And despite the change in leadership, Yasser Arafat maintains a high degree of control, including authority over major elements of the Palestinian security apparatus.

And I am pleased to hear that, just this morning Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Al Asqa have agreed to 3-month cessation of attacks against Israelis. That is a very positive step. But as we have seen many times before, the proof will be borne out over time. Also just this morning, the Israeli Defense Force disabled a large bomb in northern Israel. So clearly, the vigilance for peace and security will continue.

I believe the key to the "Road Map" or any other effort to achieve lasting peace is to stay true to the principles outlined by the President last June, particularly the necessity of combating terrorism as the first of a sequence of events.

Since the Aqaba summit earlier this month, 22 Israeli civilians have been killed and many others have been injured in three separate suicide bombings. Like every other sovereign nation, Israel has the right to self-defense. Israel must act against terrorism if the Palestinian Authority does not. As long as Palestinian leaders do not aggressively go after the terrorist infrastructure, the Israeli government has a responsibility to protect its citizens against further terrorist attacks. I believe U.S. policy must be supportive of Israel in its fight against terror until the Palestinian Authority is willing and able to assume this responsibility.

We must also wholly reject the concept of a "cycle of violence." Use of that term implies a moral equivalence between those who commit terrorist acts and their victims. Israel's targeting of terrorist leaders is not the moral equivalent of targeting of innocent civilians, including women and children.

Like my colleagues here this morning, I welcome the positive steps the Palestinians have taken, but we must also see decisive action to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure. Without such action, the Road Map or any other effort, however well intentioned, will fail.

The Palestinian people deserve a leadership that looks beyond the narrow goal of nationalism and works toward bettering the lives of its people. Regrettably, the current leadership has shown no signs of embracing those goals. As Americans, we understand the fight against those who seek our destruction. We stand should to shoulder with Israel in their fight against those who oppose their existence.

The citizens of Israel are our allies, and we will continue to support their fight against terrorism and their government's efforts to provide safety and stability for its people.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we are hearing all too frequently about continued violence in Israel, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 294, expressing solidarity with Israel.

For me, terrorism has hit close to home on too many occasions. Just last Friday, Eugene and Lorraine Goldstein, an elderly couple from Plainview, which is on Long Island, were visiting their son in Israel. It was supposed to be a time of joy for the family, but became a matter of grief.

Eugene and Lorraine Goldstein, and their son and daughter-in-law were on their way to a wedding dinner for a grandson at the Holyland Hotel, and also celebrating their son and daughter-in-law's 27th wedding anniversary. The family was traveling along Route 60, a West Bank highway.

During the drive, the Goldstein's happy day was shattered by the bullets of terrorists. The Goldsteins were shot in an attack that the Palestinian group Hamas has admitted carrying out. Within minutes Eugene and Lorraine's son was dead, their daughter-in-law was injured, and they were severely wounded, taken to a Jerusalem hospital.

Eugene Goldstein is a watch salesman at the Fortunoff store in Westbury, also in my district. Fortunoff calls Eugene a "superstar with a big wave and a big grin," and their family, friends and neighbors know the Goldsteins as good people. The family is in great shock, just one more family with lives destroyed from terrorism. I am praying that the Goldsteins recover quickly and fully, and my condolences go to their family for their loss.

Today, Israel finds herself in an unbearable situation. Despite Israeli trust, Yasser Arafat has allowed terrorism to pervade Israeli society. Prime Minister "MA-MOOD" Abbas must keep his pledge for a "complete end to violence and terrorism." Until that happens, Israel has every right to enter Palestinian cities and refugee camps to root out terror. We cannot expect Israel to sit by and watch her country crumble, and her people be murdered in groups of 20 while they ride buses.

As a Member of Congress, I will support Israel's decisions regarding security and self-defense in any way possible.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to raise concerns with House Resolution 294, Condemning The Terrorism Inflicted On Israel And Expressing Solidarity With The Israeli People.

I am greatly troubled by the violence between Palestinians and Israelis over the last two weeks. It poses a great threat to the road map toward peace before it has had a chance to progress. I am outraged by extremists on both sides who continue to frustrate and delay the peace process. For the sake of the Israeli and Palestinian people, this process must be allowed to succeed.

While I join my colleagues in denouncing all acts of terrorism, this resolution unfairly places blame on one side in the ongoing cycle of violence between the Israelis and Palestinians. The United States should always act as a fair and impartial broker in the peace process. This resolution violates that responsibility.

Let me be clear. I condemn the recent bus bombings and other acts of terrorism carried out by Hamas just as I believe Israel must halt its policy of assassinations. The day after Israel attempted to kill a senior Hamas leader, a suicide bomber killed seventeen innocent people aboard a bus in Jerusalem. The cycle of violence being perpetuated by both sides must end, but this resolution does nothing constructive to further that goal.

It is only right that Congress call upon the new government of Prime Minister Abbas to

take more effective measures in controlling Hamas and ending violence. But we should also ask the government of Prime Minister Sharon to do the same. We should sponsor impartial legislation supporting continued dialogue to end the violence in the Middle East—protecting the human rights of the innocent involved in the cross fire. We must balance our demands on both of these governments.

Both sides have crossed the line—it is time to get back to the negotiating table. We are not aiding this already volatile situation by giving our weighted support to one side in this conflict. For that reason, I must abstain on this resolution.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 294.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
H.R. 2417, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 295

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2417) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a

substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague and friend, who I am happy to report sits on both the Committee on Rules and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with me, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has granted a modified open rule for H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004. This is the standard rule that we have used for many years for the consideration of the intelligence authorization. The rule is fair. It will allow ample time for consideration of all matters.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Pro forma amendments listed in the report will be debatable under the 5-minute rule.

As in past rules for this legislation, amendments were required to be preprinted. This allowed for the vetting of amendments regarding classified matters, a procedure we have found to be a very good practice, helpful to both the committee and Members.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions, as was announced.

Mr. Speaker, as in past years, we thought it best to allow Members a good opportunity to review the bill and debate the issues that they feel are important, those particularly to our Nation's security at this time when national security is on our minds. Our classified annex and staff has been made available to any Member of Congress that was interested previously or is interested now in reviewing the underlying bill and reports.

□ 1600

H.R. 2417 is, in fact, must-do legislation because of the rules of the House.

It authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2004 intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. In effect, what that is is the 15 agencies of the intelligence community.

In the nearly 2 years since the tragic terrorist attacks on September 11, the intelligence community continues to build its capabilities to combat new threats that are threats to our Nation's safety, the well-being of Americans at home and abroad. The bill authorizes resources to improve the analytical depth and capacity in all areas of intelligence, an area that has been in crying need. This will allow us to process and disseminate the information collected in a more efficient, hopefully wiser and more timely fashion, and make sure all interested parties have access.

In addition, this legislation continues the sustained effort and long-term strategy to enhance human intelligence, an area that is vital to our current war on terrorism and is essentially the core business of intelligence, plans, and intentions of the enemy. H.R. 2417 helps to improve information sharing among Federal, State, and local governments. This is an area and a desire where we have overlapping interests with other committees in the House. This bill also provides including increased training for State and local officials on how the intelligence community can support their counterterrorism efforts, again, a matter of some overlapping interest.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few highlights from the bill that passed the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence unanimously, in the true bipartisan fashion we like to operate our House Permanent Select Committee on. I am sure a whole breadth of topics will be discussed during our general debate; and I think that we have, in this modified open rule, provided ample opportunity for all matters to come to the floor.

I noted today in earlier debate that there was focus on one issue that was not necessarily the subject that was under debate, and that was the intelligence assessments of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Obviously, this is a topic currently under review by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I would like all Members and all interested listeners to understand that we have been conducting a review on the House Permanent Select Committee to discharge properly our oversight responsibilities. We have been using the tools of oversight that are available to us. I think they are adequate, and I think they are being well used. I think we are using them in a thorough and in a nonpartisan manner. And, in fact, the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and I have taken extra steps to detail how this review will be conducted and have actually issued a public statement on that.

I think it is worth rehashing what that statement says: committee hearings, closed and open, as appropriate, that will permit Members to question senior administration officials about the prewar intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction holdings and programs, and its links to terrorism, to include questions relating to the sufficiency of intelligence collection and analytical coverage on these targets.

Granting accesses to any Member of the House who wishes, under appropriate security provisions and House rules, to review the documentation provided to the Committee by the Director of Central Intelligence in response to a May 22 letter from the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and myself to provide information. And I am happy to report we are getting full cooperation from the Director of Central Intelligence on that.

Staff interviews of intelligence community personnel involved in drafting intelligence community analyses of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction holdings and programs and Iraqi links to terrorism.

Regular committee updates and status reports on current efforts to locate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, which, after all, is a priority, including actions of the Iraq Survey Group and other government agencies employed in that task.

And a written report suitable to the results of the committee's review, including an unclassified summary as promptly as is possible.

In fact, I would say, Mr. Speaker, the committee has taken a very important additional step in its review. We have voted to allow access to the 19 volumes that we now have on hand of information provided by the Director of Central Intelligence outlining American intelligence analysis on Iraq and the sources that supported it. I do not believe we have ever done anything that specific before.

To those who believe that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not doing its job or that we are incapable of doing our job, they can come and literally read over our shoulder. I think that the committee is doing its job, and I am very proud of its members and its staff and the way it works; and I am very thankful that I have a ranking member who is anxious to preserve the nonpartisan approach that we take to the Nation's important security business.

Those who have questions about the competence of myself, my ranking member, or any of the other members on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence are welcome to express that today in a vote of no confidence; but I would urge that they not do that. We are doing our very best, and if you would like to come upstairs and help us try to do it better, we would welcome your presence.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my good

friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first point to the extraordinary leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and the bipartisan spirit of the unanimous consent of the entire Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in support of H.R. 2417. I rise in support of the rule providing for the consideration of that measure. It is the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004. This is a modified open rule, and I believe that it is adequate for a bill that is relatively non-controversial and was reported from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by unanimous vote, as I just said.

I would like to reiterate a part of what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has said and state to Members who wish to do so that they can go to the committee's office to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the National Intelligence Program. This schedule includes the CIA, as well as the Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence programs within the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the FBI, and the Departments of State, Treasury, and Imaging.

Also included in the classified documents are the authorizations for the Tactical Intelligence and related activities and the Joint Military Intelligence program of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, the Intelligence Authorization Act we consider today will provide authorizations for some of the most important national security programs in this country. This bill is the result of the committee's ongoing oversight of the intelligence community and oversight responsibilities, which include hundreds of hearings, briefings, and site visits annually.

We are well aware that the global war on terrorism has focused even greater attention on the intelligence community and its mission. The men and women who serve in this community have faced many challenges in the past 21 months and, in my judgment, have responded admirably. This bill assists them in these many challenges. It fully supports the intelligence community's efforts in the war on terrorism by providing funds for analysis, analytic tools, and a unified overhead imagery architecture.

Overall, the committee found the intelligence community is making progress in many areas, but noted that there is currently no one office in the executive branch that is charged with coordinating all elements of the intelligence and law enforcement communities to ensure they cooperate and coordinate their efforts.

The committee also called on the Director of Central Intelligence to improve diversity in the workplace and special attention on recruitment initiatives for women and minorities. I would be terribly remiss right here if I did not mention two former members, one still alive and one who is deceased: former member Louis Stokes from Ohio, and our dear departed friend Julian Dixon, from California, both of whom spearheaded efforts to ensure greater diversity in the intelligence community.

I hasten to urge that the chairman of this committee, and the now leader of the Democratic Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and certainly the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who served on the committee previously, have all been vigorous in their assertions that the intelligence community must do more in the area of diversity. So I will be introducing an amendment that I believe will assist the director in attaining the goals in this critical area.

I do urge my colleagues to support this rule and the bill; and before reserving the balance of my time, I take a point of personal privilege to thank the fine staff of the majority and the minority for the rather extraordinary work that it takes in putting this measure together, and the many measures that come across their desks on a given day, including putting up with some of us as Members and our requests. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I also associate myself with his remarks about Lou Stokes and Julian Dixon, as well as the efforts of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), when she was ranking member in the committee, to deal with the diversity issue. It is critically important. And as the gentleman from Florida knows, I am prepared to accept his amendment at the appropriate time and pleased to have his leadership.

I would also point out that I believe the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) has shown another element that has improved our bill that we approved and were able to bring to the floor in our mark. So that is an area that has received attention because it needed attention, and I am entirely satisfied that we are taking good steps.

I would also point out for other Members that we had a number of amendments requested. I do not think any were particularly controversial as to the bill itself. We have this year, because we are dealing with standing up the Department of Homeland Security, some questions about where we plug in the intelligence piece from our foreign

intelligence community, which is a very big piece, into the homeland security apparatus. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) has been a leader on that and done excellent work and is working with the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the chairman and ranking member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

We also, obviously, are working closely in some other areas that are a little new for us with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, because of some questions about how we deal with some of the Treasury aspects, and, additionally, how we deal with some of the judicial aspects as we respond to the challenge in this country of preventive enforcement for people who would take advantage of our hospitality here and do mischief. And regrettably, we do get the reports regularly that there are still some of those folks in our midst. So we are going to be working in that area.

Not all of that is going to come to a final conclusion today. We are going to go from here, from our authorization bill, to a conference process. I expect there will be progress made in some of these areas where there is some apparent overlap between now and conference time, and certainly everybody is going to be assured that this committee is interested only in the portfolio of intelligence. That is what we do, the Foreign Intelligence Program. The other committees of standing that have jurisdictional areas that are associated we will work with closely and on a friendly and nonterritorial basis. I wish to assure them all of that.

We had, I understand, some amendments that came in late and we had one amendment that was not germane; but otherwise, I understand that the Committee on Rules made six amendments in order. Five were Democratic amendments, one was a Republican amendment; and I believe that the Committee on Rules responded very fairly. I see no reason to oppose this rule and every reason to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would state that I do not intend to use all the time. I will spend the first part of the debate on H.R. 2417 sharing my views about our bill and several other issues of enormous interest to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the underlying bill, H.R. 2417. It is interesting and wonderful that both managers of this rule also ably serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is our bipartisan and collaborative chairman, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is a senior member on the Democratic side. Both have contributed enormously to this rule and, obviously, enormously to the product we will soon debate.

□ 1615

Under this rule, as has been explained, amendments will be considered under the 5-minute rule and thus debate on all amendments that were filed with the Rules Committee, germane and did not require waivers will be in order. I am certain we will have a spirited debate on several of those amendments, and I think that is exactly what we should be doing in the people's House. In that vein, I will conclude, and I look forward to a spirited debate in a few minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to comment and respond that all of us know that individuals who accept the responsibility of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence go to it with nothing but good intentions and a desire to provide the greatest service to this Nation, so I appreciate very much the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). They have been unique in the shadow of the controversy of the Iraqi war to have come together on the question of weapons of mass destruction. I look forward to their work. They have come to this floor to indicate the opportunity for Members to review thousands of documents.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to pursue my position, and that is that there should be an independent commission designed to investigate the issues dealing with the weapons of mass destruction. But in light of their bipartisan effort, I wrote an amendment that indicated subsequent to the completion of their work, 6 months subsequent to that, that we would have the opportunity to design a commission that would then be able to address the questions again, and that is an independent commission separate and apart from this body and as well, of course, the executive and legislative bodies.

I believe the intent was respectful of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I am disappointed that the amendment was not allowed to be admitted on the basis of waiving the points of order, but I will continue to insist that this is the appropriate process to proceed under.

It is not a question of whether or not we find weapons of mass destruction or not. It is not a question of whether we are in a battle over the truth. All we

need is the truth, the finding of weapons of mass destruction or not. Many made the decision to vote for the war because we were told that we were about to be under imminent attack. I think the American people are owed the ultimate determination how that decision was made.

My other amendment had to do with providing local law enforcement access to intelligence as needed and to get security clearances faster than they have been able to do so in the past. I hope we will be able to work together to ensure that happens so all of us who have local officials who need the information to perform their duties appropriately can assess this important intelligence to serve our communities. I look forward to this bill moving through the House, and working on these important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule governing floor debate on H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. I oppose this modified open Rule because it fails to make in order several amendments that improve this legislation and benefit the public.

I proposed two amendments to H.R. 2417 that were not made in order. The first amendment called for the establishment of a "National Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq." This Commission was to be responsible for reviewing and assessing the administration's knowledge of the status of and threats posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program before America went to war. The need for and the benefits of this Commission are obvious. The administration declared war, without a declaration of war by the Congress, based upon the claim that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction and that the United States was in immediate danger of being attacked by the Iraqi regime. Over the several weeks of Operation Iraqi Freedom, dozens of American and British soldiers lost their lives and many more suffered grave injuries. I had the honor of personally meeting many of our valiant, injured troops on visits to Bethesda Medical Facility and Walter Reed Army Hospital. Their courage and sacrifice was overwhelming.

For many Americans, myself included, questions remain whether the deaths and injuries suffered by young Americans in Operation Iraqi Freedom were justified. To date, we have discovered no evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Many Americans are left wondering if the justifications for waging war proffered by the administration were legitimate. That is why I proposed an amendment to H.R. 2417 calling for the establishment of a National Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq. We must study the intelligence available to the administration when war with Iraq was commenced. Was Saddam Hussein producing weapons of mass destruction? Was the Iraqi regime capable of producing weapons of mass destruction? Did the Iraqi regime conceal their weapons of mass destruction after Operation Iraqi Freedom began? These questions, and many more, need answers. The Commission established under my amendment would have provided those answers.

I support the amendment offered by my colleague from California, the Honorable BARBARA LEE. Her amendment calls for a General

Accounting Office report on the degree to which U.S. intelligence services shared information about weapons of mass destruction sites with the United Nations inspections teams searching for those weapons in Iraq. Ms. LEE's timely and important Amendment will provide many of the answers the American public seeks.

I also proposed an amendment to H.R. 2417 to expand the security clearance for law enforcement agents, specified by State executives, so that classified and vital information related to homeland security can be shared. This amendment was also not made in order, but is vital to preparing or local communities to wage the war on terrorism. Protecting our homeland will be conducted by local law enforcement agencies and small communities across the country. It is vital for valuable, often classified information related to homeland security to be accessible to local law enforcement agents. My amendment would have expanded the security clearance for designated State and local officials and given them the ability to receive vital information.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my opposition to this Rule. The Rule is too narrowly drafted and fails to make in order several valuable amendments offered by myself and my colleagues. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the narrowly-tailored Rule and in support of the amendment to H.R. 2417 offered by my colleague Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to respond to my colleague by inviting the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to come upstairs, as all Members are permitted, and see the material being worked on by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and to read the mission of the committee in that regard. I think all Members would find that substantial work is being done, and I believe all Members of this body would be very proud of the efforts put forward by Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in investigating the continuing concern that all of us in this body have, and I dare say the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence are probably more directly concerned in light of the fact that we are there on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), who are doing valuable work by looking into the intelligence surrounding Operation Iraqi Freedom.

By necessity and design, their work is classified. I feel strongly that their work must continue, but that this issue is beyond the scope of a single committee and is of such importance to our democracy that responsible public hearings by a select committee of users of intelligence are necessary. Members of relevant committees such

as the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on International Relations, who use intelligence to make policy decisions every day, provide valuable perspective that should be part of a broader review.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am a user of intelligence, and the information I receive shapes the decisions I make for many men and women in uniform every day. Members of Congress and military planners need to have confidence that intelligence is objective and provides a sound basis for policy decisions.

No decision is more grave than sending American fighting men and women into harm's way. We have a duty to be certain that public policy that we base these decisions on is credible and real. With American and British soldiers continuing to be killed at an alarming rate in Iraq, we have to be sure that our intelligence is providing a realistic view of the threats they have.

Having open hearings by a select committee of policymakers who are customers of intelligence would not only allow Congress to reclaim its vital oversight role, but help convince the American people that their elected officials and President have the right tools to make the right decisions to protect them.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about the purview of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I deeply respect the work that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence does, but with all due respect, as a customer of that intelligence, the classified work that the committee does needs to remain classified, but after that work is declassified and moves to the National Security Agency, to the Pentagon, to the military planners, to the differing alphabet soups of agencies, who then take that classified work and begin to shape public policy with it, once that work becomes declassified and is starting to be moved into the public policy realm, I and others in relevant committees, like the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on International Relations, need to understand what exactly is being done to that intelligence to either promote it or shape it to perhaps fit a preconceived decision by people in the administration or in other parts of the policy-making chain.

I want to know if the intelligence work that is being done so ably by our intelligence people and the analysis done by them has been shaped in any way that would change my mind when I make these decisions. That is why I think we need a select committee. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule, but I support the work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentlewoman

from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) that our committee is one of the users of intelligence. We are part of this community that uses intelligence information; and so it seems to me her point is right, and we are, therefore, the right committee to be assessing these questions and issues.

Second, we have already agreed on a bipartisan basis to hold public hearings as appropriate, and the subject and timing of our first hearing is under active discussion right now. I am hopeful it will be held in July. I certainly agree that the public needs to know about some of these questions. We will discuss them in more detail in a moment. I do commend her for raising this issue. We are trying to address it responsibly in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. If we should fail, then it would be timely to set up a different committee, or a commission, or use another mechanism.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, we are in a very curious position in Congress today. We standing here debating a critical bill to provide funding for our intelligence services while we ask whether those intelligence services might have suffered a massive failure in assessing Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program.

I use the word "might" very deliberately because we do not know whether there was an intelligence failure. That is why we need an investigation, and I commend my colleague from California for pushing for an investigation within the committee because not only the public deserves to know, but we deserve to know equally.

I am puzzled by many of my colleagues' lack of curiosity on this issue. The question of where Iraq's biological, chemical and nuclear weapons now may be is critical to the security of our Nation, and yet more than 90 days after the fall of Saddam Hussein, we have still not located one chemical weapon, biological weapon, or even their precursors production facilities or delivery systems.

We went to war because of the imminent threat those weapons posed. We need to find those weapons if they are there; and if they are not there, we need to ask the question what caused this massive intelligence failure that was presented to Congress as an imminent threat to our national security? Our soldiers in Iraq are still engaged in combat operations. Saddam Hussein may still be out there, Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda are still on the loose, and we need to ensure through our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that we have solid information as we move forward.

Congress has to exercise its powers of oversight openly and honestly and look into these in a thorough way. That is what our constituents deserve. That is what the American people deserve. I

look forward to working with the committee to make sure this happens in a timely fashion.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a distinguished member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, although I think this should be a totally open rule, as has been the tradition for dealing with this bill each year, I do think that the House should understand that the bill that is being brought to the House today is not controversial in the sense that it was agreed to unanimously within the committee. I would add to the remarks of my friend from Florida that this is, once again, a truly non-partisan and bipartisan effort. It is appropriate that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence should operate that way, both as the committee that provides oversight for intelligence activities and a committee that is, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) points out, a consumer of intelligence product.

No doubt there will be a great deal of controversy to follow, a great deal of political discussion to follow in coming weeks and months about the intelligence that led up to the fighting and into the fighting in Iraq. In fact, I think this will be very good for the committee because it is an excellent case study of what intelligence should be, what intelligence should not be, how it can be used, and how it can be misused. I applaud the decision of the chairman and the ranking member to investigate the disturbing matter thoroughly, and I have no doubt that we will be able to investigate it thoroughly.

□ 1630

I applaud their decision to allow Members of the House to read the large volume of material that the Director of Central Intelligence has provided to the Congress. And our committee intends to issue a written report on its findings as promptly as possible.

We have only begun to examine in detail the testimony, the statements, the published intelligence relating to Iraq's weapons programs and terrorist associations. It is early in our investigation, too early in the military's search within Iraq itself to come to any definitive conclusions or explanations of our failure so far to substantiate the prewar claims and expectations of what we would find there. But I have no doubt that the House will be satisfied with the thorough and critical look that the committee will take in this issue.

There is no question that there is a lot of ambiguous information to search through. There is no doubt that there have been some exaggerated claims at least, and lives and deaths have hung on these things. We must take a thorough look at it. We will and I think the

Members of the House will be satisfied with that look.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to add one bit of remark with regard to some of the comment we have just heard which I thought was very helpful. We understand very clearly and the Intelligence Community understands very clearly that finding the weapons of mass destruction or what happened to them or whether there was faulty intelligence is a critical issue and that is indeed ongoing. As the gentleman from New Jersey just said, we are early in the game and we have literally thousands of pages for our staff and Members to work through.

There is one thing that has not been said very clearly yet that does need to be said. I think we all share the desire to make as much of this known as possible to the public. We want the public to understand how good intelligence is and how good it is not. Frankly, I want to do everything I can to make the American people aware as well as people overseas who might be watching what we have to say here, whether they are our friends or our enemies, that our intelligence is indeed formidable and when in fact we find a place where there is a gap in it, it will be repaired and fixed and that gap will no longer be there. I think that will be a comfort to everybody. That process is partially what this bill is about. But we are doing this as regard to the debate with the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq at a time when we desire transparency but we understand that transparency might include some people who are our enemies in the Iraq area where there is still a very dangerous and difficult operational climate as we are tragically reminded every day.

I would ask that we understand that this is not just a question of going back and reviewing material at our leisure trying to come to some Solomon decision about whether it was good or bad or where we can fix it. This is matching information that we had which was the best we had at the time as far as we know with what we are beginning to find as we are able to talk to people who are captured in Iraq and other areas who are terrorists or are associated with them, document exploitation, those types of things and match that up. This process is a process that the committee has taken on. We are not just doing the prewar analysis. We are doing the what is going on now and where is it going on a daily basis.

I hope Members can be assured, we will be in a continuous position to assess, both give a score card to the community and perhaps to come back to our colleagues here and say there are some other areas where we need to invest in the Intelligence Community be-

cause a small investment will yield a greater national security return before we are through. That is an ongoing process and charge of this committee and one we take seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2417 and on the rule that was just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 295 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2417.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1635

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2417) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. OSE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very pleased to bring the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 to the floor today. As always, this authorization is the culmination of both an intensive review of the intelligence budget request and the rigorous oversight of the Intelligence Community that the committee conducts on

an ongoing basis. And I mean ongoing basis. That involves Members and staff here in Washington and elsewhere around the globe.

In putting together this legislation and schedule of authorizations, the committee must first answer the question, what is the state of America's Intelligence Community? Overall there have been some significant improvements since the low point we hit in the last decade, and I am pleased about that. I applaud the President for making needed investments in intelligence capabilities and his appreciation for intelligence as a vital element of the national security of our Nation.

I am pleased to say that our intelligence authorization comes very close to the number that the President has asked for. In dollar terms, we have basically come in at exactly the level of the President's request. Within that framework and building on the progress made to date, the committee has been able to accomplish quite a bit. Among other things, the bill before us provides full support for the Intelligence Community's efforts in the war on terrorism, job one. It postures the United States for the future with a unified overhead imagery intelligence architecture.

I just can put it this way. We have been well served by technology for a number of years. Technology gets old, just like the rest of us, and gets fragile. We need to be in a position to keep a robust architecture of the best technology available and this bill goes a long way to doing that.

This bill also makes needed investments in analysis and analytic tools. Anybody who has followed the progress of the 9/11 joint review done with our colleagues in the Senate and our committees have come to the conclusion that a big part of the problem lies in the coordination and making the whole analytical piece work better. We have focused rather extensively on that this year. It is not a new subject for us.

We also address counterintelligence concerns stemming from such celebrated cases tragically as the Hanssen case and the Montes espionage cases. These cases did do us damage and there are others that can as well. Counterintelligence becomes even more important because we understand counterintelligence may stop people from doing damaging things to Americans here at home.

In addition, the bill continues the committee's push for improved and aggressive human intelligence tools and capabilities. Human intelligence, spying, espionage, getting enemies' plans and intentions is the core business of intelligence.

On the homeland front, homeland security is very much part of our mission in the sense that we must authorize the establishment of some connection between our foreign intelligence and our domestic authorities who are dealing with the problems on the homeland. So we authorize the establishment of a

pilot program to enable State and local authorities to gather terrorist threat related information and push it upward to the Federal level.

The Intelligence Community must be forward leaning on this. As we have discovered consistently through our oversight and through the joint inquiry into the events of September 11, the United States does not have the luxury to be complacent about its national security requirements. Risk aversion, inattention to detail, lack of investment in capabilities, these are not options that the American people are willing to accept and certainly the committee is not willing to accept.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that H.R. 2417 continues the nonpartisan tradition of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of reaching consensus. This is entirely appropriate because partisanship has no place in a debate over America's security. None at all. This measure was reported out of the committee by a unanimous vote of 16-0. And I daresay, we did not start with a piece of paper that we all agreed on. We got to 16-0 by dealing with some things that we did not necessarily all agree on but we did it in a responsible and, I would say, adult way, understanding that the flag we work for is the flag of this country, not the flag for any other agenda.

I urge the House to support H.R. 2417. I will look forward to making comments on individual amendments as they come along.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of H.R. 2417.

First, I want to thank the chairman of our committee for the way he runs the committee. His approach is constructive, collaborative and cooperative and shows a real willingness to work with every member of the committee. I have had the privilege of serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for 6 years. Chairman GOSS has gracefully and competently chaired the committee since 1997 and my predecessors as ranking member during my service include the late and great Julian Dixon and our able leader the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). The membership of our committee is truly talented, diverse and hardworking, and deeply committed to fulfilling its oversight duties and responsibilities to the House. By the way, Mr. Chairman, so is our staff. Committee members and staff worked closely together to craft a bill that provides new and better capabilities to fight the war on terrorism as well as address a range of global challenges. As we have just heard from our chairman, it is a good bill and it received the unanimous vote of our committee.

An excellent summary of the public portions of our bill has been presented by the chairman, so I will not repeat it. The committee made thorough but sen-

sible decisions to focus resources on the highest priority intelligence collections programs and placed limitations on certain new programs until they are defined in more detail. The bill also supports the strategic vision of the committee for strengthening the Intelligence Community. It provides additional support for all-source analysis and encourages virtual reorganization for better information sharing and collaboration across the agencies.

Mr. Chairman, whatever the details of this intelligence authorization bill, we all know that it was developed at a time of heightened concern about the nature and quality of the intelligence that led to the decision to go to war in Iraq. I know that there are questions on both sides of the aisle about this intelligence, questions which our committee is already asking. While an independent commission or other mechanism might be needed at some later date, the members of our committee have now initiated an investigation and I would like to spend a few minutes discussing our effort.

As our colleagues know, I voted to authorize the use of military force against Iraq because I believed the intelligence case was compelling. The Intelligence Community judged that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and the danger, in the President's words, was grave and gathering. The aftermath of the war has revealed just how brutal Saddam Hussein's regime was. The discovery of mass graves in Iraq and the gut-wrenching grief of families victimized by the regime speak for themselves.

To date, however, coalition forces have only uncovered two suspected Iraqi mobile biological warfare agent production plants. Coalition forces have yet to uncover chemical or biological weapons or further evidence of Iraqi links to terrorism. Where are Iraq's chemical and biological weapons? Why can't our forces find them? For our committee, these questions have loomed over the preparation of this authorization bill. It has been anything but business as usual.

On May 22, Chairman GOSS and I sent a letter to the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, expressing the committee's interest in learning in detail how the intelligence picture regarding Iraq's WMD and ties to terrorism was developed. The chairman and I have also met twice with the Director on this subject. In response to our request, the Intelligence Community has provided 19 volumes of information on Iraq's WMD programs and ties to terrorism. On June 12, the chairman and I announced the bipartisan and unanimous commitment of our committee to a serious, focused, comprehensive review of the quality and objectivity of prewar intelligence. We announced that we would hold hearings, closed and open—open means public—to question senior administration and intelligence officials about the prewar intelligence on Iraq's WMD and its links to terrorism.

□ 1645

I think it is very important that the committee hold public hearings, and I have the gentleman from Florida's (Chairman GOSS) personal commitment that we will. I hope our first hearing will occur in July. Our committee also decided to produce a written, unclassified report as promptly as possible, and in addition we agreed to give all House Members access to the materials provided by the intelligence community in response to the committee's request, under appropriate security conditions and House rules.

Last week our committee held two hearings in connection with our investigation, one examining the October, 2002, National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs and the other on the current search for Iraq's weapons. While we are still at an early stage in this investigation, I want to comment on what we have reviewed so far.

First, past possession of WMD. We know that Iraq had chemical and biological weapons in the past. In the 1980s the Iraqi military used chemical weapons against Iran and the Kurds. In the 1990s Iraq admitted to U.N. weapons inspectors that it had produced over 8,400 liters of anthrax and 3.9 tons of the chemical warfare agent VX. Drawing on both direct and circumstantial evidence collected over many years, the intelligence community also concluded that Iraq had people, planning documents, and equipment to support WMD production.

Number two, hiding WMD. The agents that comprise weapons of mass destruction are exceedingly easy to hide, a point neither the administration nor the intelligence community made adequately clear before the war in Iraq. Five hundred metric tons of bulk chemical agents would fill a backyard swimming pool. Biological agents can be hidden in small vials in private residences. But it is not so easy to hide delivery vehicles like unmanned aerial drones, missiles, or munitions. That none of these other harder-to-hide items has been found is cause for real concern.

Number three, overstating the case. When discussing Iraq's WMD, administration officials rarely included the caveats and qualifiers attached to the intelligence community's judgments. Secretary of State Powell, for example, told the U.N. Security Council that "we know that Saddam Hussein is determined to keep his weapons of mass destruction . . ." On the eve of war, President Bush said, "Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised." And on a March 30 Sunday news show, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld said that he knew where the WMD were located. Bogus information on Iraq's alleged nuclear connection to Niger was even included in the President's State of the Union Address. For

many Americans, the administration's certainty gave the impression that there was even stronger intelligence about Iraq's possession of and intention to use WMD.

Number four, circumstantial evidence. The committee is now investigating whether the intelligence case on Iraq's WMD was based on circumstantial evidence rather than hard facts and whether the intelligence community made clear to the policymakers and Congress that most of its analytic judgments were based on things like aerial photographs and Iraqi defector interviews, not hard facts. This is an issue that we have to explore.

And, finally, number five, weak ties to al Qaeda. Iraq did have ties to terrorist groups, but the investigation suggests that the intelligence linking al Qaeda to Iraq, a prominent theme in the administration's statements prior to the war, contradictory contrary to what was claimed by the administration. Much remains to be investigated in this area.

Mr. Chairman, the highest priority of our committee, and I think of our Nation, remains finding and dismantling Iraq's WMD. It is counterintuitive to think that Iraq destroyed its weapons and did not report this to the United Nations. It is conceivable that Saddam destroyed them on the eve of or even after the start of the war once he recognized the futility of using them and the political advantage of keeping the United States from finding them; but the more likely scenario is that he buried or dispersed his weapons of mass destruction and that some may now be in the hands of terrorist groups outside of Iraq or counterinsurgents in Iraq who continue to harm and kill U.S. and British troops.

But even if Iraq's chemical and biological weapons are found tomorrow, and I hope they are, these issues warrant scrutiny by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. It is already clear that there were flaws in U.S. intelligence. Iraq's WMD was not located where the intelligence community thought it might be. Chemical weapons were not used in the war despite the intelligence community's judgment that their use was likely. I urge this administration not to contemplate military action, especially preemptive action, in Iran, North Korea or Syria until these issues are cleared up. Certainly this Member would not support such action until these matters are cleared up.

As the committee moves forward with its investigation, we need also be mindful of the burden the intelligence agencies are carrying, not only in Iraq but also in the war on terrorism in other areas of the world. Our Nation is best served by an effective intelligence community, not one hobbled by risk aversion and finger-pointing. The committee's review must be based on facts, which I and others intend to follow unflinchingly wherever they may lead.

Our Nation needs a robust intelligence budget, which this authorization bill supports. At the same time, the committee's immediate priority is to resolve the questions regarding Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and ties to terrorist groups. If the answers dictate changes in the future intelligence budgets or policy, I am committed to bringing those recommendations forward. Meanwhile, this authorization bill deserves our strong support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that we are going to have a lot of Member participation in the general debate today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), the chairman of the Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence Subcommittee.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the intelligence authorization bill, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me this time.

This bill addresses vital intelligence needs, and may I say there is no greater need nor more important need, in my view, than the need for more and better human intelligence, also known as HUMINT. For America's intelligence community, fighting terrorism, as the chairman has said, is job one and rightly so. In order to learn the plans and intentions of America's terrorist enemies, which we must do to defend against another terrorist attack, we must improve the quality and quantity of intelligence from human sources. Technology certainly can help, but it has limited application. For instance, the overhead collection systems of the Cold War era continue to be a wonderful resource. However, they are not much good for tracking individual terrorists, and they certainly cannot get inside the heads of those individuals who are plotting to kill Americans. For that we must have HUMINT. HUMINT is the force multiplier.

As good as the information is that the National Security Agency collects, it is that much more powerful when HUMINT officers down on the ground locate individuals who can tell them just what those electronic signals mean while talking to them in their native language. This authorization bill recognizes this fact, and I am very proud of the significant bipartisan support given to our HUMINT capabilities by the community.

As I have said previously, throughout much of the 1990s there was a debate about whether America really needed to spend so much money on defense; and as for intelligence, some people even said there was no longer any need for the CIA. Mr. Chairman, that debate is long over. The task before us now is to continue to provide the necessary

resources for HUMINT programs so that our policymakers can have a better, more detailed understanding of what the intelligence analysis means.

Unfortunately, the HUMINT programs of the CIA, America's premier HUMINT agency, were nearly starved to death during the mid-1990s; and with the help from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Congress, and now a supportive administration, those programs are being resuscitated and brought back to new life. But despite this renewed commitment, the CIA still has to surge to cover the world's hot spots. This needs to change, and this bill helps us get there.

The men and women of the CIA wherever they are found are doing a wonderful job; but they need encouragement, they need support from Congress, and they need the support of the American people. Our committee has again this year, under the leadership of the chairman and with the support of the ranking member, made the commitment to provide the resources to properly support these fine people to add to their numbers, to improve their foreign language skills, and to get them overseas where they are needed and needed badly. The support for the effort of these people must be sustained and a vote on H.R. 2417 is a perfect expression of that support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, ranking member, for yielding me this time.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership, along with our ranking member, in presenting a bill that I think addresses many of the concerns that many Members of Congress have expressed to a number of us on the committee.

H.R. 2417 expresses, among other things, the committee's deep and long-standing concern about the lack of progress made by the intelligence community in diversifying its workforce, especially in the senior ranks and the core mission areas. In fiscal year 2002, the intelligence community had a smaller proportion of women and minorities than the Federal Government workforce and the civilian workforce at large. Women and minorities continue to be especially underrepresented in senior grades GS-13 through 15 and in Senior Intelligence and Executive Services positions.

This bill requires that the Director of Central Intelligence submit a report outlining the current diversity action plan including short- and long-term goals. This report should also include the DCI's plan for implementing diversity initiatives across the intelligence community and plans for measuring the progress made by the individual agencies in the intelligence community. The bill limits the use of a por-

tion of the money authorized to be appropriated to the Community Management Account until such time as the Director of Central Intelligence reports to this committee on his plan for implementing an effective and a meaningful diversity plan.

Diversity in the workforce is a corporate imperative. It is critical to defeating global threats and simply makes good business sense. Therefore, the committee will look to the Director of Central Intelligence and each intelligence community agency director to ensure that more is done to diversify the intelligence workforce. The DCI and agency heads are also urged to take diversity into account when selecting officers to fill the many senior management vacancies in the agencies across the intelligence community. It makes good business sense. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2417.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who is the chairman of the Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee who has done an extraordinary job on a very difficult subject.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

□ 1700

I want to pay my respects and admiration to both the chairman and the ranking member who I think are extraordinary public servants and do a great job for our committee.

As chair of the HPSCI's Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, I am continuously impressed by the men and women of the Intelligence Community. Over the past year, we have witnessed significant success in the war on terrorism, to include the capture of a number of significant terrorist operatives around the world. The men and women of the Intelligence Community have worked tirelessly to deter, disrupt, and destroy terrorist capabilities wherever they threaten our interests, and they have performed remarkably in support of our successful military action in Iraq. Their ability to carry out their mission is due, at least in part, to the support provided by the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), this House has consistently supported providing more resources and better tools to the Intelligence Community. This support has only now begun to reverse the underinvestment suffered by the Intelligence Community in the last decade.

As we continue to face threats to U.S. interests at home and abroad, we must remain vigilant. We must ensure that the Intelligence Community has the personnel, the skill, the languages, and the resources necessary to work against such threats. The Intelligence

Community must be prepared to confront the asymmetrical threat to the future.

Mr. Chairman, to this end, H.R. 2417 provides authorization funding for the counterterrorism activities of the Intelligence Community. It provides money and other resources to deepen all-source analytical capabilities. This is most important when confronting the terrorist target. It is through our analytical efforts that all the dots that get collected ultimately get connected.

This bill also provides funding for the Terrorist Threat Integration Center proposed by the President of the United States in his State of the Union address. The TTIC is a primary example of how well the Intelligence Community is marshalling its resources, encouraging efficiencies, and disseminating timely intelligence across government in defense of the American homeland.

The President deserves a great deal of credit for his vision. The Intelligence Community deserves credit for putting that vision into action.

H.R. 2417 also authorizes additional funding to specifically improve the sharing of terrorist threat-related information across all levels of government, Federal, State and local, and it is through the aggressive collection, analysis, and dissemination of threat information that the agencies and organizations of the Federal, State, and local governments, as well as the private sector, can best protect the homeland, prosecute the war on terrorism, and work together to keep America safe.

The counterterrorism elements of the Intelligence Community are at the forefront of this effort, and this bill is an investment in that effort, and I urge support of H.R. 2417.

I want to say a word about two other issues. Some of us have been briefed on the House floor by Secretary Rumsfeld. He stood in the well of this House and briefed many Members. On one occasion, when asked the question, how do we know when we have won the war, he said three things: regime change, which we have accomplished; a new regime, which is now being put in place; and finding the weapons of mass destruction. I have great faith that with two of those goals accomplished, the third goal will be accomplished. I have great faith, after a number of briefings from folks in the Intelligence Community, that the weapons of mass destruction will be found. And I think all Members should have that kind of reassurance from the Select Committee on Intelligence, based on reports that we have received, based on information we have been given by the Secretary of Defense that that will take place.

If I could say one other thing. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman: I think our committee probably has stepped over the bounds a little bit by saying to every Member of the House they can have all of this information. I think sharing this information is going to

turn out to be a mistake. This is the greatest talking body in the whole world. People love to talk. Very few listen. And I am afraid that when 435 Members have access to the information we do, a select committee, an important committee, I am afraid of what is going to happen, particularly after what the New York Times had to say about a very important meeting that we had in the Select Committee on Intelligence, which is now out in the public. Nobody knows how it got out there, but I guarantee my colleagues, if we give 435 access, we got big problems.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I have great faith that the WMD will be found too, and in the seriousness and responsibility of the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), who is ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for his hard work. He is truly a leader, and he treats us with fairness, and he has the best interests of our Nation in his heart, as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). I appreciate that very much.

I would associate myself with some of the remarks that the previous speaker just made concerning having some faith. We are two-thirds of the way there, and I think we have reason to believe we will get there.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2417. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, working with the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), who I appreciate very much his hard work and efforts, we have observed firsthand the dedication and the professionalism of the men and women on the frontline collecting intelligence around the globe. Through their sacrifices and their heroic efforts, they have helped make our Nation more secure and have contributed greatly to our military success in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am pleased that this bill provides the tools essential to intelligence collectors to meet operational goals; in particular, those related to military operations, combating terrorism, and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

My colleagues will also appreciate that in H.R. 2417, it also requires the Director of Central Intelligence to report back to the committee on lessons learned from the war in Iraq. Careful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of our technical systems and processes will allow both the executive branch and Congress to make better resource allocation decisions in the future.

H.R. 2417 also stresses the need for improved strategic and all-source intelligence analysis, both key to U.S. policymaker understanding of the capabilities and the intentions of rogue nations and individuals posing threats to U.S. interests. The bill further authorizes additional billets for analysts, as we all know we have to have people to do jobs, and additional funds for information technology upgrades to help analysts more efficiently do their job.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I trust my colleagues will support it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who is a new and valued member of our committee, and we welcome him.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I too rise in strong support of H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. It is a good bill with bipartisan support and, hopefully, it will be adopted, and I feel sure it will.

Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on our Nation, the Select Committee on Intelligence has noted the urgent need for better information-sharing between and among our various Intelligence Community's agencies, and Federal, State, and even local law enforcement are enjoying better shared intelligence. Since joining the committee earlier this year, I have observed the chairman, ranking member, and committee members, how they have advocated the implementation of new policies and technologies which are designed to facilitate the timely sharing of important information among our intelligence agencies and our local law enforcement.

Technical shortfalls in communications and collaboration systems, however, have undermined efforts to fully share information across the Intelligence Community. This bill makes an effort to correct those issues. These technical limitations can be overcome with proper management and capital investments. This bill provides significant funding to assist the Intelligence Community's leadership in developing and sharing useful information, management tools, capabilities, and operating systems throughout the Intelligence Community.

As important as technological solutions to information-sharing are the needs for updated policies to direct the flow of information. The community's leadership has not been sufficiently clear about its information-sharing policies with its various component agencies. As a result, information becomes irrelevant due to outdated directives or conflicting opinions about what information can or cannot be shared, and with whom. One of the key lessons learned by the committee's 9/11 inquiry last year was that a failure to communicate sensitive data on an urgent basis among intelligence law enforcement agencies can cost our Nation dearly.

The committee has taken steps to improve this situation with this impor-

tant bill. It is a good piece of legislation, a strong piece of legislation. I encourage its passage and support it fully.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2004. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), our ranking member, for their leadership and the professional, bipartisan manner in which they conduct the business of the Committee on Intelligence.

H.R. 2417 includes authorizations for the CIA, as well as Foreign Intelligence and Counterintelligence Programs within the Departments of Defense, Justice, State, Treasury, Energy and the FBI. The bill addresses critical threats to our national security, but it also calls attention to particular areas of concern. Among those concerns is the connection between drug trafficking and terrorist activities.

The committee is concerned about the level of personnel and funding resources dedicated to combat transnational crimes such as drug trafficking, arms smuggling, and money laundering. As seen in both Colombia and Afghanistan, the activities of terrorist organizations are closely linked to the drug trade. These illicit activities feed upon and sustain each other. To defeat terrorist organizations, the Intelligence Community must understand the transnational organized crime that supports them. Therefore, the committee calls upon the administration to reinvigorate the strategy in this area.

In addition, the bill extends the authority granted last year to allow foreign intelligence funds dedicated for Colombia to be used in a unified campaign against drug trafficking and activities by groups designated as terrorist organizations.

Finally, the bill establishes an Assistant Secretary of Intelligence and Enforcement within the Department of Treasury to enhance the identification and targeting of illicit financial transactions. This office will also seek to improve the coordination and dissemination of intelligence products concerning drug trafficking, international crime, and terrorist activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished vice chairman of the committee.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me

this time. I rise in strong support of the legislation.

This Member would like to commend the exemplary bipartisan efforts of the chairman and the distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). Often when people in Washington talk about the need for bipartisanship, what they really mean is that the other side should agree with them. In the case of the Committee on Intelligence, however, there has been true bipartisanship and genuine cooperation towards the goal of serving the Nation's interest. Although this bipartisanship is a tradition on the Committee on Intelligence, it is commendably reinforced by the leadership style and the efforts of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Under the chairman's leadership, and in this bill, the legislative branch will be moving rapidly to address a number of long-standing concerns in our collection and analysis of intelligence. This Member would mention just a few.

First, it should be recognized that in the aftermath of the terrorist attack of September 11, President Bush declared war on terrorist financing. There is, however, no single office in the Federal government that is responsible for ensuring that all elements of law enforcement and intelligence share terrorist information in a timely fashion. As a result, our counterterrorist financing efforts to date have not been as effective as they could be. The committee concluded that the Department of the Treasury needs to be more effective in implementing its counterterrorist financing mission from an intelligence sharing perspective. By elevating the intelligence function within the Treasury Department, this bill ensures that the coordination and information sharing between the Treasury and the rest of the Intelligence Community can be more effective.

This Member recognizes that the assistance and the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), will be required to achieve this important policy change. The Select Committee on Intelligence will continue to work with him and his committee, on which this Member also serves, to ensure that we get this correct.

Mr. Chairman, secondly, it should be noted that Americans have become painfully aware of the threats to the homeland and the risk that terrorist cells and their support networks may be operating in the United States. Several suspected cells already have been cracked. Indeed, an individual has just been convicted last week of conducting surveillance operations for possible al Qaeda attacks. The presence of this new and very real threat has compelled the FBI to transform the way it conducts investigations.

□ 1715

No longer does the FBI solely pursue investigations in order to build criminal cases. Now they are also actively at work to disrupt and destroy terrorist cells before they launch attacks. This is nothing less than revolutionary in the way that the FBI does its business. It is a very necessary transformation that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is following closely through careful oversight. We in the legislative branch are attempting to ensure that the information flow between the FBI and the intelligence community is done effectively, but also within the confines of the law.

The committee intends to continue aggressive oversight. I want to assure our colleagues of this evolving relationship between this intelligence and law enforcement.

Third, and finally, this Member would remind his colleagues of the enormity of the challenge now faced by the intelligence community. The war on terrorism has required an unprecedented commitment requiring timely, actionable intelligence on a truly global scale.

In addition, our intelligence services are devoting significant resources to the effort to Iraq, not only to identify and to apprehend the remaining elements of Saddam Hussein's regime but also to locate Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. More on that subject later.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), the distinguished ranking member of our subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, TNT, who became a grandfather for the second time yesterday.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my new granddaughter, Patricia Lanier, I would say it is my pleasure today to speak about a very important piece of legislation that our colleagues in this House will pass judgment on.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2417, the fiscal year 2004 intelligence authorization act. I am a fairly new member of this House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. It is a unique opportunity for Members of the House to serve on this select committee.

I came on to the committee at the time that the joint 9-11 hearings were taking place. And as I look around the room today and I observe my colleagues that participated in those joint sessions with the Senate, I want my other colleagues that are not on this committee to know how impressed I was with the leadership of this committee and our participation with the Senate as well.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the staff who have been most kind and generous on both sides of the aisle to participate with us as we have gone through these very tough issues.

This is a good bill. It is a complicated bill. It is hard for some Members to un-

derstand. For example, traditionally, the executive branch, the Congress, the industry, we focus on expanding the capability of sensors. Sensors are used to take pictures, to intercept communications or to measure some special signature whether they are from satellites, whether they are from aircraft, or whether they are from ships. But the government has underinvested in abilities to task the collection systems properly and to exploit and disseminate the collection data once received.

For a number of years this subcommittee that I am on on this committee has worked to improve and rectify that imbalance. This year's bill accomplishes that and expands the concept as well. In years past, the committee has stressed the need for more investment and better management at the National Imagery and Mapping Agency and the National Security Agency to improve processing, exploitation and dissemination capabilities for imagery and signals intelligence. The committee sustained these initiatives in the current bill.

We also lay a foundation for applying information technology to solve problems revealed by the congressional investigation into the September 11 tragedy as well.

This is an important bill. I urge its support. I also want to point out that the missile in space intelligence command in my district is adequately covered by funding under this important piece of legislation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the intelligence authorization bill, and I want to start by commending the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for their leadership, their bipartisanship and their commitment. We are all in this together. And while I am at it, I want to compliment the most professional staff that I have seen of any committees in the Congress in my years in this institution.

As a member of the committee, I know well the threats facing our country. They are many. They are varied and they are serious. The job of intelligence is challenging and never ending. All of us, not just in the Congress but across the country, have become painfully aware that while many countries of the world are working with us to promote peace and stability, there are those who are committed to undermining our efforts. The Nation has been exposed to this ugly reality. The memory of September 11 will forevermore be seared on our souls.

Our collective awareness has increased as has our understanding of the

absolute need for a very capable intelligence community. This bill accelerates investment in enhanced capabilities and people to move the intelligence community from being postured from the threats of the past to being positioned to address the increasingly asymmetric threats facing us in the future.

It will not happen overnight, but the changes needed must and will come about at a rapid pace. Rebuilding the infrastructure and retooling for the future is under way even as we debate this issue. Every area of intelligence operations needs support and attention. But I want to focus on what I believe is the most critical need we face, and that is in the area of human intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, the sad fact is that we, of necessity, need to reverse course from the years of decline in investments in the people that make up our cadre of human intelligence officials. This does not mean we should not continue to invest in important technical systems, but we must not become solely dependent on them. Satellites in the heavens and all the sophisticated and complex technologies here on Earth must be complemented by our eyes and ears around the globe. There must be a proper balance between people and machines.

We are proud of our intelligence professionals because of the outstanding work they perform day in and day out, so often putting their lives at risk. What they do and how they do it is not easy. And they have earned our gratitude for their dedication and professionalism.

One of the basic tools that these professionals need in order to do their job is the ability to speak foreign languages. Quite frankly, and this is sad to say, this is a deficient area. I am not at all happy, and I will confess it up front, about the response we have received from the intelligence community leadership on this issue, despite our continuing efforts to improve language skills. We set a clear priority to ensure that we have people with native language capabilities regardless of where we might find ourselves. Yet year after year we have provided an increase in the amount of funds requested for language training, and year after year something happens that is not our intent.

The response to our concerns has been unsatisfactory. Year after year the intelligence community finds ways to avoid implementing these initiatives which are essential to its success.

Mr. Chairman, this year we insist that the community leadership resolve to fix the language inadequacy. No more finessing, no more fudging. Just do it or else.

Our country's intelligence community is still recovering from years of decline. There are fundamental shortcomings that must be addressed, and we will fail in this challenge if we do not adequately restore the resources to a sufficient level to get the job done.

While this budget represents a significant increase over the past years, we support it with the full knowledge and understanding there is a great deal more work to be done. Language being only one of the issues, but this is an issue that we have to pay attention to. It does not do us any good to have some sophisticated satellite costing a jillion dollars up in the heavens taking pictures of Afghanistan, if in the caves there are all these people bent on doing us harm and there is nobody in there who can understand them, communicate with them, or provide us with necessary intelligence. And that is what we intend to correct, and I am proud to say the committee stands strong behind this commitment and we will follow through on it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds. The 15 seconds is to tell the prior speaker, our wonderful colleague, that I totally agree with him. As the representative from the district in America that probably makes most of our intelligence satellites and has fabulous technology, that is great; but we need more investment in human intelligence. And he is right.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), a classmate and good friend, one of the rookies on our committee, but already the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Policy, and National Security.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and the chairman of our committee for their joint leadership and the standards that they set for us every day.

I respect and have high regard for the men and women of the intelligence community, and I really consider it a high privilege to have been appointed to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the House. As a new member, I have valued meeting and learning from the many talented and patriotic individuals in our intelligence community; and I believe it is important for the foreign policy and the national security of the United States that our intelligence community be given the tools and the support they need and that their efforts be focused on important priorities. That is why we are on the floor today in support of this authorization act for fiscal year 2004.

I do have some concerns today that I would like to voice. I serve as the ranking member of the Subcommittee of the Intelligence Policy and National Security, as the ranking member just said. The role of the subcommittee is to examine how intelligence supports national security policy, ensuring that intelligence is focused on the right priorities and is as reliable as it can be and that it is used appropriately by senior policymakers in furthering U.S. foreign policy. Issues such as potentially politicized intelligence, potential

exaggeration of intelligence and imprecise characterizations of intelligence are of significant concern to me in my role on this committee. So I am very concerned about the role intelligence played in the foreign policy debates about going to war in Iraq.

The answers must await a thorough accounting, and we cannot predetermine what those outcomes are. But I am concerned that the administration and the American people and the Members of this House relied too heavily on their interpretation of the threat facing this country, a threat that was described as imminent, as grave and growing without sufficient transparency into the intelligence picture underpinning the argument for war.

I think we are learning that a foreign policy based on preemption puts far too much pressure on the intelligence community to deliver certainty when it simply cannot. So the intelligence community must be given all that they need to protect our magnificent Nation.

Every administration deserves the best intelligence that they possibly can get. But we must assure the credibility of this for the American people and for the world community.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this authorization act. It is important for our country and the protection of our people.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the distinguished gentleman who is a very valued member of our committees and has helped us on a number of fronts.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first thank not only the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), but he ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Our committee is a bipartisan committee. The defense committee that I sit on is also, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and people like that; and it is really a pleasure to work on.

□ 1730

When there is a pressure put on the ranking member to force political gain on weapons of mass destruction, it is a sign of true leadership and bipartisanship to not do that and to work with the chairman to come about and perform a bill like this, and we should all be proud of that, the Members, and I want to personally thank the gentlewoman from California.

The weapons of mass destruction, we cannot say too much about them, but the chairman and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) also made something in order that has not been done before, and that is for every single Member to be able to look at the information. I am convinced that if anyone on this floor looks at that information, they only have one conclusion. There are weapons of mass destruction still there. If we take a vial

this big, the size of an eye dropper and have two seeds in it and in 2 days a person can whip up a batch to kill every man, woman and child in New York City and then try and find that with deceit, a system that was designed to hide it on deceit or destroy it if people get close, and the one thing I can say is we were told there would be absolutely no way possible for Hans Blix and the U.N. to find such things, especially with Saddam Hussein still there trying to hide it. So that was a bogus issue.

I would also tell them that the committee does not just deal with terrorism, the war on drugs, local crime and the one thing that I could say before we ever did a pre-9/11 look was that we did not fund the folks enough. We need to change some laws.

The Phoenix report, we knew there were terrorists in Arizona, but our intelligence agencies were afraid to act because they would be sued because it would be racial profiling, and these guys put out papers supporting Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda, and we could not touch them under the first amendment and that is wrong. There is the same type of people there in Arizona today. One guy was so stupid he went to navigator school. He failed that. Do my colleagues know what he is in today? Airport security, and we cannot touch him.

So I think we need to go further and change some of our laws to protect American citizens, and I know there is a fine line in protecting rights and the other, but by golly, I know where I stand and I know where the committee stands, and I am proud of them.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. We are all proud to serve on this committee. It is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), the rookie on the committee and a rookie in Congress, but he is no rookie to these issues.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I too want to acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member. I have been in local politics for 18 years, and we have tremendous leadership on this committee, and I think all members of this committee put the Nation first.

I rise in support of H.R. 2417. The bill reflects the committee's support for the Intelligence Community and the men and women who serve in the intelligence agencies. Often unrecognized, these individuals have made great sacrifices to secure our homeland and to support the war in Iraq, the global war on terrorism and other important national priorities. I am proud to represent many of the men and women who work for the National Security Agency, NSA, in Fort Meade, Maryland, my Second Congressional District.

This bill addresses concerns for the health and well-being of NSA employ-

ees by providing additional funds to ensure a cleaner, healthier and better maintained workforce. It provides tort liability protection to NSA security officers so that they have legal protections similar to those provided other law enforcement officers.

The bill gives NSA the authority to provide living quarters to the bright and talented students participating in NASA's summer and cooperative educational programs.

It also encourages NASA to continue its acquisition reform initiatives and bring its processes in line with standard commercial and government practices. It increases funds available for the recapitalization and modernization of NASA's technical systems which will allow the Nation's Signals Intelligence Systems to keep pace with changing technology.

H.R. 2417 emphasizes the need for the Federal Government to improve information sharing with State and local governments. As the Baltimore County Executive, I was the county executive during 9/11, this is very important, and where appropriate, private companies.

To make this possible, the bill allows the Director of Central Intelligence to establish pilot projects to train State and local officials to increase the flow of information between them and Federal agencies. Advisory councils on privacy and civil liberties and State and local issues will help ensure the protection of individual rights, and the needs of State and local governments need to be properly addressed.

I am also pleased that this bill provides additional funding to the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center to enhance the analysis of health risks to our deployed forces.

Together, the enhancements provided for in H.R. 2417 will contribute to our Nation's efforts to prevent terrorism and to curb the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction around the globe. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), also a valuable member of our committee.

(Mr. BURR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2417.

After terrorists struck on September 11, 2001, our government has been engaged in an aggressive prosecution of the global war on terrorism, a war that will be fought for years to come, I fear. Our efforts I have no doubt will be successful. To ensure success, however, we must prepare for the long road ahead of us. That is exactly what this bill does.

The men and women of Intelligence and Law Enforcement Communities have been instrumental in the numerous successes thus far. I thank them for their sacrifices, for their dedication. We are indebted to them for their tireless service.

In my view, the key to success in this war on terrorism is communication. We have to improve our communication across the Federal Government. We must improve and make seamless the flow of information within our Intelligence Community. It is essential to have good communication with our liaison partners, and better communication between Federal, State and local authorities and with the private sector must be ensured.

Without doubt, intelligence and law enforcement officers are our front line defenders in our daily battle against this evil. State and local authorities also stand at the forefront of this war. Success in safeguarding the homeland lies firmly in the ability to communicate effectively and share sensitive, timely and actionable information among Federal, State and local officials.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2417 is an important bill because it also specifically authorizes greater training and support to local and State authorities as it relates to preventing the possible use of weapons of mass destruction in the United States.

Additionally, H.R. 2417 authorizes funding to ensure greater participation of city, county and State law enforcement officials in joint terrorism task forces that are spread across this country.

Mr. Chairman, only with better communication and sharing necessary, relevant and actionable information with State and local authorities, can we best wage the best effort on the war on terrorism in our homeland.

I urge its passage.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers except for me and I have some brief closing remarks. So I would yield if there are speakers over there and perhaps speak just before our chairman closes this debate.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to advise the Chair to advise the gentlewoman that we have no further speakers except myself to make a few household and closing remarks.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This debate has been friendly, collaborative, supportive, not just of each other but our staffs. It is clear that committee members are putting the country first in our service on the committee. I believe that our authorization bill is putting the country first in terms of the priorities it chooses, and I believe further, Mr. Chairman, that our investigation of the quality of intelligence supporting the war in Iraq is also putting the country first.

Our investigation has a long way to go but it is serious, collaborative, and bipartisan. We will do as much as possible in public, and we will report to the public on our findings.

Should we hit the wall and fail in our endeavor, then it may be time for a commission or an alternative committee or set of committees of Congress to take over. But meanwhile, I

want to commend the Members of this committee who serve with great distinction, and I urge the passage of this authorization bill, H.R. 2417.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I would like to also announce that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLEY) are other members of the committee who will probably join us later on and we are equally proud of them.

We obviously have an extraordinarily high level of group of members, as my colleagues have seen, on both sides of the aisle who take this business quite seriously, and we are very pleased about that.

I would like to include for the RECORD the administration policy and exchange of correspondence with the chairmen of the appropriate committees. That would be the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 2417—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FY 2004

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

The Administration appreciates the support of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for the work and efforts of the Intelligence Community (IC), as well as the Committee's inclusion in its bill of a significant number of requested provisions. The Administration would support H.R. 2417 if the concerns outlined below are addressed.

The Administration has not had the opportunity to review the classified schedule of authorizations, and reserves comment on those authorizations. The Administration would strenuously object if certain high priority transformational development programs affecting the IC's future collection and research and development strategies, are not authorized as requested.

The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for our initiatives to improve our nation's intelligence capabilities, and believes that section 336, regarding improved information sharing among federal, State, and local government officials, addresses significant and important issues. However, the Administration has concerns with this and other sections of the bill (such as section 321) which seek to direct specific roles and responsibilities to be carried out by particular components of the Executive Branch. They could impinge on the President's constitutional authority to determine how Executive Branch agencies should be organized to carry out national defense and anti-terrorism activities.

Section 505, concerning the measurement and signatures intelligence (MASINT) research program, would provide the Defense Department the authority to review CIA and other intelligence agencies' MASINT pro-

grams. The Administration would oppose this expanded authority for DoD, as we believe the existing authorities and responsibilities are properly vested.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress on these and a number of other policy and technical concerns as H.R. 2417 moves through the legislative process.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2003.

Hon. PORTER GOSS,

Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOSS: In recognition of the desire to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 2417, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2004, the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill with the understanding that you will continue to work with me on sections within the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction and that for any of those sections on which we cannot reach a mutually agreeable resolution, you will remove them before enactment. I further understand that you will support the Committee on the Judiciary's request for conferees on these sections.

The sections in the bill as reported that contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction are:

104(e) (relating to funding for the Department of Justice's National Drug Intelligence Center);

321 (relating to procedures for using classified information);

332 (relating to the use of explosives by certain qualified aliens if they are in the United States to cooperate with the CIA or the United States military);

333 (relating to the naturalization of certain persons);

334 (relating to the types of financial institutions from which law enforcement can obtain financial records for criminal investigation purposes);

335 (relating to certain aspects of the mandatory source rules for Federal Prison Industries as they relate to procurements by the Central Intelligence Agency);

336 (relating to pilot projects to encourage the sharing of intelligence information between state and local officials and representatives of critical infrastructure industries on the one hand and federal officials on the other)

401 (relating to giving certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act when they take certain actions to prevent crime)

504 (relating to giving certain employees of the National Security Agency the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act when they take certain actions to prevent crime)

(These section numbers refer to the bill as reported.) Based on this understanding, I will not request a sequential referral based on their inclusion in the bill as reported.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in your Committee's report on H.R. 2417 and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, June 16, 2003.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2417, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2004. As you noted, several provisions of the bill as reported fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I will continue to work with you on these sections. For any of these sections on which we cannot reach a mutually agreeable resolution, I will remove them before enactment. Further I will support the Committee on the Judiciary's request for conferees on these sections.

The sections of the bill as reported that contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction are:

104(e) (relating to funding for the Department of Justice's National Drug Intelligence Center);

321 (relating to procedures for using classified information);

332 (relating to the use of explosives by certain qualified aliens if they are in the United States to cooperate with the CIA or the United States military);

333 (relating to the naturalization of certain persons);

334 (relating to the types of financial institutions from which law enforcement can obtain financial records for criminal investigation purposes);

335 (relating to certain aspects of the mandatory source rules for Federal Prison Industries as they relate to procurements by the Central Intelligence Agency);

336 (relating to pilot projects to encourage the sharing of intelligence information between state and local officials and representatives of critical infrastructure industries on the one hand and federal officials on the other);

401 (relating to giving certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act when they take certain actions to prevent crime);

504 (relating to giving certain employees of the National Security Agency the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act when they take certain actions to prevent crime).

(These section numbers refer to the bill as reported.) I appreciate your willingness to forgo consideration of the bill and not request a sequential referral based on this understanding.

I acknowledge that by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive its jurisdiction over the bill or any of the matters under your jurisdiction. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in our Committee's report on H.R. 2417 and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2003.

Hon. PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOSS: On June 12, 2003, the Select Committee on Intelligence ordered reported H.R. 2417, The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. As you are

aware, the bill as reported contained several provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

As you know, we continue to have strong concerns about some of these provisions, particularly those relating to the creation of a Bureau of Enforcement and Intelligence within the Department of the Treasury. However, because of your commitment to support my position regarding all of these provisions as the bill moves through the process and the need to move this legislation expeditiously, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Financial Services Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 2417. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 2417 or related legislation.

Finally, I request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Select Committee's report on the bill, and that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this legislation on the floor.

I appreciate your commitment to address my concerns as the process moves forward and willingness to work constructively toward common goals.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, June 17, 2003.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OXLEY: On June 12, 2003, the Select Committee on Intelligence ordered reported H.R. 2417, the "Intelligence Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004." The bill as reported contained several provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

I am quite aware of, and sensitive to the specific concerns you raise about the inclusion of section 105 in H.R. 2417 concerning the establishment of a Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement within the Department of the Treasury. Once again, I want to convey my personal commitment to work with you to resolve this issue to our common satisfaction and support your position in a conference with the Senate on the Intelligence Authorization bill.

I very much appreciate your willingness to waive consideration of H.R. 2417 by the Financial Services Committee. I acknowledge that, by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 2417. I further recognize that the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I will support a request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 2417 or related legislation.

Finally, I am pleased to accommodate your request to include a copy of your letter and my response in the Select Committee's report on the bill, and that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this legislation on the floor.

I appreciate your commitment to work together so as to achieve an appropriate and mutually satisfactory resolution of this important national security matter.

Sincerely,

PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2003.

Hon. PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOSS: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Armed Services in matters being considered in H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I recognize the importance of H.R. 2417 and the need for this legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while the committee is entitled to a jurisdictional claim on this legislation, I do not intend to request a sequential referral.

The Committee on Armed Services asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference. Additionally, I request that you include this letter as part of your committee's report on H.R. 2417.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, June 18, 2003.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2417, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2004. As you noted, elements of the bill as reported fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. I will continue to work with you on these sections. I will support the Committee on Armed Services' request for conferees on these sections.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo consideration of the bill and not request a sequential referral based on this understanding.

I acknowledge that by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive its jurisdiction over the bill or any of the matters under your jurisdiction. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in our Committee's report on H.R. 2417 and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our staff. We have a perfect balance, I believe, between professional management staff and expertise on the various facets of the Intelligence Community which is what we need to do our job properly in terms of providing

oversight on the one hand, to make sure the Intelligence Community plays in bounds and to make sure they have the necessary wherewithal, the advocacy piece that is our other side, the other hat we wear.

I am very much convinced that intelligence is the best investment. We are involved globally. There is no question the United States of America is no secret any place around the world, and in order for us to do the best we can in terms of our security, we have to have good information. It is a good investment.

Nobody would pretend that we are fully sufficient in all that we have. We can always do better, and I think we will probably be talking about sufficiency and insufficiency as we go along in our review.

Nobody would say that we are inherent. There is no document I know that is written that is inherent with the possible exception of the Bible, and some would say the New York Times, but I think they forfeited their right to that recently, nor is there anyone infallible. We are all human beings. What I can say to the American people is that I am satisfied that the men and women of the Intelligence Community of our Nation, and there are thousands of them, are doing their best for our national security, and I think we need to be behind them, and supporting this bill would be a good way to do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2417, a bill to reauthorize appropriations for FY 2004 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government.

It has been my honor to serve this Nation with the Central Intelligence Agency for 10 years, five of which were spent as an operations officer in Southeast Asia. For over 30 years I served on active and reserve duty as a Military Intelligence Officer and have also had the unique privilege of serving as Staff Director for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence under Chairmen Barry Goldwater and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. All this service took place at a time when our Nation was seeking to win the Cold War.

The collapse of the Soviet Union changed our world for the better, but did not eliminate the need for accurate and timely intelligence. We now face a new uncertainty and risk. Rather than focusing on one or two superpowers, we have to defend against numerous lethal covert terrorist groups.

H.R. 2417 responds to these changing threats by boosting the role of human intelligence or HUMINT gathered from human sources around the world; increases our ability to analyze material from a broad spectrum of sources; increases our capability to conduct counter terrorism; and authorizes protections and benefits for our intelligence officers at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, it is incumbent on this body to improve the intelligence capabilities of the Nation, to better serve as the "eyes and ears" of America in a difficult and dangerous world. This bill responds to this urgent requirement, and I support it completely.

H.R. 2417—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY 2004, UPDATED JUNE 24, 2003

FLOOR SITUATION

The House is scheduled to consider H.R. 2417, pursuant to a rule, on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. On Tuesday, June 24, 2003, the Rules Committee granted, by voice vote, a modified open rule providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule provides that it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill, which shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule provides that no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution, and all points of order against said amendments are waived. The rule provides that each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SUMMARY

H.R. 2417 authorizes appropriations for FY 2004 for (a) the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, (b) the Community Management Account, and (c) the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. The authorization level is classified. The funding levels and personnel ceilings for most programs are outlined in a classified annex to the committee report, which Members only may review in the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H-405 in the Capitol.

HIGHLIGHTS

H.R. 2417 will:

Provide full support for the Intelligence Community's efforts in the war on terrorism; Focus attention on the need to enhance Human Intelligence capabilities and tools;

Authorize additional resources to improve analytical depth in all areas of intelligence, and increase our analytical capacity to process, exploit, and disseminate all of the intelligence that is collected;

Posture the Intelligence Community to develop a framework for a unified overhead imagery architecture;

Include provisions that are intended to improve the government's ability to identify any spies that might be working against the United States and to provide the government additional leverage as it moves to prosecute such traitors, such as Hanssen, Ames, and Montes;

Establish a Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement within the Department of the Treasury, to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Enforcement, that will enhance the government's ability to gather and process information about the financial support of terrorism and other illegal activity;

Require the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) to report on lessons learned as a result of military operations in Iraq;

Improve information sharing among Federal, State, and local government officials; including increased training for state and

local officials on how the intelligence community can support their counterterrorism efforts;

Require the Intelligence Community's senior leadership to comprehensively examine (and report to Congress on) policy and technical issues related to digital information sharing, electronic collaboration, and "horizontal integration" across the Intelligence Community;

Extend the authority for the use of funds designated for intelligence and intelligence-related purposes for assistance to the Government of Colombia for counter-drug activities to be used also to fund counterterrorism activities in Colombia for each of FYs 2004 through 2005;

Provide limited immunity from tort liability to those Special Police Officers of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency;

Authorize the personnel ceilings on September 30, 2004 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government and permit the Director of Central Intelligence to authorize personnel ceilings in Fiscal Year 2003 for any intelligence element up to two percent above the authorized levels, with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

Authorize \$226.4 million for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund (CIARDS) in order to fully fund the accruing cost of retirement benefits for individuals in the Civil Service Retirement System, CIARDS, and other Federal retirement systems.

BACKGROUND

Agencies' activities affected by the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2003, include fourteen agencies of the U.S. government, such as: Central Intelligence Agency; National Security Agency; Defense Intelligence Agency; National Imagery and Mapping Agency; National Reconnaissance Organization; FBI (Counterterrorism and Counterintelligence); DOE; Homeland Security; and U.S. Coast Guard.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H.R. 2417 was introduced by Chairman Goss on June 11, 2003. It was reported from the Select Intelligence Committee by a vote of 16-0 on June 12, 2003 (H. Rpt. 108-163).

COST ESTIMATE

CBO estimates that the unclassified portions of this measure will cost \$320 million over the 2004-2008 period, assuming appropriation of the specified and estimated amounts. CBO also estimates the bill will affect direct spending and receipts by an insignificant amount.

H.R. 2417 contains intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), but CBO estimates that the costs of complying with these mandates will not exceed the thresholds established by that act (\$59 million for intergovernmental mandates and \$117 million for private-sector mandates in 2003, adjusted annually for inflation).

AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER UNDER THE RULE (6 AMENDMENTS)

Rep. Cox will offer an amendment (#10) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. The amendment strikes Section 336 (Improvement of Information Sharing Among Federal, State, and Local Government Officials) of the bill. Contact: 6-8417.

Rep. Farr will offer an amendment (#9) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. The amendment seeks to improve the foreign language training of the intelligence community by providing: (1) training in the application of standardized foreign language skill assessment mechanisms; (2) development of curriculum for advanced proficiency intel-

ligence community foreign language speakers and interpreters; (3) non-degree training for translators and interpreters; (4) training intelligence community foreign language teachers in the use of technology geared for teaching advanced "critical languages;" (5) intensive on-site foreign language training. Contact: 5-2861.

Rep. Harman will offer an amendment (#2) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. It amends section (g)(1) of Section 343 of the bill by requiring the Director of Central Intelligence to report on whether further consolidation or elimination of watch list databases in Federal departments and agencies would contribute to the efficacy and effectiveness of the Terrorist Identification Classification System in identifying known or suspected terrorists. If passed, it would also require the Director of Central Intelligence to report on steps required to consolidate or eliminate such watch lists. Contact: 5-8220.

Rep. Hastings (FL) will offer an amendment (#1) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. The amendment directs the Director of Central Intelligence to establish a pilot project to improve recruitment of ethnic and cultural minorities and women to meet the diversity of skills, language, and expertise required by the current mission. Contact: 5-1313.

Rep. Kucinich will offer an amendment (#8) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. The amendment directs the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct an audit of all telephone and electronic communications between the CIA and the Office of the Vice President that relate to weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq preceding Operation Iraqi Freedom. Not later than one year after the date of enactment, the Inspector General shall submit a report to Congress on the audit conducted. Contact: 5-5871.

Rep. Lee will offer an amendment (#7) on Wednesday, June 25, 2003. The amendment requires the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to determine the extent of intelligence sharing by the Department of Defense and intelligence community with United Nations inspectors searching for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Contact: 5-2661.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the collaborative efforts of my colleagues who serve on the Permanent Select Committee in crafting the FY2004 Intelligence Authorization, H.R. 2417. This measure encourages information sharing among agencies, which is critical to our Nation's ability to respond to threats to our homeland security.

There are still important intelligence questions unresolved from our war in Iraq—questions that will, and should, face greater scrutiny in the coming months. This Intelligence Authorization provides added resources that will be used in securing the answers to those questions and we should support it.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to commend the committee for giving us a bill that strengthens the Intelligence Community and provides new and better capabilities to fight the war on terrorism, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the debate is concluded.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

HEFLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. ISAKSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2417) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will taken in the following order:

- H. Con. Res. 49, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 199, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 294, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H. Res. 277 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT ESCALATION OF ANTI-SEMITIC VIOLENCE WITHIN PARTICIPATING STATES OF OSCE IS OF PROFOUND CONCERN AND EFFORTS SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO PREVENT FUTURE OCCURRENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 49.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 49, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]
YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Berry	Burgess
Ackerman	Biggart	Burns
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burr
Akin	Bishop (GA)	Burton (IN)
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Buyer
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Andrews	Blackburn	Camp
Baca	Blumenauer	Cannon
Bachus	Blunt	Cantor
Baird	Boehlert	Capito
Baker	Boehner	Capps
Baldwin	Bonilla	Capuano
Ballance	Bonner	Cardin
Ballenger	Bono	Cardoza
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Carson (IN)
Bartlett (MD)	Boswell	Carson (OK)
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Carter
Bass	Boyd	Case
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Castle
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Bell	Brady (TX)	Chocola
Bereuter	Brown (OH)	Clay
Berkley	Brown (SC)	Clyburn
Berman	Brown, Corrine	Coble

Cole	Hoyer	Nadler
Collins	Hulshof	Napolitano
Cooper	Hyde	Neal (MA)
Costello	Insee	Nethercutt
Cox	Isakson	Neugebauer
Cramer	Israel	Ney
Crane	Issa	Northup
Crenshaw	Istook	Nunes
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Cummings	(TX)	Obey
Cunningham	Janklow	Olver
Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Ortiz
Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Osborne
Davis (FL)	John	Ose
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Otter
Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)	Owens
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Oxley
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Deal (GA)	Jones (NC)	Pascarell
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Pastor
DeGette	Kanjorski	Paul
Delahunt	Kaptur	Payne
DeLauro	Keller	Pearce
DeLay	Kelly	Pelosi
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Pence
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilpatrick	Petri
Dicks	Kind	Pickering
Dingell	King (IA)	Pitts
Doggett	King (NY)	Platts
Dooley (CA)	Kingston	Pomeroy
Doolittle	Kirk	Porter
Doyle	Kleczka	Portman
Dreier	Kline	Price (NC)
Duncan	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)
Dunn	Kucinich	Putnam
Edwards	LaHood	Quinn
Ehlers	Lampson	Radanovich
Emanuel	Langevin	Rahall
Emerson	Lantos	Ramstad
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
English	Larson (CT)	Regula
Eshoo	Latham	Rehberg
Etheridge	LaTourette	Reyes
Evans	Leach	Reynolds
Farr	Lee	Rodriguez
Fattah	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Feeney	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Foley	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Lipinski	Ross
Ford	LoBiondo	Rothman
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Royce
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Ruppersberger
Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Rush
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Gerlach	Majette	Ryan (WI)
Gibbons	Maloney	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sabo
Gingrey	Markey	Sanchez, Linda
Gonzalez	Marshall	T.
Goode	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
Goodlatte	Matsui	Sanders
Gordon	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Goss	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Granger	McCollum	Schiff
Graves	McCotter	Schrock
Green (TX)	McCrery	Scott (GA)
Green (WI)	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Greenwood	McGovern	Sensenbrenner
Grijalva	McHugh	Serrano
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sessions
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shaw
Hall	McKeon	Shays
Harman	McNulty	Sherman
Harris	Meek (FL)	Sherwood
Hart	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Simmons
Hayes	Michaud	Simpson
Hefley	Millender-	Slaughter
Hensarling	McDonald	Smith (MI)
Herger	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hill	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Hinchey	Miller (NC)	Snyder
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Solis
Hobson	Miller, George	Souder
Hoefel	Mollohan	Spratt
Hoekstra	Moore	Stearns
Holden	Moran (KS)	Stenholm
Holt	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Honda	Murphy	Stupak
Hooley (OR)	Murtha	Sullivan
Hostettler	Musgrave	Sweeney
Houghton	Myrick	Tancredo

Tanner	Turner (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Tauscher	Udall (CO)	Weldon (PA)
Tauzin	Udall (NM)	Weller
Taylor (MS)	Upton	Wexler
Taylor (NC)	Van Hollen	Whitfield
Terry	Velazquez	Wicker
Thomas	Visclosky	Wilson (NM)
Thompson (CA)	Vitter	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (MS)	Walden (OR)	Wolf
Thornberry	Walsh	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Wamp	Wu
Tiberti	Waters	Wynn
Tierney	Watson	Young (AK)
Toomey	Watt	Young (FL)
Towns	Waxman	
Turner (OH)	Weiner	

NOT VOTING—22

Brown-Waite,	Franks (AZ)	Pombo
Ginny	Gephardt	Renzi
Conyers	Gilchrest	Saxton
Cubin	Hayworth	Shadegg
Everett	Hunter	Skelton
Flake	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Fletcher	Meehan	Stark
Fossella	Norwood	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1806

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series of votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CALLING ON CHINA TO IMMEDIATELY AND UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE DR. YANG JIANLI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 199, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]
YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Baker	Bell
Ackerman	Baldwin	Bereuter
Aderholt	Ballance	Berkley
Akin	Ballenger	Berry
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Biggart
Allen	Bartlett (MD)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)
Baca	Bass	Bishop (NY)
Bachus	Beauprez	Bishop (UT)
Baird	Becerra	Blackburn

Blumenauer	Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Ruppersberger	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)	Ballance	Emerson	Latham
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Rush	Snyder	Upton	Ballenger	Engel	LaTourette
Boehrlert	Gerlach	Majette	Ryan (OH)	Solis	Van Hollen	Barrett (SC)	English	Leach
Boehner	Gibbons	Maloney	Ryan (WI)	Souder	Velazquez	Bartlett (MD)	Eshoo	Levin
Bonilla	Gillmor	Manzullo	Ryan (KS)	Spratt	Visclosky	Barton (TX)	Etheridge	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Gingrey	Markey	Sabo	Stearns	Vitter	Bass	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Bono	Gonzalez	Marshall	Sanchez, Linda T.	Stenholm	Walden (OR)	Beauprez	Farr	Lewis (KY)
Boozman	Goode	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Strickland	Walsh	Becerra	Fattah	Linder
Boswell	Goodlatte	Matsui	Sanders	Stupak	Wamp	Bell	Feeney	Lipinski
Boucher	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin	Sullivan	Waters	Bereuter	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Boyd	Goss	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky	Sweeney	Watson	Berkley	Filner	Lofgren
Bradley (NH)	Granger	McCollum	Schiff	Tancred	Watt	Berman	Foley	Lowe
Brady (PA)	Graves	McCotter	Schrock	Tanner	Waxman	Berry	Forbes	Lucas (KY)
Brady (TX)	Green (TX)	McCreery	Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Weiner	Biggart	Ford	Lucas (OK)
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Tauzin	Weldon (FL)	Bilirakis	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Brown (SC)	Greenwood	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)	Bishop (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Majette
Brown, Corrine	Grijalva	McHugh	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Weller	Bishop (NY)	Frost	Maloney
Burgess	Gutierrez	McInnis	Serrano	Terry	Wexler	Bishop (UT)	Gallegly	Manzullo
Burns	Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shaw	Thomas	Whitfield	Blackburn	Garrett (NJ)	Markey
Burr	Hall	McKeon	Shays	Thompson (CA)	Wicker	Blumenauer	Gerlach	Marshall
Burton (IN)	Harman	McNulty	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (NM)	Blunt	Gibbons	Matheson
Buyer	Harris	Meehan	Sherwood	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)	Boehrlert	Gillmor	Matsui
Calvert	Hart	Meek (FL)	Shimkus	Tiaht	Wolf	Boehner	Gingrey	McCarthy (MO)
Camp	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Shuster	Tiberi	Woolsey	Bonilla	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Simmons	Tierney	Wu	Bonner	Goode	McCollum
Cantor	Hayes	Mica	Simpson	Toomey	Wynn	Bono	Goodlatte	McCotter
Capito	Hefley	Michaud	Slaughter	Towns	Young (AK)	Boozman	Gordon	McCreery
Capps	Hensarling	Millender-	Smith (MI)	Turner (OH)	Young (FL)	Boswell	Goss	McGovern
Capuano	Herger	McDonald	Smith (NJ)	Turner (TX)		Boucher	Granger	McHugh
Cardin	Hill	Miller (FL)		Udall (CO)		Boyd	Graves	McInnis
Cardoza	Hinche	Miller (MI)				Bradley (NH)	Green (TX)	McIntyre
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)				Brady (PA)	Green (WI)	McKeon
Carson (OK)	Hobson	Miller, Gary				Brady (TX)	Greenwood	McNulty
Carter	Hoefel	Miller, George				Brown (OH)	Grijalva	Meehan
Case	Hoekstra	Mollohan				Brown (SC)	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Castle	Holden	Moore				Brown, Corrine	Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)
Chabot	Holt	Moran (KS)				Burgess	Hall	Menendez
Chocola	Honda	Moran (VA)				Burns	Harman	Mica
Clay	Hooley (OR)	Murphy				Burr	Harris	Michaud
Clyburn	Hostettler	Murtha				Burton (IN)	Hart	Millender-
Coble	Houghton	Musgrave				Buyer	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Cole	Hoyer	Myrick				Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Collins	Hulshof	Nadler				Camp	Hayes	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hyde	Napolitano				Cannon	Hefley	Miller (NC)
Costello	Inslee	Neal (MA)				Cantor	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Cox	Isakson	Nethercutt				Capito	Herger	Miller, George
Cramer	Israel	Neugebauer				Capps	Hill	Mollohan
Crane	Issa	Ney				Capuano	Hinche	Moore
Crenshaw	Istook	Northup				Cardin	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Nunes				Cardoza	Hobson	Murphy
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Nussle				Carson (IN)	Hoefel	Murtha
Cummings	(TX)	Oberstar				Carson (OK)	Hoekstra	Musgrave
Cunningham	Janklow	Obey				Carter	Holden	Myrick
Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Olver				Case	Holt	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Ortiz				Castle	Honda	Napolitano
Davis (FL)	John	Osborne				Chabot	Hooley (OR)	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Ose				Chocola	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)	Otter				Clyburn	Houghton	Neugebauer
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, E. B.	Owens				Coble	Hoyer	Ney
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Oxley				Cole	Hulshof	Northup
Deal (GA)	Jones (NC)	Pallone				Collins	Hyde	Nunes
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Pascarell				Cooper	Inslee	Nussle
DeGette	Kanjorski	Pastor				Costello	Isakson	Oberstar
Delahunt	Kaptur	Paul				Cox	Israel	Olver
DeLauro	Keller	Payne				Cramer	Issa	Ortiz
DeLay	Kelly	Pearce				Crane	Istook	Osborne
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Pelosi				Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Ose
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Pence				Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Otter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kildee	Peterson (MN)				Culberson	(TX)	Owens
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)				Cummings	Janklow	Oxley
Dicks	Kind	Petri				Cunningham	Jefferson	Pallone
Dingell	King (IA)	Pickering				Davis (AL)	Jenkins	Pascarell
Doggett	King (NY)	Pitts				Davis (CA)	John	Pastor
Dooley (CA)	Kingston	Platts				Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Payne
Doolittle	Kirk	Pomeroy				Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)	Pearce
Doyle	Kleczka	Porter				Davis (TN)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Dreier	Kline	Portman				Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Pence
Duncan	Knollenberg	Price (NC)				Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
Dunn	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)				Deal (GA)	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
Edwards	LaHood	Putnam				DeFazio	Kanjorski	Petri
Ehlers	Lampson	Quinn				DeGette	Kaptur	Pickering
Emanuel	Langevin	Radanovich				Delahunt	Keller	Pitts
Emerson	Lantos	Rahall				DeLauro	Kelly	Platts
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Ramstad				DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Pomeroy
English	Larson (CT)	Rangel				DeMint	Kennedy (RI)	Porter
Eshoo	Latham	Regula				Deutsch	Kildee	Portman
Etheridge	LaTourette	Rehberg				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind	Price (NC)
Evans	Leach	Reyes				Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)	Pryce (OH)
Farr	Lee	Reynolds				Dicks	King (NY)	Putnam
Fattah	Levin	Rodriguez				Doggett	Kingston	Quinn
Feeney	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)				Dooley (CA)	Kirk	Radanovich
Ferguson	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)				Doolittle	Kline	Ramstad
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)				Doyle	Knollenberg	Rangel
Foley	Linder	Rohrabacher				Dreier	LaHood	Regula
Forbes	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen				Duncan	Lampson	Rehberg
Ford	LoBiondo	Ross				Dunn	Langevin	Reyes
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Rothman				Edwards	Lantos	Reynolds
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Roybal-Allard				Ehlers	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Royce				Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)

NOT VOTING—22

Berman
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Conyers
Cubin
Everett
Flake
Fletcher
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Hayworth
Hunter
Kolbe
Norwood
Pombo
Renzi
Saxton
Shadegg
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1814

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING TERRORISM INFLECTED ON ISRAEL SINCE AQABA SUMMIT AND EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE ISRAELI PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 294.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 294, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 5, answered “present” 7, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Alexander	Bachus
Ackerman	Allen	Baird
Aderholt	Andrews	Baker
Akin	Baca	Baldwin

Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Tierney
Rogers (MI)	Shuster	Toomey
Rohrabacher	Simmons	Towns
Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Turner (OH)
Ross	Slaughter	Turner (TX)
Rothman	Smith (MI)	Udall (CO)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)
Royce	Smith (TX)	Upton
Ruppersberger	Snyder	Van Hollen
Rush	Solis	Velazquez
Ryan (OH)	Souder	Visclosky
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Vitter
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Walden (OR)
Sabo	Stenholm	Walsh
Sanchez, Linda T.	Strickland	Wamp
Sanchez, Loretta	Stupak	Watson
Sanders	Sullivan	Waxman
Sandlin	Sweeney	Weiner
Schakowsky	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Schiff	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Schrock	Tauscher	Weller
Scott (GA)	Tauzin	Wexler
Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Serrano	Terry	Wilson (NM)
Sessions	Thomas	Wilson (SC)
Shaw	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Shays	Thompson (MS)	Wu
Sherman	Thornberry	Wynn
Sherwood	Tiahrt	Young (AK)
	Tiberi	Young (FL)

NAYS—5

Dingell	Paul	Woolsey
Kleczyka	Rahall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Clay	Lee	Watt
Kilpatrick	McDermott	
Kucinich	Waters	

NOT VOTING—23

Brown-Waite,	Franks (AZ)	Obey
Ginny	Gephardt	Pombo
Conyers	Gilchrest	Renzi
Cubin	Hayworth	Saxton
Everett	Hunter	Shadegg
Flake	Kolbe	Skelton
Fletcher	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
Fossella	Norwood	Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1823

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I was attending Congressman Bob Stump's funeral service today and missed votes on the following measures:

On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Con. Res. 49—Expressing the sense of the Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences (Roll No. 315). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 199—Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China immediately and unconditionally to release Dr. Yang Jianli, calling on the President of the United States to continue working on behalf of Dr. Yank Jianli for his release (Roll No. 316). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 294—Condemning the terrorism inflicted

on Israel since the Aqaba summit, expressing solidarity with the Israeli people, and calling on the Palestinian Authority to take immediate and effective steps to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure on the West Bank and Gaza (Roll No. 317). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 295 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2417.

□ 1824

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2417) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2417

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

- Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.
- Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.
- Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.
- Sec. 105. Intelligence elements of the Department of the Treasury.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Subtitle A—Recurring General Provisions
- Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
- Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Subtitle B—Intelligence

Sec. 311. Modification of notice and wait requirements on projects to construct or improve intelligence community facilities.

Subtitle C—Counterintelligence

Sec. 321. Counterintelligence initiatives for the intelligence community.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

- Sec. 331. Extension of suspension of reorganization of Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office.
- Sec. 332. Modifications of authorities on explosive materials.
- Sec. 333. Modification of prohibition on the naturalization of certain persons.
- Sec. 334. Modification to definition of financial institution in the Right to Financial Privacy Act.
- Sec. 335. Procedural requirements for Central Intelligence Agency relating to products of Federal prison industries.
- Sec. 336. Improvement of information sharing among federal, State, and local government officials.

Subtitle E—Reports and Technical Amendments

- Sec. 341. Extension of deadline for final report of the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community.
- Sec. 342. Modification of various reports required of intelligence community elements.
- Sec. 343. Technical amendments.
- Sec. 344. Report on lessons learned from military operations in Iraq.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

- Sec. 401. Protection from tort liability for certain Central Intelligence Agency personnel.
- Sec. 402. Repeal of limitation on use of funds in Central Services Working Capital Fund.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

- Sec. 501. Use of funds for counterdrug and counterterrorism activities for Colombia.
- Sec. 502. Authority to provide living quarters for certain students in cooperative and summer education programs of the National Security Agency.
- Sec. 503. Authority for intelligence community elements of Department of Defense to award personal service contracts.
- Sec. 504. Protection of certain National Security Agency personnel from tort liability.
- Sec. 505. Measurement and signatures intelligence program.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (2) The Department of Defense.
- (3) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (4) The National Security Agency.
- (5) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (6) The National Imagery and Mapping Agency.
- (7) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (8) The Department of State.
- (9) The Department of the Treasury.
- (10) The Department of Energy.
- (11) The Department of Justice.
- (12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (13) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (14) The Coast Guard.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL CEILINGS.—The amounts authorized to

be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2004, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 2417 of the One Hundred Eighth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—With the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Central Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2004 under section 102 when the Director of Central Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 2 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such section for such element.

(b) NOTICE TO INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall notify promptly the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate whenever the Director exercises the authority granted by this section.

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence for fiscal year 2004 the sum of \$192,640,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for the Advanced Research and Development Committee shall remain available until September 30, 2005.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized 320 full-time personnel as of September 30, 2004. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Intelligence Community Management Account or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are also authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2004 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts shall remain available until September 30, 2004.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2004, there are hereby authorized such additional personnel for such elements as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—Except as provided in section 113 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404h), during fiscal year 2004 any officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the staff of the Intelligence Community Management Account from another element of the

United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member may be detailed on a non-reimbursable basis for a period of less than one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of Central Intelligence.

(e) NATIONAL DRUG INTELLIGENCE CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), \$34,248,000 shall be available for the National Drug Intelligence Center. Within such amount, funds provided for research, development, testing, and evaluation purposes shall remain available until September 30, 2005, and funds provided for procurement purposes shall remain available until September 30, 2006.

(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall transfer to the Attorney General funds available for the National Drug Intelligence Center under paragraph (1). The Attorney General shall utilize funds so transferred for the activities of the National Drug Intelligence Center.

(3) LIMITATION.—Amounts available for the National Drug Intelligence Center may not be used in contravention of the provisions of section 103(d)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(d)(1)).

(4) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall retain full authority over the operations of the National Drug Intelligence Center.

SEC. 105. INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 402 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“BUREAU OF INTELLIGENCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

“SEC. 119. (a) IN GENERAL.—There is within the Department of the Treasury a Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement headed by an Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Enforcement, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) The Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Enforcement shall oversee and coordinate functions of the Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement.

“(2) The Assistant Secretary shall report directly to the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(c) COMPOSITION OF BUREAU.—The Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement shall consist of the following offices:

“(1) The Office of Intelligence Support.

“(2) The Office of Foreign Assets Control.

“(3) The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

“(4) Such other offices as the Assistant Secretary may establish.”.

(2) The table of contents contained in the first section of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 118 the following new item:

“Sec. 119. Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement of the Department of the Treasury.”.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH DCI IN APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTELLIGENCE AND ENFORCEMENT.—Section 106(b)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 403-6(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) The Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Enforcement.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 3(4) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “the Department of the Treasury,” in subparagraph (H);

(B) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (J);

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (K) as subparagraph (L); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following new subparagraph:

“(K) the Bureau of Intelligence and Enforcement of the Department of the Treasury; and”.

(2) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury by striking “(7)” and inserting “(8)”.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2004 the sum of \$226,400,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Recurring General Provisions

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise permitted under the Constitution or authorized pursuant to the laws of the United States.

Subtitle B—Intelligence

SEC. 311. MODIFICATION OF NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS ON PROJECTS TO CONSTRUCT OR IMPROVE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

(a) INCREASE OF THRESHOLDS FOR NOTICE.—Section 602(a) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-359; 108 Stat. 3432; 50 U.S.C. 403-2b(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “\$750,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$5,000,000”;

(2) by striking “\$500,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(3) in paragraph (2), as amended by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting after “\$1,000,000” the second place it appears, the following: “but less than \$5,000,000”.

(b) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS FOR EMERGENCY PROJECTS.—Section 602(b)(2) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-359; 108 Stat. 3432; 50 U.S.C. 403-2b(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the third sentence, by striking “21-day” and inserting “7-day”; and,

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, when the Director of Central Intelligence and Secretary of Defense jointly determine that an emergency relating to the national security or to the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality exists and that delay would irreparably harm any or all of those interests, the project may begin on the date the notification is received by such committees.”.

Subtitle C—Counterintelligence

SEC. 321. COUNTERINTELLIGENCE INITIATIVES FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“COUNTERINTELLIGENCE INITIATIVES

“SEC. 1102. (a) INSPECTION PROCESS.—(1) In order to protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Director of Central Intelligence shall establish and implement an inspection process for all agencies and departments of the United States that handle classified information relating to the national security of the United States intended to assure that those agencies and departments maintain effective operational security practices and programs directed against counterintelligence activities.

“(2) The Director shall carry out the process through the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive.

“(b) FBI COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OFFICE.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish an Office of Counterintelligence within the Bureau to investigate potential espionage activities within the Bureau.

“(c) ANNUAL REVIEW OF DISSEMINATION LISTS.—(1) The Director of Central Intelligence shall establish and implement a process for all elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 101(4)) to review, on an annual basis, individuals included on distribution lists for access to classified information. Such process shall ensure that only individuals who have a particularized ‘need to know’ (as determined by the Director) are continued on such distribution lists.

“(2) Not later than October 15 of each year, the Director shall certify to the congressional intelligence committees that the review required under paragraph (1) has been conducted in all elements of the intelligence community during the preceding fiscal year.

“(d) REQUIRED COMPLETION OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.—(1) The Director of Central Intelligence shall establish and implement a process by which heads of the elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 101(4)) direct that all employees, in order to be granted access to classified information, submit financial disclosure forms required under section 1.3(b) of Executive Order No. 12969 (August 2, 1995; 60 F.R. 40245; 50 U.S.C. 435 note).

“(2) The Director shall carry out paragraph (1) through the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive.

“(e) ARRANGEMENTS TO HANDLE SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall establish, for all elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 101(4)), programs and procedures by which sensitive classified information relating to human intelligence is safeguarded against unauthorized disclosure by employees of those elements.”

(2) The table of contents contained in the first section of such Act is amended in the items relating to title XI by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 1102. Counterintelligence initiatives.”

(b) INTELLIGENCE AND NATIONAL SECURITY ASPECTS OF ESPIONAGE PROSECUTIONS.—The Attorney General, acting through the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review of the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive, shall establish policies and procedures to assist the Attorney General in the Attorney General’s consideration of intelligence and national security equities in the development of charging documents and related pleadings in espionage prosecutions.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 331. EXTENSION OF SUSPENSION OF REORGANIZATION OF DIPLOMATIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROGRAM OFFICE.

Section 311 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-108; 115 Stat. 1401; 22 U.S.C. 7301 note), as amended by section 351 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 116 Stat. 2401; 22 U.S.C. 7301 note), is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “two-year” before “suspension of reorganization”; and

(2) in the text, by striking “ending on October 1, 2003” and inserting “ending on the date that is 60 days after the date on which appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction (as defined in section 324(d) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 7304(d)) are notified jointly by the Secretary of State (or the Secretary’s designee) and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or the Director’s designee) that the operational framework for the office has been terminated”.

SEC. 332. MODIFICATIONS OF AUTHORITIES ON EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DISTRIBUTE EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS TO QUALIFIED ALIENS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be lawful for any person knowingly to distribute explosive materials to any qualified alien—

(1) if, in the case of a qualified alien described in subsection (c)(1), the distribution to, shipment to, transportation to, receipt by, or possession by the alien of the explosive materials is in furtherance of such cooperation; or

(2) if, in the case of a qualified alien described in subsection (c)(2), the distribution to, shipping to, transporting to, possession by, or receipt by the alien of explosive materials is in furtherance of the authorized military purpose.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR QUALIFIED ALIENS TO SHIP EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be lawful for a qualified alien to ship or transport any explosive in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce or to receive or possess any explosive which has been shipped or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce—

(1) if, in the case of a qualified alien described in subsection (c)(1), the possession, shipment, or transportation by the alien of the explosive materials is in furtherance of such cooperation; or

(2) if, in the case of a qualified alien described in subsection (c)(2), the possession, shipment, or transportation by the alien of explosive materials is in furtherance of the authorized military purpose.

(c) QUALIFIED ALIEN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “qualified alien” means an alien—

(1) who is lawfully present in the United States in cooperation with the Director of Central Intelligence; or

(2) who is a member of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), or other friendly foreign military force (as determined by the Attorney General with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense) who is present in the United States under military orders for training or other military purpose authorized by the United States.

SEC. 333. MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON THE NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS.

Section 313(e)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1424(e)(4)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “when Department of Defense activities are relevant to the determination” after “Secretary of Defense”; and

(2) by inserting “and the Secretary of Homeland Security” after “Attorney General”.

SEC. 334. MODIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION IN THE RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(1) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401(1)) is amended by inserting “, except as provided in section 1114,” before “means any of—”

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1114 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) For purposes of this section, the term ‘financial institution’ has the same meaning as in section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code, except that, for purposes of this section, such term shall include only such a financial institution any part of which is located inside any State or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the United States Virgin Islands.”

SEC. 335. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO PRODUCTS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES.

The Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RELATING TO PRODUCTS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

“SEC. 23. (a) MARKET RESEARCH.—Before purchasing a product listed in the latest edition of

the Federal Prison Industries catalog under section 4124(d) of title 18, United States Code, the Director shall conduct market research to determine whether the Federal Prison Industries product is comparable to products available from the private sector that best meet the Agency’s needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery.

“(b) COMPETITION REQUIREMENT.—If the Director determines that a Federal Prison Industries product is not comparable in price, quality, or time of delivery to products available from the private sector that best meet the Agency’s needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery, the Director shall use competitive procedures for the procurement of the product or shall make an individual purchase under a multiple award contract. In conducting such a competition or making such a purchase, the Director shall consider a timely offer from Federal Prison Industries.

“(c) IMPLEMENTATION BY DIRECTOR.—The Director shall ensure that—

“(1) the Agency does not purchase a Federal Prison Industries product or service unless a contracting officer of the Agency determines that the product or service is comparable to products or services available from the private sector that best meet the Agency’s needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery; and

“(2) Federal Prison Industries performs its contractual obligations to the same extent as any other contractor for the Agency.

“(d) MARKET RESEARCH DETERMINATION NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW.—A determination by a contracting officer regarding whether a product or service offered by Federal Prison Industries is comparable to products or services available from the private sector that best meet the Agency’s needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery shall not be subject to review pursuant to section 4124(b) of title 18.

“(e) PERFORMANCE AS A SUBCONTRACTOR.—(1) A contractor or potential contractor of the Agency may not be required to use Federal Prison Industries as a subcontractor or supplier of products or provider of services for the performance of a contract of the Agency by any means, including means such as—

“(A) a contract solicitation provision requiring a contractor to offer to make use of products or services of Federal Prison Industries in the performance of the contract;

“(B) a contract specification requiring the contractor to use specific products or services (or classes of products or services) offered by Federal Prison Industries in the performance of the contract; or

“(C) any contract modification directing the use of products or services of Federal Prison Industries in the performance of the contract.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘contractor’, with respect to a contract, includes a subcontractor at any tier under the contract.

“(f) PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—The Director may not enter into any contract with Federal Prison Industries under which an inmate worker would have access to—

“(1) any data that is classified;

“(2) any geographic data regarding the location of—

“(A) surface and subsurface infrastructure providing communications or water or electrical power distribution;

“(B) pipelines for the distribution of natural gas, bulk petroleum products, or other commodities; or

“(C) other utilities; or

“(3) any personal or financial information about any individual private citizen, including information relating to such person’s real property however described, without the prior consent of the individual.

“(g) APPLICATION OF PROVISION.—This section is subject to the preceding provisions of this Act, and shall not be construed as affecting any right or duty of the Director under those provisions.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The terms ‘competitive procedures’ and ‘procurement’ have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403).

“(2) The term ‘market research’ means obtaining specific information about the price, quality, and time of delivery of products available in the private sector through a variety of means, which may include—

“(A) contacting knowledgeable individuals in government and industry;

“(B) interactive communication among industry, acquisition personnel, and customers; and

“(C) interchange meetings or pre-solicitation conferences with potential offerors.”.

SEC. 336. IMPROVEMENT OF INFORMATION SHARING AMONG FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

(a) PILOT PROJECT TO ENCOURAGE STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS, AS WELL AS REPRESENTATIVES OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, TO COLLECT AND SHARE RELEVANT INFORMATION.—Section 892(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 6 U.S.C. 482) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) The Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, may conduct projects in several cities to encourage officials of State and local government, as well as representatives of industries that comprise the critical infrastructure in those cities to lawfully collect and to pass on to the appropriate Federal officials information vital for the prevention of terrorist attacks against the United States.

“(B) The Director of Central Intelligence shall carry out any duty under this paragraph through the Director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center.

“(C) Under the projects, training shall be provided to such officials and representatives to—

“(i) identify sources of potential threats through such methods as the Secretary determines appropriate;

“(ii) report information relating to such potential threats to the appropriate Federal agencies in the appropriate form and manner; and

“(iii) assure that all reported information is systematically submitted to and passed on by the Department for use by appropriate Federal agencies.

“(D) The Under Secretary shall carry out the pilot project under this paragraph for a period of 3 years.

“(E) Not later than 1 year after the implementation of the pilot project, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot project conducted under this paragraph. Each such report shall include—

“(i) an assessment of the effectiveness of the project; and

“(ii) recommendations on the continuation of the project as well as any recommendations to improve the effectiveness of information collection and sharing by such officials and representatives and the Federal government.”.

(b) PILOT PROJECT TO TEST USE OF TEAR-LINE INTELLIGENCE REPORTS.—(1) Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 226. PILOT PROJECT TO TEST USE OF TEAR-LINE INTELLIGENCE REPORTS.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, may carry out a pilot program under which the Under Secretary may make intelligence information in the possession of the Department available to officials of State and local governments through the use of tear-line intelligence reports.

“(b) TEAR-LINE INTELLIGENCE REPORTS DESCRIBED.—For purpose of this section, a tear-line report is a report containing intelligence gathered by an agency or department of the United States that is in the possession of the Department that is prepared in a manner such that information relating to intelligence sources and methods is easily severable from the report to protect such sources and methods from disclosure. Such a report may be in a paper or an electronic format.

“(c) DURATION OF PROJECT.—The Under Secretary shall carry out the pilot project under this section for a period of 3 years.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the implementation of the pilot project, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot project conducted under this section, and shall include in the report an assessment of—

“(1) the effectiveness of the use of the tear-line reports in providing intelligence information on a timely basis to State and local authorities; and

“(2) if the use of such tear-line reports were to be made permanent, whether additional safeguards are needed with respect to the use of such reports.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Under Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.”.

(2) The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended in subtitle C of title II by adding at the end the following new item.

“Sec. 226. Pilot project to test use of tear-line intelligence reports.”.

(c) HOMELAND DEFENDER INTELLIGENCE TRAINING PROGRAM.

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Director of Central Intelligence may establish a comprehensive program of orientation and training to qualified State and local officials in accessing and using available resources of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401(4))).

(2) CONSULTATION.—Insofar as the Director establishes the intelligence training program under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult and coordinate with the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Secretary of Homeland Security on the development and administration of the program.

(3) PROGRAM GOALS.—Any intelligence training program established under paragraph (1) shall provide qualified State and local officials instruction on the mission and roles of the intelligence community to promote more effective information sharing among Federal, State, and local officials to prevent terrorist attacks against the United States.

(4) CURRICULUM.—Insofar as the Director establishes the intelligence training program under paragraph (1), the Director shall develop a curriculum for the program after consultation with qualified State and local officials. The curriculum shall include classroom instruction with respect to and orientation to the various elements of the intelligence community.

(5) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the initial implementation of the intelligence training program under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the program. Each such report shall include—

(A) an assessment of the effectiveness of the project; and

(B) recommendations on the continuation of the project as well as any recommendations to improve the effectiveness of information collection and sharing by qualified officials and representatives and the Federal government.

(6) QUALIFIED STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “qualified State and local officials” means officials of State and local government agencies that Director of Central Intelligence determines—

(A) have received appropriate security clearances from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for access to classified information; and

(B) oversee or manage first responders or counterterrorism activities.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director such sums as are necessary to carry out the intelligence training program under this subsection.

(d) ADVISORY COUNCILS.—(1) The Director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center shall establish two advisory councils (described in paragraph (2)) to provide the Director such advice and recommendations as the Director may require to effectively carry out the functions of the Center.

(2)(A) One advisory council shall have as its focus privacy and civil liberties issues.

(B) The other advisory council shall have as its focus State and local government information needs.

Subtitle E—Reports and Technical Amendments

SEC. 341. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1007 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 50 U.S.C. 401 note; 116 Stat. 2442) is amended by striking “September 1, 2003” and inserting “September 1, 2004”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 1007 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

SEC. 342. MODIFICATION OF VARIOUS REPORTS REQUIRED OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENTS.

(a) REPORTS ON ACQUISITION OF TECHNOLOGY RELATING TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND ADVANCED CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 721 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-293; 110 Stat. 3474; 50 U.S.C. 2366), as amended by section 811(b)(5)(C) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 116 Stat. 2424; 50 U.S.C. 2366), is amended by striking “a semi-annual” and inserting “an annual”.

(b) PERIODIC AND SPECIAL REPORTS ON DISCLOSURE OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION TO UNITED NATIONS.—Section 112(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404g(b)(1)) is amended by striking “semiannually” and inserting “annually”.

SEC. 343. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Section 112(d)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404g(d)(1)) is amended by striking “section 103(c)(6)” and inserting “section 103(c)(7)”.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949.—(1) Section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403g) is amended by striking “section 103(c)(6)” and inserting “section 103(c)(7)”.

(2) Section 15 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 403o) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “special policemen of the General Services Administration perform under the first section of the Act entitled ‘An Act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policeman for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes’ (40 U.S.C. 318),” and inserting “officers and agents of the Department of Homeland Security, as provided in section 1315(b)(2) of title 40, United States Code,”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “the fourth section of the Act referred to in subsection (a) of

this section (40 U.S.C. 318c)" and inserting "section 1315(c)(2) of title 40, United States Code".

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY ACT OF 1959.—Section 11 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "special policemen of the General Services Administration perform under the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policeman for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes' (40 U.S.C. 318)" and inserting "officers and agents of the Department of Homeland Security, as provided in section 1315(b)(2) of title 40, United States Code,"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "the fourth section of the Act referred to in subsection (a) (40 U.S.C. 318c)" and inserting "section 1315(c)(2) of title 40, United States Code".

(d) INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.—Section 343 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 116 Stat. 2399; 50 U.S.C. 404n-2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking "section 103(c)(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(6))" and inserting "section 103(c)(7) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(7))"; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by striking "section 103(c)(6)" and inserting "section 103(c)(7)".

(e) PUBLIC LAW 107-173.—Section 201(c)(3)(F) of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-173; 116 Stat. 548; 8 U.S.C. 1721(c)(3)(F)) is amended by striking "section 103(c)(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(6))" and inserting "section 103(c)(7) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(7))".

(f) FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2002.—Section 3535(b)(1) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 1001(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296), and section 3545(b)(1) of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 301(b)(1) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347), are each amended by inserting "or any other law" after "1978".

SEC. 344. REPORT ON LESSONS LEARNED FROM MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Central Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the intelligence lessons learned as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom, including lessons relating to the following:

(1) The tasking, collection, processing, exploitation, analysis, and dissemination of intelligence.

(2) Accuracy, timeliness, and objectivity of intelligence analysis.

(3) Intelligence support to policymakers and members of the Armed Forces in combat.

(4) Coordination of intelligence activities and operations with military operations.

(5) Strengths and limitations of intelligence systems and equipment.

(6) Such other matters as the Director considers appropriate.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include such recommendations on improvement in the matters described in subsection (a) as the Director considers appropriate.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SEC. 401. PROTECTION FROM TORT LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 15 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Agency personnel designated by the Director under subsection (a) shall be deemed for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law relating to tort liability, to be acting within the scope of their office or employment if the Agency personnel take reasonable action, which may include the use of force, to—

"(A) protect an individual in the presence of the Agency personnel from a crime of violence;

"(B) provide immediate assistance to an individual who has suffered or who is threatened with bodily harm; or

"(C) prevent the escape of any individual whom the Agency personnel reasonably believe to have committed a crime of violence in the presence of such personnel.

"(2) In this subsection, the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given that term in section 16 of title 18, United States Code."

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (d) of section 15, as added by subsection (a), shall not be construed as affecting the authorities of the Attorney General under the Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-694; 28 U.S.C. 2671, 2674, 2679(b), 2679(d)).

SEC. 402. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CENTRAL SERVICES WORKING CAPITAL FUND.

Section 21(f)(2) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403u(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(A) Subjunct to subparagraph (B), the Director" and inserting "The Director"; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

SEC. 501. USE OF FUNDS FOR COUNTERDRUG AND COUNTERTERRORISM ACTIVITIES FOR COLOMBIA.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 501 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 116 Stat. 2404) is amended by striking "for fiscal years 2002 and 2003" and inserting "for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005".

(b) MODIFICATION.—(1) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) PROHIBITION.—No United States Armed Forces personnel, United States civilian employee or contractor engaged by the United States will participate in any combat operation in connection with assistance made available under this section, except for the purpose of acting to protect the life or the physical security of others, in self defense, or during the course of search and rescue operations."

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking "Sections 556, 567, and 568 of Public Law 107-115, section 8093 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002," and inserting "Section 553 and the certification requirements of section 564(a)(2) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2003 (division E of Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 200, 205), and section 8093 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107-248; 116 Stat. 1558; 10 U.S.C. 182 note)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall apply to assistance made available under such section 501 during fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE LIVING QUARTERS FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS IN COOPERATIVE AND SUMMER EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

Section 2195 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Director of the National Security Agency may provide a qualifying employee of a defense laboratory of that Agency with living quarters at no charge, or at a rate or charge prescribed by the Director by regulation, without regard to section 5911(c) of title 5.

"(2) In this subsection, the term 'qualifying employee' means a student who is employed at the National Security Agency under—

"(A) a Student Educational Employment Program of the Agency conducted under this section or any other provision of law; or

"(B) a similar cooperative or summer education program of the Agency that meets the criteria for Federal cooperative or summer education programs prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management."

SEC. 503. AUTHORITY FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO AWARD PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§426. Personal services contracts: authority and limitations

"(a) PERSONAL SERVICES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may, notwithstanding section 3109 of title 5, enter into personal services contracts in the United States if the personal services directly support the mission of a defense intelligence component or counter-intelligence organization.

"(2) The contracting officer for a personal services contract shall be responsible for ensuring that a personal services contract is the appropriate vehicle for carrying out the purpose of the contract.

"(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'defense intelligence component' means a component of the Department of Defense that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4))."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"426. Personal services contracts: authority and limitations."

SEC. 504. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY PERSONNEL FROM TORT LIABILITY.

Section 11 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, agency personnel designated by the Director of the National Security Agency under subsection (a) shall be considered for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law relating to tort liability, to be acting within the scope of their office or employment when such agency personnel take reasonable action, which may include the use of force, to—

"(A) protect an individual in the presence of such agency personnel from a crime of violence;

"(B) provide immediate assistance to an individual who has suffered or who is threatened with bodily harm; or

"(C) prevent the escape of any individual whom such agency personnel reasonably believe to have committed a crime of violence in the presence of such agency personnel.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not affect the authorities of the Attorney General under section 2679(d)(1) of title 28, United States Code.

"(3) In this subsection, the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given that term in section 16 of title 18, United States Code."

SEC. 505. MEASUREMENT AND SIGNATURES INTELLIGENCE RESEARCH PROGRAM.

(a) **RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency's Directorate for MASINT and Technical Collection, shall carry out a program to incorporate the results of basic research on sensors into the measurement and signatures intelligence systems of the United States, to the extent the results of such research is applicable to such systems.

(b) **PROGRAM COMPONENTS.**—The program under subsection (a) shall review and assess both basic research on sensors and technologies conducted by the United States Government and by non-governmental entities. In carrying out the program, the Director shall protect intellectual property rights, maintain organizational flexibility, and establish research projects, funding levels, and potential benefits in an equitable manner through Directorate.

(c) **ADVISORY PANEL.**—(1) The Director shall establish an advisory panel to assist the Director in carrying out the program under subsection (a).

(2) The advisory panel shall be headed by the Director who shall determine the selection, review, and assessment of the research projects under the program.

(3)(A) The Director shall appoint as members of the advisory panel representatives of each entity of the MASINT community, and may appoint as such members representatives of national laboratories, universities, and private sector entities.

(B) For purposes of this subsection the term "MASINT community" means academic, professional, industrial, and government entities that are committed towards the advancement of the sciences in measurement and signatures intelligence.

(C) The term for a member of the advisory panel shall be established by the Director, but may not exceed a period of 5 consecutive years.

(D) Members of the advisory panel may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the advisory panel, but may receive per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) The Director may accept contributions from non-governmental participants on the advisory panel to defray the expenses of the advisory panel.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 108-176. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-176.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COX

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. COX:
Strike section 336.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2417. The amendment that I have introduced I will address in a moment but let me state at the outset that there is no more important function in the war on terrorism than hav-

ing and acting on good intelligence, intelligence about attacks that are yet to come, intelligence about who is involved, what is planned, where and when it will take place and how it might be executed.

The bill as it is written provides critical support for the Intelligence Community's efforts in the war on terrorism. I especially appreciate the provisions in the legislation focusing additional attention on enhancing our capability for gathering human intelligence as well as the provisions that provide additional resources to increase our analytical capacity to process and make use of the intelligence we do gather.

The amendment that I am offering seeks to strike section 336 of the legislation. Section 336 would amend the Homeland Security Act to create two pilot programs, one, to encourage State and local officials, critical infrastructure owners to collect and share relevant information; and, two, to test use of tear-line intelligence reports. However, Mr. Chairman, the Homeland Security Act already includes training and information sharing requirements for State, local and private sector officials. The Director of Central Intelligence, the head of the CIA, would under the language of the bill as it is written have a central role in both of these pilot programs which would inject the CIA into this domestic, homeland security function.

Under the first section 336 pilot program on sharing critical infrastructure information, the DCI would carry out his responsibilities through the Director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center, or TTIC, which has never before been recognized in law and has no responsibilities whatever for critical infrastructure information. Using TTIC in this way would undermine the statutory function of the Office of Infrastructure Protection subdirectorate of the Department of Homeland Security. We do not need to pilotize the Department's existing statutory obligations.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, already is required to, and this is now a quote from existing law, "coordinate training and other support to the elements and personnel of the Department, other agencies of the Federal Government, and State and local governments that provide information to the Department, or are consumers of information provided by the Department, in order to facilitate the identification and sharing of information." That is the Homeland Security Act as it is written.

The Homeland Security Act already requires that the Secretary of Homeland Security "coordinate with elements of the Intelligence Community and with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, and the private sector." Extensive information sharing requirements covering State, local and private officials already exist in the

Homeland Security Act, for example, in sections 891 and 892.

Tear-line reporting, unclassified reports to convey the critical substance of classified intelligence reporting, is already a common practice. There is not a need for a pilot program. The Homeland Security Act already requires that the Secretary of Homeland Security "in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, shall work to ensure that intelligence or other information relating to terrorism to which the Department has access is appropriately shared with State and local governments."

□ 1830

At this point I hope that the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, could rise to enter into a colloquy so that I might obtain additional information on the amendments to the Homeland Security Act contained within section 336 of the legislation, and I would yield for this purpose to the chairman.

As the chairman knows, I am offering an amendment to strike section 336 of the legislation as it proposes amendments to the Homeland Security Act that fall within the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Homeland Security. I am prepared to withdraw this amendment pending appropriate clarification by the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to clarify for the record that the provisions of H.R. 2417, Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, amending the Homeland Security Act, fall within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Homeland Security and that their inclusion in H.R. 2417 does not create a basis for the assertion of jurisdiction over the act by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Furthermore, I would like to clarify for the distinguished chairman that the chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security and I have indeed agreed upon a revision of the provisions that are acceptable to both our ranking members, that is, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the gentleman's committee's ranking member. I will commit to work with the gentleman's committee and the Committee on the Judiciary for substitution of the revised language in the conference negotiations between the House and the Senate, and to that end I have also agreed to support the request of the Select Committee on Homeland Security for the appointment of two conferees on H.R. 2417.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of the exchange of correspondence between our two committees on this topic.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON
INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2003.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER COX,
Chairman,
Select Committee on Homeland Security, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is to memorialize our understanding that the provisions of H.R. 2417 (the "provisions") amending the Homeland Security Act (the "Act") fall within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and that their inclusion in H.R. 2417 does not create a basis for the assertion of jurisdiction over the Act by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

We have agreed upon a revision of the provisions that is acceptable to both of our Ranking Members, a copy of which is attached, and we agree to work for a mutually agreeable resolution of this provision with your Committee and the Committee on the Judiciary, for substitution in the conference negotiations between the House and the Senate.

To that end, I have agreed to support the request of the Select Committee on Homeland Security for the appointment of two conferees on H.R. 2417.

Sincerely,

PORTER J. GOSS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND
SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2003.

Hon. PORTER GOSS,
Chairman,
House Permanent Select Committee on Intel-
ligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOSS: This letter is to memorialize our understanding that the provisions of H.R. 2417 (the "provisions") amending the Homeland Security Act (the "Act") fall within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and that their inclusion in H.R. 2417 does not create a basis for the assertion of jurisdiction over the Act by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

We have agreed upon a revision of the provisions that is acceptable to both of our Ranking Members, a copy of which is attached, and we agree to work for substitution of the revised language in the conference negotiations between the House and the Senate.

To that end, I have agreed to support the request of the Select Committee on Homeland Security for the appointment of two conferees on H.R. 2417.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER COX,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2417, AS REPORTED OF-
FERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA (FOR HIM-
SELF AND MR. TURNER OF TEXAS)

Amend section 336 to read as follows:

**SEC. 336. IMPROVEMENT OF INFORMATION SHAR-
ING AMONG FEDERAL, STATE AND
LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 892(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 6 U.S.C. 482) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A) The Secretary shall establish a program to provide appropriate training to officials described in subparagraph (B) in order to assist such officials in—

"(i) identifying sources of potential terrorist threats through such methods as the Secretary determines appropriate;

"(ii) reporting information relating to such potential terrorist threats to the appropriate Federal agencies in the appropriate form and manner;

"(iii) assuring that all reported information is systematically submitted to and passed on by the Department for use by appropriate Federal agencies; and

"(iv) understanding the mission and roles of the intelligence community to promote more effective information sharing among Federal, State, and local officials to prevent terrorist attacks against the United States.

"(B) The officials referred to in subparagraph (A) are officials of State and local government agencies that oversee or manage first responders or counterterrorism activities.

"(C) The Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General to ensure that the training program established in subparagraph (A) does not duplicate the training program established in section 908 of the USA PATRIOT Act (Public Law 107-56; 28 U.S.C. 509 note).

"(D) The Secretary shall carry out this paragraph through the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (acting pursuant to the duties described in section 201(d)(16)), in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Attorney General."

(b) REPORT.—(1) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report that describes the Secretary's plan for implementing such section 892 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act) and an estimated date of completion of the implementation.

Because of the agreement between our two committees, I will also ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

I look forward to working with the chairman and members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for an agreeable resolution of this matter in conference.

Mr. Chairman, if I have remaining time, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to state that I fully support the agreement that has been worked out between the chairmen of the two committees on which I serve. Since the language at issue was language that was inserted in our bill at my request, I want to make clear that we should work out these jurisdictional issues, but we also should proceed to find the right sections of the right bills to insert additional language on information sharing which is still a critical need in the homeland security and the terrorist threat areas.

We also need to insert language at the right places about the protection of civil liberties. I listened to the comments by the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) concerning the fact that we have no statutory language for TTIC, the Terrorist Threat Integration Center, and perhaps we should decide about that in some other forum. Nonetheless, TTIC exists, and it is critically important that we make sure that it

respects the civil liberties of Americans. So we will continue to search for new venues, but I thank both chairmen for finding the proper way to solve this issue.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use the 5 minutes. I just want to clarify this point while the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security is here that his efforts and the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. HARMAN) efforts to work out acceptable language had in fact transpired and we were prepared to accept an amendment to the bill to do that. There is another party involved, and we wanted to make sure that the appropriate full dialogue took place because what we are about here is really trying to plug in a Foreign Intelligence Program, which is what our portfolio is with the new efforts domestically to deal with terrorism on the homeland.

We are not interested in any territorial acquisition, as I have said many times. We are interested in plugging in the national foreign intelligence activity and capability in the right places in the right way. That will involve working with a number of committees. Fortunately, we have good Members who serve on a number of committees and we are using that expertise to make these bridging arrangements. I would like to publicly thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for their efforts to get the homeland security piece done. We have more work to do on this particular element. They have my pledge in the colloquy that we will work together to get this done properly, and I have nothing further to add to that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to return the favor and thank both the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), ranking member, for all of the work that went into making this language acceptable, the language that we had agreed upon. I am sorry it cannot be included procedurally, but our understanding to do it at the next step is certainly satisfactory to me; and I just want to say that I could not agree more with the sentiments of both the chairman and the ranking member about the importance of sharing information. That is what the mission of Homeland Security is all about, and we do have between us and among us ample opportunity to amend whatever laws it takes to get this job done; and I would point out that the Speaker has made it possible for all three of us to work together on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. So we are doing our version of fusion here in the House, and I am confident we will succeed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-176.

If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is not to be offered, then it is now in order to consider amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 108-176.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. HARMAN:
At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. MODIFICATION OF TERRORIST IDENTIFICATION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR CONSOLIDATION OF WATCH LISTS.—Subsection (g)(1) of section 343 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 116 Stat. 2399; 50 U.S.C. 404n2) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E);

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Whether further consolidation or elimination of watch list databases in the departments and agencies with access to the System would contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the System in identifying individuals who are known or suspected international terrorists.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (E), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following: “If the certification under subparagraph (D) is in the positive, the steps required to consolidate or eliminate such watch lists.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Director shall establish an advisory council comprised of experts in the field of civil liberties and privacy issues to advise the Director on issues of civil liberties and privacy as they relate to the maintenance of the System.”.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say first that the amendment which the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) would have offered is an excellent amendment having to do with language skills, and my understanding is that we have accommodated him in some other way. I am sure the chairman will speak to that. And I would be happy to yield to him first on that subject.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

All I would say is that I was going to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for a very helpful, thoughtful contribution to our work product. In fact, we have been working on this subject for a number of years, which is the training question and the

language question; and the gentleman has some very unique perspectives on this which have been very helpful to us. We are improved in our committee for his participation in this process. I do not believe it is necessary to offer the amendment. Apparently he has not, but I nevertheless wanted to appreciate publicly the contribution he has made.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, turning to my amendment, in August, 2001, the FBI was frantically looking for two men who became part of the terrorist suicide team on 9-11. Had we been able to find Nawaf al-Hazmi and Khaled al-Mihdhar, we may have been able to unravel the plot for 9-11. At least we would have stopped these two individuals from participating in it.

The problem, it turns out, was that the State Department and INS watchlists, which included their names, were not available to the FAA and the airlines. So the hijackers were freely allowed to board the ill-fated American Airlines Flight 77.

Two years later, the Federal Government still has as many as 50 databases used for tracking international terrorists and international terrorist organizations. Just recently, the GAO highlighted 12 watchlists run by nine agencies.

This is shocking. Information contained in one database need not be connected to information in another. Vital data that could help prevent the next terrorist attack could be missed. We must consolidate or at least ensure the interoperability of government watchlists, and my amendment pending before this House to this intelligence authorization bill addresses this.

In last year's intelligence authorization act, the Congress required the creation of a Terrorist Identification Classification System, TICS. This system is intended to be an authoritative real-time compilation of individuals and organizations known or suspected of international terrorism derived from all-source intelligence and available for use by other government agencies. The establishment of TICS is still a work in progress. The Director of Central Intelligence is required to report on progress by the end of November.

My amendment requires the Director of Central Intelligence to certify whether further consolidation, or increased interoperability, is the best way to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of TICS. Either way we go, the point is to connect the dots in real time.

The concept of a single government database to track suspected terrorists does raise some civil liberties concerns. To address the privacy and civil liberties concerns, my amendment requires the Director of Central Intelligence to establish an advisory council of experts on matters of civil liberties and privacy.

Mr. Chairman, the relationship of civil liberties and security has been an

abiding concern for this committee. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), one of our members, has been active in this area, and so has our chairman, who convened the first hearing, public hearing, on civil liberties earlier this year where a panel of witnesses from the ACLU to the Heritage Foundation agreed that we need to balance civil liberty and security.

As Ben Franklin once said: “They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.” The Harman amendment addresses both liberty and safety, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on an amendment that she has worked hard on and I know cares a great deal about, and I will say right up front that the amendment is acceptable to the committee. I do want to make a comment on it, though.

The amendment requires the DCI to consider whether further consolidation of the various U.S. Government terrorist watchlist databases might add to the efficiency of the watchlist system in identifying known or suspected terrorists. Absolutely a goal that we have to achieve. The question is what is the right way to do it? And the gentlewoman has raised the question properly. I commend her for it. Her dedication and expertise on counterterrorism issues I think is well known. She has served not only the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of this Congress but previous iterations of this effort on national commissions and so forth; and I think we all very much respect her judgment.

And as I said, this amendment is a good one and it brings the issue to the floor. It asks the DCI to review and determine how much more consolidation of the various terrorist watchlists is needed, but I would add the words “if any.” And the reason I say that is I am concerned about the potential loss of data that might result from the consolidation of all the watchlists available to the government. I do not know that that would happen. It is a question that has to be asked.

Additionally, I would think that there is one other area that I worry about a little bit, and that is sort of the idea of Big Brother. The one big unified, centralized U.S. Government computer database with all of the information available to the U.S. Government on individuals and their associates might be viewed to some as concerning, particularly those who worry about Big Brother invading their privacy.

I am not saying I have the answer; but at this stage of my thinking, I am sort of in the position to be inclined to support a network solution that virtually combines the data in various databases without actually dumping all of the information from all the databases into one big government Big

Brother database. So I would think that something on the order perhaps of Web browser or Web sniffer, some way of searching out all the databases simultaneously, using some of those extraordinary technological tools that are developed in the gentlewoman's district, the software that is out there that not only searches all of them at the same time but also crossreferences the search results in such a way that maximizes the researchers' efficiencies and at the same time gives us some of the safeguards, or the appearance of safeguards anyway, the perception that we are safeguarding better than one big database.

I do not wish to prejudice the outcome of the review. As we always do, we candidly state our positions on these things. As I said, I think the gentlewoman has raised exactly the right question. I thank her for her contribution in doing that, and I believe the amendment is worded properly so we go forward, and I will accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I support the gentlewoman's amendment also, and I am very pleased to acknowledge the atmosphere in this committee that allows us to function so well. It is what a committee should be. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), ranking member, avoid, I think, destructive partisanship and allow us to air our differences in a very constructive way.

I would like to draw attention to section 336 of this bill that includes a provision that I have strongly advocated for to require the director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center to establish two advisory councils to help the center carry out its critical and time-sensitive work, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1845

One Advisory Council will focus on privacy and civil liberty concerns. We all know and understand that we are engaged in an ongoing fight against global terrorism and that our entire Intelligence Community is central to prosecuting and winning this struggle. But, at the same time, as we enhance our intelligence-gathering and analysis, it is equally important that the Director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center and all employees there must respect the basic civil liberties that define our lives as Americans. Surely this Advisory Council will help us more nearly achieve the right delicate balance between security and liberty.

Now, equally important, this section of the bill also requires an Advisory Council to the Director of the Terrorist Threat Integration Center be established to concentrate on getting more and better information to State and local governments. The efforts to improve substantially our homeland security as a matter of urgency fall pri-

marily upon our first responders and the local and State governments who employ them. In my meetings with State and local officials in New Jersey, and with first responders in my district, I have heard repeatedly that they receive only the most general and vague and almost useless information from Washington. They seldom, if ever, receive any more specific information about what they should guard against. Clearly, they deserve more timely and useful information if they are to function to protect the lives, the safety, and the security of Americans. This Advisory Council should help overcome this incomplete communication of practically useful intelligence information from the Federal to the community level.

Third, I would like to comment about the importance of incorporating information based on open sources. These sources of information are not classified secret. And traditionally, within the Intelligence Community and to this day, some individuals seem to think that if information is not classified secret, it is not valuable. In the 21st century this institutionalized mindset is unfortunate, since our sources of information and the amount of information readily available to the public domain and in the public domain have grown enormously. The Internet has enabled one to access information that was once extremely hard or impractical to obtain, and the dynamics of globalization, the accelerated integration of global industry, commerce, communication, and travel have created many new sources of information. The civil and commercial sectors, for instance, are looking into subjects and technologies that once were the exclusive preserve of governments and intelligence services. A prominent example is imagery from satellites that is publicly or commercially available. In HUMINT intelligence, open access to officials and experts is unparalleled today.

I believe that the Intelligence Community should be exploiting such open source information far more than it is today, and achieving this goal will require a culture change and the application of technology. I thank the chairman for agreeing to include in the report a call for the Director of Central Intelligence to study and report back to Congress within 6 months how to incorporate and use open source material in virtually every aspect of intelligence, from collection to analysis, and across all disciplines. There are many instances where open source information can be useful, perhaps even more useful than classified sources, and surely, in many cases, cheaper.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier about the decision by the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ranking Member HARMAN) to investigate thoroughly concerns about weapons of mass destruction and the intelligence that led into our fighting in Iraq. Our com-

mittee intends to issue a written report on its findings as promptly as possible, and I spoke about that earlier.

I would like to say a bit more, though. One concern that I have had is that the administration officials too often appear to have dropped the caveats and the uncertainties expressed in the intelligence reporting. Another concern is that at times the intelligence reporting or the officials presenting the intelligence appear to have been very certain about their conclusions that were based on uncertain evidence.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOLT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, it is critically important to determine whether the Intelligence Community's estimates on Iraq were badly off base, or whether the Iraqi regime managed to destroy or spirit away the suspect weapons or materials. Either way, it seems clear that performance of the Intelligence Community was less than we would expect. It is clear to all of the world that the coalition did not have the intelligence information specific enough to find, identify, and secure any massively destructive weapons. That realization certainly raises questions about whether we were ready to go to war if the Commander in Chief and the Pentagon were convinced that the weapons were real, but they did not know quite where they were or how we would secure them once we went to war. But that is a question for another day. We will be talking about that in weeks to come.

Now, I would say, with the amendments that we have in front of us today, I offer my full support to this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 108-176.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, insert the following new section:

SEC. 337. IMPROVEMENT OF RECRUITMENT, HIRING AND RETENTION OF ETHNIC AND CULTURAL MINORITIES IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) PILOT PROJECT TO IMPROVE DIVERSITY THROUGHOUT THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY USING INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGIES FOR THE RECRUITMENT, HIRING AND RETENTION OF ETHNIC AND CULTURAL MINORITIES AND WOMEN

WITH THE DIVERSITY OF SKILLS, LANGUAGES AND EXPERTISE REFLECTIVE OF THE CURRENT MISSION.—The Director of Central Intelligence shall carry out a pilot project under this section to test and evaluate alternative, innovative methods to recruit and hire for the intelligence community women and minorities with diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, skills, language proficiency, and expertise.

(b) METHODS.—In carrying out the pilot project, the Director shall employ methods such as advertising in foreign language newspapers in the United States, site visits to institutions with a high percentage of students who study English as a second language, and other methods that are not used by the Director under the DCI Diversity Strategic Plan to increase diversity of officers and employees in the intelligence community.

(c) DURATION OF PROJECT.—The Director shall carry out the project under this section for a 3-year period.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date the Director implements the pilot project under this section, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the project. The report shall include—

(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of the project; and

(2) recommendations on the continuation of the project as well as for improving the effectiveness of the project in meeting the goals of increasing the recruiting and hiring of women and minorities within the intelligence community.

(e) DIVERSITY PLAN.—(1) Not later than February 15, 2004, the Director of Central Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report which describes the plan of the Director, entitled the "DCI Diversity Strategic Plan", and any subsequent revision to that plan, to increase diversity of officers and employees in the intelligence community, including the short- and long-term goals of the plan. The report shall also provide a detailed description of the progress that has been made by each element of the intelligence community in implementing the plan.

(2) In implementing the plan, the Director shall incorporate innovative methods for the recruitment and hiring of women and minorities that the Director has determined to be effective from the pilot project carried out under this section.

(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "intelligence community" has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401(4)).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Intelligence Authorization bill on behalf of myself and the following members who are immediate cosponsors of the Select Committee on Intelligence: The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL). I would also like to thank the chairman of the committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for his previously stated support for this amendment.

Further, I would be remiss if I did not recognize the efforts of former member Louis Stokes and now departed and former member Julian Dixon; our present minority leader of the Democratic Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI),

and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and I had forgotten about Tim Roemer, who also was very instrumental in this particular arena as a former member, and others on both sides of the aisle that have been interested in this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment directs the Director of Central Intelligence to establish a pilot program to improve the recruitment, hiring, and retention of ethnic and cultural minorities throughout the Intelligence Community.

Leaders in the Intelligence Community have, for a number of years, expressed the view that diversity within their population can pay dividends with respect to cultural understanding and especially language capabilities. And, for an equal number of years, the Select Committee on Intelligence has urged them to improve their efforts of hiring, promoting, and retaining individuals from diverse backgrounds.

While we noted in our report to accompany H.R. 2417 that progress has been made and, indeed, it has been, especially in the more recent years just passed, we also noted a lack of progress with respect to hiring, promotion, and retention of women and minorities under the current plan. The Secretary of Defense has stated that, "The current personnel system is not flexible enough to confront the dangers of the 21st century."

The amendment we offer today addresses one of the many concerns raised by the Secretary and proposes a potential solution. It directs the DCI to develop a pilot program to achieve the goals for increased diversity amongst the Intelligence Community staff.

This amendment requires that the Director use methods such as advertising in foreign language newspapers or conducting site visits to high schools, and I would even encourage middle schools as we look toward the future, because it is interesting that in those areas I feel we find many of our grandchildren and little children know a lot about computers that a lot of us older hands do not know about; and colleges as well, with a high percentage of students from diverse backgrounds as two or more recruitment methods. It also requires an annual report from the Director to assess the effectiveness of this project in meeting his goals.

If the horrors of 9/11 taught us anything, it is that the biggest threat to our democratic ideals and cultural beliefs comes from those who do not share our ideals and beliefs.

The war on terrorism has focused even greater attention on the Intelligence Community as they have collectively faced these and many other challenges with commendable determination. It will take time, innovation, and a long-term strategy to ensure that the Intelligence Community remains capable of both understanding and responding to the threats of the 21st century.

I believe that this amendment will help the Intelligence Community meet

the goals they have set for themselves and challenges in the decades to come. I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this amendment is before us. It is entirely consistent with the committee position, and I am very happy to accept it. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for his continued, persistent, effective leadership on this, along with our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), who have both done the committee a big favor by keeping us focused on this.

The amendment directs the DCI to establish a pilot project to test and evaluate alternative and innovative methods to recruit and hire women and minorities with diverse skills, expertise, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds, and language proficiencies. That is obviously a very rich contribution to the Intelligence Community.

The pilot project would be carried out for a 3-year period, with a report on the effectiveness of the project at the end of the second year, as I understand the amendment.

The amendment also includes direction to the DCI to report to the committee by mid-February of the next calendar year on the DCI's diversity strategic plan, which is something we have been after for a while. This aspect of this amendment incorporates, in part, the amendment made to the schedule of authorizations by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) in the committee's markup. I think they are complementary to each other. I see no conflict, and I think that combined, they are a benefit.

Both members deserve and are commended for promoting the needs of the Intelligence Community in the area of diversity of skills, expertise, languages, cultural understanding, and ethnic background, which is not a fully met need, very clearly, in the Community, as we know.

In the committee report we stated that, and I am going to quote the language, "Diversity throughout the Intelligence Community population can pay dividends with respect to the richness it brings to the work of the IC, particularly as it relates to cultural understandings of particular target sets, increased language capabilities, and increased skills to address particular intelligence problems." Amen.

I believe that this project will help. I very eagerly accept the amendment without reservation, and I am pleased that the gentleman has offered it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the civilized and collaborative way in which this whole debate is going.

I rise in strong support of this amendment, and I just want to make a few brief points, Mr. Chairman.

When the DDCICM, the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence for Community Management—that is a mouthful—Joan Dempsey, came to say goodbye recently, it occurred to me that she was one of the few senior women in the entire Intelligence Community. The only other one I can think of is Joanne Isham, who is the Deputy Director of the National Security Agency. The same story can be said about people from other ethnic groups. That is unfortunate.

This amendment, which is carefully drafted and consistent with our policy in our committee for the last 15 years, will hopefully move the Community forward.

□ 1900

Earlier in this debate, I spoke, and others did, about the importance of beefing up HUMINT, our human intelligence resources. What is the point of human intelligence? The point is obviously to learn about terrorists. Their plans and intentions.

How do you do that? Well, you try to penetrate terrorist cells. How do you do that? Well, it would help if you looked like the terrorists and spoke their languages. And we cannot succeed in our effort if we just recruit the same old, same old. So it should be obvious that this is not the politically correct thing to do; it is the intelligent thing to do if we are trying to expand the talent pool and the capability of our intelligence agencies.

I strongly support this amendment. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES). They and others have done us a huge service.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hastings amendment. As has been stated, and I hope those that are watching this debate tonight can see the kind of cooperation and willingness to work together to solve some of the issues that greatly effect the national security of our country watching our chairman and ranking member and other members of the committee talk about what is good for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I think that people of diverse backgrounds can bring their unique cultural experiences, skills and language proficiencies to bear on intelligence problems, intelligence issues and intelligence expertise. The percentage of women and minorities in the intelligence community has for way too many years been smaller than the percentage of women and minorities in the total Federal workforce and the civilian workforce. Fiscal year 2002 data demonstrates that women and minorities continue to be under-represented in the intelligence community, especially in core mission areas and the senior ranks, as has been noted here by other members of our committee.

The committee has repeatedly expressed grave concern about the lack of

progress made by the intelligence community in recruiting, in hiring and retaining a diverse workforce, essential if we are going to protect our country's national security. New tools must be brought to bear on the challenge of sufficiently diversifying the intelligence community workforce. Intelligence agencies must think, as we like to say, outside the box. I believe that the Hastings amendment encourages this kind of thinking, out-of-the-box thinking, by requiring the Director of Central Intelligence to carry out a pilot project to test and evaluate innovative alternative methods for recruiting and hiring people with diverse backgrounds.

The amendment, like the general provisions that have been reported out of our committee, also requires that the DCI report to Congress on his current diversity plan, including short- and long-term goals and the progress that is being made in implementing it by each of the intelligence community agencies.

Mr. Chairman, not only does this make good sense. It is good practice, it is good business, and it is good public policy. And, therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Hastings amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for putting this before us. I think its time is overdue, and I think it is reasonable that he would have a pilot project.

I just have to think back on my own life experience, and I will not tell you about that today, in starting in a country home, way out in the country. But I go to schools a lot, and I particularly want to talk to the young folk in regard to their futures and education and what it means to them. And I often tell them my story and, again, I will not tell you tonight, but what it can do for equal opportunity. It is the road to success.

So I think that it would be very good if I can go to my African American schools, which I will, to my Hispanic community, to my Asian-Americans and all the others and say to them, this opportunity is happening and you too can be an effective person if you will get your education and come forth, and we will have a pilot project to show that; but you can come forth, and you can be in the high-level place to make sure our country is secure as the others have done before you.

So I encourage you to do this, and I am really glad that you have done this. It is a reasonable request that is needed. It ought to be done, and I am glad to hear the responses that we are hearing here tonight. I congratulate the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding. I join him in expressing support for this amendment

and accolades to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), and the others who are working on this.

I wanted to reiterate my concern about the lack of racial, linguistic, cultural and gender diversity within the intelligence community. Our intelligence network should reflect much more of the diversity and multicultural composition of the American people and of the world that we seek to understand. But no one should be comforted by the words in this amendment. This is the umpteenth time that the problem has been identified and that intelligence agencies have been exhorted, even required, to do better. I hope this amendment produces real results.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman, and the members of committee for the sensitivity and the concern that we are now paying to the issue of diversity.

For some time now this committee has been wrestling with the idea of diversity going back to former chairman Lou Stokes, former ranking member Julian Dixon. In my service on the committee for 6 years up until this term of Congress we have repeatedly been concerned. And I believe that the director has made it clear that diversity, cultural diversity, lingual diversity is a matter of good business sense for the intelligence community.

We all wish that we had been a little more sensitive and a little more knowledgeable prior to 9-11. But this I think is an opportunity now for us to get it right. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has done an excellent job in helping us to think out of the box by requiring the director to carry out this pilot test project to evaluate innovative alternative methods for recruiting and hiring and retaining members of the intelligence community with a diverse background.

Let me take this opportunity to mention just one member of the African American community who is completing 30 years of service to both the military and the intelligence community, and that is Mr. Garnett Stowe who has retired as chief of staff of the National Reconnaissance Office. Mr. Stowe made tremendous contributions in his own right as a member of the intelligence community, but he too was very sensitive. And he took the time to come with the Congressional Black Caucus last year to appear on a panel that we had dealing with this issue of diversity in diplomatic and intelligence matters.

He has made a tremendous contribution to our country, to the free world through his 30 years of service; and I

certainly would like to take this opportunity as we debate this bill to congratulate him on a career of great service and wish him well in the future.

With that, I would just like to associate myself with all of the remarks that have been said in a positive way in support of the Hastings amendment. I worked very hard when I was on the committee. I am delighted that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the other members of the committee are continuing this work because it is one on which we must be vigilant. We cannot afford to give it up. We have got to get it done, and we have got to do it until we get it right. And I want to commend the committee and commend my colleagues for a job well done. Hopefully, we can complete this and get on the road to having the best real-time intelligence for our policymakers and our war fighters based on the most broad net of collection devices and individuals.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just wanted to say I was remiss in my remarks not to note the gentleman's service on the committee on this particular issue and many other issues as well. It is a pleasure to welcome you back to the debate here.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Hastings amendment and to again restate my appreciation for the service of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Goss) and the service of the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). I also want to thank the members who served on this committee, and I do not want to say served, I want to have it correct, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is still serving on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. His leadership we have appreciated.

In the debate previously, he extended to me an opportunity to pursue reviewing a number of documents dealing with the question of the weapons of mass destruction. I wanted to publicly say to him that I noted in my remarks earlier how pleased I was in a bipartisan way this committee would not only open up this massive documentation but also work together in a bipartisan way to find out the truth. And I still hold to that, and I will comment very briefly in my remarks on that point. But I wanted to rise initially to support the Hastings amendment because we learned a lot after 9-11.

We learned that information would come or has come or needs to come from people from all walks of life, ethnic backgrounds and languages. We

found that in our intelligence community we did not have the reach that we possibly needed to ensure the safety of this Nation, to secure the kind of intelligence we needed to have representation in parts of the world where languages are spoken that we may not be familiar with. And so the issue of diversity is crucial. Not only that, I think it is important to have the "mosaicness" of America represented in the intelligence community, the intellect that they bring, the sensitivity that they bring, the cultural understanding that they bring, the knowledge that they bring about the Muslim faith, and also the understanding that all immigration, all people who are different does not equate to terrorism. That comes from a cultural understanding.

We know that in the United States military, we found that the military expanded its chaplain corps and that is, of course, to include people from many different faiths, and that those serving in the military come from many different faiths and many different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Many Hispanics are serving. Many Muslims are serving, many Native Americans, African Americans, obviously Caucasians, and certainly the wide breadth of diversity, Asian-Americans, in our Nation.

So this is a very good amendment, and I applaud the gentleman and I believe this will go a long way in securing America because that is what we are talking about in actually securing America.

I would like to take this opportunity also to lend my support to the Kucinich amendment. That clearly speaks to, I think, us getting at the truth, and that is to secure an audit that would include information about telephone and electronic communications between the CIA and the office of the Vice President.

I also lend my support to the distinguished representative, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), her amendment to require the Government Accounting Office to conduct a study to determine the extent of intelligence sharing by the Defense Department and the intelligence community with the United Nations.

Collectively, these amendments do not in any way indict the good work of the intelligence committee. What it does is helps to build, it provides anchors, it moves us forward in staffing diversity, but it also moves us forward in finding out particular aspects of this question dealing with the weapons of mass destruction.

I have already said on this floor that I believe that ultimately a commission, after the work of this House committee and after the work of the Senate committee, whatever their processes will be, that we look at creating an independent commission. I also believe that if we are to find wrong-doing that a special prosecutor would be appropriate as well.

I am prepared to work in this bipartisan effort, but I think truth is important. And, again, it is important not only for the American people, but my colleagues who in good faith, many who, sincerely, all of us, might I say came to the floor of the House and voted our conscience, many voting because they believed that we were under imminent attack by the alleged weapons of mass destruction. Many would say that those of us who argue this point will find it out. We will get ours. They will find the weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1915

Mr. Chairman, I will not be in any way offended because the question of America is about democracy and truth. It is about sharing with the American people the reasons why we make such decisions. It is not about a "get you" foreign policy. I do not need a "get you" foreign policy. I do not need to be victorious in this independent commission or the work of the intelligence committee. I do not need to find out that there were no weapons of mass destruction. I simply need to find the truth because the administration is obligated to tell the truth to the American people and to this Congress, for us to make the life and death decision of war and peace.

I also believe that war should have been the last option, but I believe my colleagues voted in good faith, and therefore, they should have the truth, the American people should have the truth, and I think a commission will bring us to a point of securing the truth.

So I rise in support of the Hastings amendment enthusiastically, the Kucinich amendment and the Lee amendment so we can move forward in a bipartisan manner.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House report 108-176.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ON WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

(a) **AUDIT.**—The Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency shall conduct an audit of all telephone and electronic communications between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Office of the Vice President that relate to weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq preceding Operation Iraqi Freedom on or after September 11, 2001.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall submit to Congress a report on the audit conducted under subsection (a). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, we now know that there were not vast stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq when the U.S. invaded and that, therefore, Iraq did not pose an imminent threat to the United States, as the administration claimed before the war.

The question remaining is whether the administration compelled the Central Intelligence Agency to release raw, undissemminated information they knew to be unreliable because it helped support the worst case scenario concerning Iraq's weapons program and, therefore, helped make the case, an erroneous case it turns out, that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the United States.

The administration has made numerous assertions. The President in his State of the Union said, The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production.

Number one, the claim about uranium from Africa was forged. Number two, the aluminum tubes were not suitable for a nuclear enrichment program. These assertions made by the President in his State of the Union to justify an immediate war with Iraq were false.

Did the Vice President play a role in making false information become the public reason the President went to war in Iraq? The Vice President, as reported in the Washington Post of June 5, 2003, Vice President CHENEY and his most senior aide made multiple trips to the CIA over the past year to question analysts studying Iraq's weapons programs and alleged links to al Qaeda, creating an environment in which some analysts felt they were being pressured to make their assessments fit with the Bush administration's policy objectives. That is from the Washington Post on June 5, 2003.

Number two, the Vice President knew or should have known that documents purporting to show that Iraq had bought uranium from Niger were forged. On March 7, the IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei reported the following to the U.N. Security

Council: These documents which form the basis for reports of recent uranium transactions between Iraq and Niger are, in fact, not authentic. We have, therefore, concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded. We have found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons program in Iraq.

It turns out that the forgeries were crude. Anyone with an Internet search engine could determine that these documents were forgeries. Yet on March 16, nine days afterwards, the Vice President repeated the falsehood on national television. He said, We believe, and he was talking about Hussein, has in fact reconstituted nuclear weapons.

The Vice President knew 1 year earlier, it appears, that the documents were forgeries and, therefore, the allegations false. According to the New York Times of May 6, 2003, More than a year ago the Vice President's office asked for an investigation of the uranium deal. So a former U.S. ambassador to Africa was dispatched to Niger. In February 2002, according to someone present at the meetings, that envoy reported to the CIA and the State Department that the information was unequivocally wrong and that the documents had been forged.

So public reports indicate the Vice President made assertions which were unreliable, and the Vice President visited the CIA, making analysts there feel, according to the Washington Post, that a certain output was desired from here.

In summary, what this amendment seeks to do is to probe what role the Vice President played in causing the CIA to disseminate unreliable, raw, previously undissemminated, untrue information about Iraq's alleged threat to the United States.

Specifically, this amendment would direct the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency to audit all electronic and telephone communications between the Office of the Vice President and the CIA which would answer the question about how extensive the visits by the Vice President to the CIA were.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kucinich amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio has woven an interesting story and made a number of bald and bold assertions, but I think it is important to look at what the amendment says.

The amendment calls for the Inspector General of the CIA to conduct an audit of all telephone electronic communications between the CIA and the Office of the Vice President relating to Iraq and WMD. The amendment is unusual and frankly a bit confusing. It purports to address what is allegedly a very serious issue, the altering or shading of intelligence for political, perhaps for strategic, purposes, but then it focuses only on the Vice President and only on his phone and e-mail communications.

If there was a real problem, one would expect a comprehensive review, but the amendment targets only one individual, the Vice President, and this is an individual who has the right, indeed he has the obligation, to receive information related to, for example, Iraq WMD and a run-up to a war.

However, the Vice President's telephone conversations are not recorded. Thus, the information that is sought in this amendment does not exist when it comes to telephone calls. Perhaps a record of the number of telephone conversations between the Vice President and the CIA could be compiled, but this would tell us only how many calls were made and when they occurred. Frankly, this is not useful information.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Vice President was in contact with the Intelligence Community should not be surprising. Frankly, it would be very upsetting if there was insufficient contact. These are sensitive communications, of course, on important matters. We should all expect the Vice President's office to talk regularly with the CIA, to visit the CIA for that matter, and the rest of the Intelligence Community. So should not the Vice President and the President be avid consumers of intelligence in order to be well-informed in the decisions that they make?

Remember what the amendment says. It is targeting the telephone calls between the Vice President, only the Vice President, and the CIA, only that component of the Intelligence Community, and the electronic communications that took place between that individual and that agency.

So it seems very clear to me that it is not a comprehensive review. It is targeted at the Vice President, and one simply has to realize that it is going to be unsuccessful in really revealing any information that it purports to have as an interest of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out for clarification purposes, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, that the result of this amendment would be both a count of the number of communications and an inventory of the substance of the communications. The count would establish the number of times the Vice President took the unusual step of traveling to the CIA to meet directly with CIA analysts and the inventory would establish the nature of those visits.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio raises the serious issue of politicization of intelligence. The question of the integrity of the intelligence process is a legitimate one and has

been a continuing concern in the oversight of the intelligence agencies. The question of politicization of intelligence is an area that our committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, will explore in its investigation of Iraq intelligence.

I must, however, oppose the gentleman's amendment. The amendment, in my view, does not take the best approach to ensuring a comprehensive look at the matter. It is narrowly focused on one possible area for investigation, and it addresses that one area in a way I believe would be counter-productive.

It is not clear to me that the audit as described in the amendment would develop useful information. The offices of the Inspectors General can be effectively utilized in congressional investigations and oversight, but the resources of these offices should be deployed according to a comprehensive plan of investigation.

In sum, I believe the gentleman has raised an important issue, and that issue should and will be examined in the context of our committee's investigation. The amendment in this form should be defeated.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, just to point out to the gentlewoman that I think it would be helpful if the committee supported the amendment because, at worst, if the amendment would be repeating the work of the committee, if it would be essentially redundant, then it could not hurt, and I would also want to point out that the gentlewoman is correct.

I mean, this amendment is narrowly focused, and it is aiming specifically at obtaining information relative to the relationship between the Vice President and the CIA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. HARMAN. Just to conclude, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we can get to the issue of politicization of intelligence in a different manner, one that is bipartisan and one that falls within the thorough and comprehensive investigation of this committee. That would be a better way for this House to go.

Once again, I commend the gentleman for raising this issue but hope that we will decide to take a different course on this subject.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the way I would characterize this amendment is as the cheap shot amendment. This is a totally political amendment. It is a totally cheap shot at the Vice President. It is an extension of a campaign being waged by the gentleman from Ohio who has made a number of speeches on this floor and around the country. I believe it is an extension of his presidential campaign to try and besmirch the record of this administration, to besmirch the good name of the Vice

President, and I think when people have an opportunity to really look at the amendment, they can see that it is so shallow in its wording and in its nature, that it is what it is.

It is a political amendment. It is only brought here to the floor to continue an opportunity for the gentleman from Ohio to try and find something that simply cannot be found.

It also, I think, degrades the work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. This gentleman who is offering this amendment has been a Member of this House. He knows of the work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. He knows that if he had some kind of a complaint about the kind of activity that he is trying to allege the Vice President has engaged in that he could come to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. He could petition the chairman, he could petition the ranking member. He could ask the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I guess we are not good enough to do our work that you have to seek some kind of an outside counsel or outside organization to try and look into it.

□ 1930

This is unprecedented what this amendment asks for. It is unprecedented in its nature to think that this body, under this amendment, is going to go after the phone records of the Vice President. Now, anybody who does not see the politicizing of what is going on here cannot see the nature of it. You can see it in the words, because they are very shallow.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Under the gentleman's logic, there would be no reason at all for any amendments to be offered from this floor. We might as well dispense with the amendment process and move to a system in which the committees of Congress report bills for a simple up or down vote from the whole House. So we might as well extend the suspension calendar for all bills.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman by saying this. If this is the authorization for the intelligence bill, and the gentleman is offering this amendment under our authorization, why does the gentleman not give some direction to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to look into the matter? Why does the gentleman have to find somebody else to do it? And the gentleman may respond, if he would like.

Mr. KUCINICH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield, and I would say that, first of all, the idea that it is the committee's jurisdiction and, therefore, should be left to the committee, I do not believe the gentleman is seriously proposing

what I think is an absurdity, but the argument rests on the same absurd logic. All Members of the Congress have the privilege to offer amendments, and if a majority of the House agrees with the amendment, it passes. However, I do not believe it is legitimate or logical against my amendment to say that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence should enjoy an exemption from the amendment process.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, what I am saying to the gentleman is apparently the gentleman does not think the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is doing their job. Apparently, the gentleman does not think we have the capability to carry this out, and so he has crafted an amendment to go to some outside group, some outside organization because the gentleman does not have trust and faith in what we have been doing and the work that we have been doing.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would ask that the gentleman not take offense. This is certainly, I would hope the gentleman would agree, a salient issue of interest to the American people and that the public does have a right to know, and there have been published statements that provide contradictory information relative to what is really a question of a singular cause of war. So I respect the gentleman's right to make these statements, and I would ask the gentleman to respect my right as a Member of Congress to offer this amendment.

Mr. LAHOOD. Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if the gentleman wanted to offer an amendment on our authorization bill, at least he ought to give us the benefit of the doubt that we have professional staff and we have people who spend an inordinate amount of time, including the gentleman's ranking member because this is her only committee assignment. She spends all of her time in this Congress working on intelligence activities. Apparently the gentleman does not think enough of her expertise and the expertise of the committee staff on that side to give them some kind of an assignment.

And why the Vice President? Why not the President? Why not the Director of the CIA? Why not the Director of the FBI? This is a political amendment. This is an extension of a campaign.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) has expired.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KUCINICH. Reserving the right to object, I would be happy to grant the gentleman an additional 2 minutes if he would be happy to return the favor to me.

Mr. LAHOOD. I will be more than happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Why the Vice President? Why not other officials of the government? Why not officials of the government who have direct responsibility for intelligence-gathering information? If there is some kinds of a cabal going on around here, why did the gentleman just happen to pick this individual?

I believe this is what it is. This is a political amendment. This is an amendment to try and embarrass one member of this administration. This is an amendment to try and embarrass the second-highest-ranking elected official in our government by some way, shape, or form, thinking that if the gentleman gets some kind of phone records he is going to find something out.

As members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, we get information every day, 24-7, our staff. Pretty much 24-7, our staff are working on gathering intelligence; and this is a slap in the face at the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, to the gentleman's own members, to our members.

It really is what it is. It is a political amendment, and I stand by what I said. It is the cheap shot amendment. It is the cheap shot amendment of the year. It gets the award, in my opinion; and I hope people see it for what it is.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), that I would hope the gentleman would appreciate receiving clear direction for an inquiry. I can only assume that the gentleman does not want the direction of the whole Congress to get to the bottom of the Vice President's role.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I simply would say to the gentleman that he knows that we have established in this bill two advisory committees. We had people on the floor earlier suggesting a commission; but apparently, the gentleman does not think the oversight obligation that we serve, as the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,

is enough. And I say it is a slight. It is a slap at us.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just tell the gentleman that as a member of the Committee on Government Reform I certainly appreciate the role of government oversight, and I certainly appreciate the role of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as well. I would say that if the gentleman did not want to get to the bottom of the role of the Vice President, which has been a matter of public contest and controversy long before I have spoken here, that would indeed be a reason to oppose the amendment; but it would not be a reason for anyone else in Congress to vote "no" on the amendment.

And to the Members of Congress, I say if they want to demand a thorough investigation into the role that the Vice President may have played in offering the American public discredited intelligence reports of a nonexistent Iraqi weapons program, then they should vote "yes" for my amendment.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield once again?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say this. I would say that the gentleman's ranking member has bent over backwards. It was the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and others who asked for the two advisory committees. And it is other people on the gentleman's side who are asking for some kind of a commission. Now, we have not acted on that, and that is not in this bill; but I think every request that was made by the gentleman's side to the chairman has been granted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has expired.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAHOOD. Really, Mr. Chairman, I think we have done everything we can. Now, to go outside of the jurisdiction of the committee and to take a cheap shot at the Vice President, it makes no sense, I say to the gentleman. It really does not. I think, really, the truth is, after listening to this and listening to the fact that the gentleman's ranking member is not going to support the gentleman's amendment, I think it is in his best interest to withdraw the amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind words, and it's nice that the gentleman from Illinois is worried about me and whether I am re-

spected. I believe I am respected, and I believe that the person who offers this amendment respects me, and I certainly hope that he respects our committee.

I just want repeat something I said earlier, which is that our investigation will be thorough and it will be bipartisan and we will follow the facts unflinchingly. So I do not want the gentleman from Ohio to assert, because it is not correct, that we are taking things off limits. The reason I oppose the gentleman's amendment is that I think we will do a comprehensive job in a fair way, and all of us, on a unanimous basis, will proceed and go forward. We will do the right job for this House, and we should have a chance to proceed and do it that way.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in serving in the Congress with the gentlewoman and the gentleman. I would say, though, that I do not see this so much as being a battle over turf as I see it being an assertion of the need for pursuing the truth. And I would expect that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has the capability to do the job, but I also think that this particular matter is so unique that it receive the attention of the House, which is why I have offered this amendment and why I will continue to insist on it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment, and I put it in the context of the work that this committee has done and that we have accomplished and the vision that we outlined in the Intelligence Authorization Act for 2004.

I serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence. As such, one of our jobs is to oversee some of the Nation's most sophisticated intelligence technologies. I have the opportunity and responsibility for critically reviewing new concepts of operation. I must ensure that currently fielded systems continue to be capable of meeting the needs that we have outlined.

In this area, we are pursuing aggressive oversight. We have worked with the ranking member. We have been to the ranking member's district to meet with some of the contractors there; and I think it is a good example of how, in a bipartisan way, we have asked some tough questions of the intelligence community and of those groups that provide us with the materials and the equipment that we need. We have asked the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to provide us with a long-range plan and how all of these pieces will fit together and what a strategic plan may look like for the next 6 to 10 years.

In the comments attached to the bill, we have outlined our disappointment

that that plan has not come forward to the committee, so that we are moving forward with a little bit less information, perhaps, at this time, than what we would like to have had. But I do not think that the amendment that the gentleman is bringing up is one that is going to work in the best interest of what we are trying to get accomplished.

On a weekly basis, this committee meets with the communities analytic cadre. We have met with them on a regular basis to review the intelligence that they prepared for us and they prepared for the President, the Vice President and Members of Congress; and that information is now available to all 435 Members of Congress so that they can take a look at what we were looking at and how we were shaping our judgments and where we were getting our information from.

I think it is important for the American people to know that. That information is not secret. We are being very open with our colleagues because we recognize the importance of maintaining the credibility of the process, the individuals, and the analysis that goes into the intelligence that we have gathered. We take this job very, very seriously.

One of the things that I am concerned about with this gentleman's amendment is that if we pursue this path, and in this case it identifies the Vice President but also implicates the folks at the different intelligence agencies as perhaps not keeping the best interest of the country in the forefront, then what we will end up with, and I agree with my colleague from Illinois that it is a cheap shot amendment because there is not a basis in fact to make these accusations against the Vice President or against the folks at the intelligence agency, but the result and danger is that what we are going to end up with is we are going to end up with a cadre of analysts that are going to be intimidated to such a point that they are going to go through the process, they are going to gather the intelligence, and they are going to be sitting there and saying, you know, I really cannot take the next step of providing some expert judgment, which I have been trained for, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years. I am not going to be able to share that expert judgment with the folks who recognize the source and the art of this work.

Remember, the job we give these folks, in plain English, is we ask them to go out and steal other people's secrets. We ask them to do that in an imprecise way and to put the pieces together. And when they have a few pieces of the puzzle, we ask them to try to paint for us what the picture and what the final puzzle may look like. If we put a cloud over their heads and say every time you have a few of the pieces out there and you have painted a picture for us, for us to better understand the environment after the fact, if what you laid out beforehand does not per-

fectly match what we find out afterwards, you have failed.

In reality, these are talented people. They are doing a very, very good job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOEKSTRA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

□ 1945

Mr. HOEKSTRA. They come back and they give us their best judgment. I am impressed with the work of the chairman and the ranking member, how they have set a course that says we are going to go through this in a bipartisan way. We are going to take a look at the information and how the people processed the information. We are going to take a look at how we analyzed it and how decisions were made off that information, but we are going to do that in a bipartisan way and we are going to make sure that we do not take this down a road of pure partisan politics because in the 2½ years I have been on this committee, in a bipartisan way we have kept as our primary focus what is good for this country, recognizing the sensitive nature of the information that we deal with, recognizing the importance of us to work through very, very difficult issues, but to reach a consensus that enables us to move forward.

That is exactly what the leadership of this committee has done, it is exactly the way that the members of the committee have guided their behavior, and it is what sets the behavior of our committee and the members of that committee apart from the amendment that is brought forward at this time.

It is a partisan amendment, it has a potential to be used in many, many different ways, but primarily in my analysis it hurts the prospect of truly improving the process so that when we move forward in the future, we will have the intelligence, the capability and the right people in place to ensure that we make the best possible decisions.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to underscore the right of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) to offer this amendment and say that he is getting at a very important point, but to say further it is a bad amendment and should be opposed. It is both too narrow and too broad. He is certainly intending to get at an important point, but it is too narrow in that it deals with the phone records of one public official, and it is too broad in the sense that it is a fishing expedition. It is the kind of fishing expedition which I think so sullied some previous Congresses.

The question of whether intelligence has been cooked or coerced is a critical question, and I thank the gentleman for raising it. But in fact in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence we have already raised that, and we

will continue to raise that issue. I ask the assistance of every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle to help us formulate the questions that need to be asked and to hold us to task that those questions are asked to the satisfaction of all Members of this body and of the citizens of America. But I do not believe that this amendment will help us do that. I must oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be useful as we begin these debates for us to reflect on the essential constitutional role of the Congress and on the importance of separation of powers and on the cause which took a Nation into war because we are not talking about just any other matter here, we are talking about a matter that resulted in the people of this country having their sons and daughters sent to Iraq.

Nothing less than the entire involvement of this Congress will do to be able to hold safe the constitutional prerogatives of separation of powers. No congressional committee can override the requirements of the Constitution and the role of this Congress.

When Members of this Congress gave the President authority to pursue an attack against Iraq, they took upon themselves a serious and grave responsibility, and since information has been presented that raises grave questions about the cause of our action against Iraq, we have a moral obligation to get into this, and I take nothing away from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, but I would tell Members, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence should take nothing away from Members of the House.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, perhaps the gentleman did not hear me earlier this evening when I said that what we are looking at are critical questions that have to do with lives and deaths that have occurred or might occur. It has a lot to do with the future direction of our country; but I do not believe that this amendment will help us carry out the investigation that we need to carry out and ask the questions that we need to ask and have for the future the kind of truth-telling intelligence agents and analysts who will help this country get where we want to go.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the latest speech of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), and that is to say if the gentleman really wants the prerogatives of the House to be worked out, let the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence do it. The gentleman's amendment says the IG or the GAO is supposed to

go in and get the Vice President's phone records. If the gentleman thinks it is such a great idea, let us do it. We have been doing it. Why have some outside group do it? That is the flaw in the gentleman's amendment. That is what our committee is supposed to do. That is the flaw, and that is what politicizes it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I would direct the gentleman from Illinois to an article in the Washington Post on June 5 which says that the esteemed chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence said there is "no indication that analysts at DIA or CIA changed their analysis to fit what they perceived as the desire of the administration officials."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) has expired.

(On request of Mr. KUCINICH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, it goes on to say the intelligence oversight panels have received no whistleblower complaints from the CIA or other intelligence agencies on the issue. I would maintain that this would not be a subject of whistleblowing, and only the Office of Inspector General or in this case the investigative agency would have an opportunity to be able to get this in an evenhanded way, and it takes it out of politics at a time when Members suggest this is only political.

I might further add that I did not make my reputation in this House by raising partisan issues, and I do not see this as a partisan issue, I see this as justifying the administration's claim that this country had to go to war against Iraq because there was imminent threat.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I want to point out two things, and they are meant to be constructive. First of all, it is certainly true everybody in the United States counts on it being true and it is true that the Vice President and the President are responsible for the protection of the national security. The national security team involves the Vice President. The President and the Vice President are regular consumers of intelligence information, and were they not, we probably should be calling for some kind of an investigation.

I do recall it was not so long ago that one of the complaints from one of the Directors of the CIA was in fact just that, that he did not get enough quality time and enough access with the

top leaders of the country and the Intelligence Community was not being well-served. That was at another time and we need not go into that.

My suggestion to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who I have great respect for, is that this amendment is truly not worthy of his best efforts. I do not believe the gentleman is fully informed on it. It appears that the gentleman is basing his amendment and information and his case on media. Again, at the risk of getting impaled by the media, I have this trouble with the errancy problem in the media.

Media simply does not know everything, and if they did, they would stop asking me and the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and other members of the committee questions. Believe me, the media does not know everything. They are not fully informed, and if the gentleman is using the media, the gentleman is not fully informed.

I invite the gentleman to come upstairs, sign the secrecy agreement if the gentleman has not already, and review the material. That is why we have it there. If the gentleman took advantage of that, the gentleman would be better able to understand what we are doing, and I would hope would be supportive of our efforts. Having said all that, I hope we are getting ready for a vote on this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the Kucinich amendment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) is familiar with the amendment and the letter of the amendment, and I would ask if the chairman would be willing to commit the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to seeking specifically the information that I am asking here of the Inspector General. Would the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence be willing to conduct publicly an audit of all telephone and electronic communications between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Office of the Vice President as they relate to this matter?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, certainly we will publicly not commit to that. We will publicly commit to where the review of the information takes us. We have a bipartisan agreement on that. We have 20 able members who are members of good judgment and good sense who will follow the review and the material that comes in to the appropriate places.

The gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN) has used the word "unflinching." It is a fair word. I assure the gentleman I am going where the information takes us.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would suggest to the gentleman and I would not impugn his answer by stating that his unwillingness to clearly commit to gathering this information publicly would in any way reflect a partisan position on his part, just as my desire to have the Inspector General bring that information forward is not reflective of a partisan position on my part.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. There are two reasons why this would be a difficult task to do publicly, and I would not make that broad a commitment. The first is that much of the material that the gentleman is talking about is probably classified if the gentleman is talking about the content of what may or may not be involved in calls, and I cannot go there.

The second part is the matter of Constitution which does understand that working documents and so forth of the executive are respected and privileged. That has always been the case no matter who is in the White House.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, it would be more than instructive. It would be classified information if the Vice President manipulated CIA analysts to disseminate false, raw unreliable information to justify a war in Iraq. I am hopeful no one is saying that and I am not aware that the administration has asserted executive privilege in an attempt to shield such information from the Congress. I am not aware of that at all. Maybe that has happened privately, but I am not aware that such an assertion can be private and that in fact such an assertion has been made.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. That is an option that they have and that is why I cannot make a commitment. I cannot overcome that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would say in order for the test to be made to make the request first then imposes our responsibility as Members of Congress, and as a coequal branch of government, we are entitled to do that and the executive branch is entitled to assert executive privilege, if they so choose, and that would be illuminating, I think.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask that the Bush administration provide the American people with a full account of the events leading up to the war with Iraq.

□ 2000

The amendment sponsored by Representative KUCINICH is a good starting point but there is still much that we do not know about the basis of our war with Iraq. Since August of last year, when the administration began beating the war drum, they have offered little concrete evidence backing up their claims that Iraq posed an "imminent threat" to the United States.

The rhetoric employed by the administration was strong and unwavering:

On September 12, 2002, the President told the UN: "Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons . . . Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes used to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon."

On October 7, 2002, the President said: "It [Iraq] possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons."

The Vice President said earlier this year on "Meet The Press" that: "we believe he [Saddam Hussein] has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons."

And the Secretary of Defense joined in saying: "We know where they [weapons of mass destruction] are, they are in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad."

Yet, despite this certainty, 3 months after the fall of Baghdad, no chemical, biological or nuclear weapons have been found. Nor have the facilities to make these weapons been found. The administration has tried to capitalize on our fears born out of the September 11th terrorist attacks, suggesting there was a link between Saddam Hussein and leaders of al Qaeda.

Even though this connection has been disproved consistently, the President still cites it as fact.

And today, we learned that at least one member of the intelligence community felt pressured to shape his reports to fit the administration's position on weapons of mass destruction even though he had no evidence to support those claims.

Congress must work to ensure that the information that comes out of the intelligence community is reliable and is not unduly influenced by anyone. This is not a partisan issue. This is about restoring the credibility of the United States both with our constituents and throughout the world.

The President has said that he is confident that weapons of mass destruction will be found; the evidence is strong he says.

I encourage him to shine the light of day on the evidence so that the world can understand why the United States went to war—unprovoked—and put the lives of thousands in danger.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 108-176.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. LEE:

At the end of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 345. REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH UNITED NATIONS WEAPONS INSPECTORS SEARCHING FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which intelligence developed by the Department of Defense and by the intelligence community with respect to weapons of mass destruction obtained or developed by Iraq preceding Operation Iraqi Freedom was made available to the United Nations weapons inspectors and the quantity and quality of the information that was provided (if any).

(b) SPECIFIC MATTER STUDIED.—The study shall provide for an analysis of the sufficiency of the intelligence provided by the Director of Central Intelligence to those weapons inspectors, and whether the information was provided in a timely manner and in a sufficient quantity and quality to enable the inspectors to locate, visit, and conduct investigations on all high and medium value suspected sites of weapons of mass destruction.

(c) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Comptroller General may secure directly from any agency or department of the United States information necessary to carry out the study under subsection (a).

(2) The appropriate Federal agencies or departments shall cooperate with the Comptroller General in expeditiously providing appropriate security clearances to individuals carrying out the study to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this section without the appropriate security clearances.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) for her support and her leadership in crafting this bipartisan bill. Also to my staff, Julie Little and Shannon Smith, I want to thank them for their very diligent work.

This is a commonsense amendment seeking an answer to a question that the American people have a right to know: How was our intelligence regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction handled in the months before the war? Specifically, this amendment seeks a GAO study to determine the extent and timeliness with which the Intelligence

Community shared information about suspected weapons in Iraq with the United Nations inspectors on the ground searching for those weapons.

There are growing questions being raised about the use or possible misuse of intelligence in the months leading up to the war against Iraq. If intelligence was distorted, that raises serious doubts around the world about United States credibility. Our President told the American people, the Congress and the world that inspections had failed, that Iraq unquestionably possessed weapons of mass destruction, and that these weapons posed such a dire, imminent threat to the United States that we had no choice but to go to war. All other options, he said, had been exhausted. But the question we must continue to ask is, were those options truly exhausted? Were they, in fact, fully pursued? Did the United States Intelligence Community share information with the United Nations inspectors about suspected weapons sites? Did it happen in a timely and sufficient manner?

President Bush went before the United Nations General Assembly and stated, "My nation will work with the U.N. Security Council to meet our common challenge." He and Secretary Powell pledged to work with the United Nations to pursue inspections to seek out and destroy weapons of mass destruction. What we have before us is a question of both policy and credibility. If we failed to fully share intelligence with United Nations inspectors, we may have undermined their effectiveness. If we relied on intelligence that was distorted or less complete than implied, if we failed to share crucial information with our allies, then we have undermined our own national credibility.

This Nation launched a preemptive war based on what it claimed was indisputable evidence. If that evidence was not so solid and especially if it was distorted, then we severely undercut our ability to convince the world about future dangers from weapons of mass destruction in other countries. The doctrine of preemption, which I happen incidentally to strongly oppose, totally collapses without credibility.

For these reasons, we need to find the answer to these questions. The American people have a right to know. A respected and esteemed member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence said that he has been working for the last 6 months to try to force disclosure of important facts relevant to the sharing of intelligence information on suspect weapons of mass destruction sites by the CIA with the United Nations arms inspectors.

He continued, and I quote, "If it had been public knowledge in February or March of this year that the CIA had not shared information on all of the top Iraqi WMD suspect sites with the United Nations inspectors, it could have worked against the administration's timetable for initiating military

action against Iraq. There could have been questions as to why; it could have made the administration's decision to cut short the U.N. inspection process and to institute military action less compelling; and there could have been greater demand that we share all such information with the United Nations before abandoning the inspection process."

I share his concerns and I echo his call for a bipartisan investigation. These are not partisan issues, they are fundamental questions about credibility and they need to be answered. This amendment calls for a GAO study into the sharing of United States intelligence with the U.N. inspections teams. It calls for a report to Congress with a classified annex if necessary for security reasons. We are all aware that to date the United States military has not found weapons of mass destruction in its searches since the end of the war. We also know that that does not prove the weapons are not there. They may well be. And I believe we should bring in more IAEA and United Nations inspectors to help seek out, secure and destroy them if they are hidden in Iraq.

Given the Administration's confident and unequivocal statements that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction and given the President's assurances that he wanted to work with the United Nations to seek non-military solutions through a renewed inspections process, it is important that we learn to answer to the question of whether or not intelligence was shared in a timely and sufficient manner with the UN inspections teams.

I urge you to support this amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I rise in opposition to the Lee amendment. It calls, of course, for the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and determine the extent of intelligence sharing within the Intelligence Community, DOD and the U.N. inspectors in Iraq.

I would like to make two general points first. As a part of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's review of the Intelligence Community regarding prewar intelligence on Iraq, the committee has already begun to examine this issue and will assess the effectiveness and procedures governing the sharing of intelligence to international and foreign bodies.

Secondly, the committee acknowledges that the Comptroller has some capabilities for investigation. But I would note that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has a long and distinguished record of conducting bipartisan and thorough reviews of intelligence matters. Therefore, before outside help is requested, it seems only appropriate that the committee should have an opportunity to fulfill its mandate for the House and for the Congress

to conduct rigorous oversight of the Intelligence Community. This subject area of the amendment is not going to be neglected.

Now a few details. In the run-up to renewed weapons inspections in Iraq late last year, U.N. weapons inspector Hans Blix told the press that although his team could use U.S. intelligence, the team was not supposed to trust anyone, and that it was the team's decision, not a particular government's, as to what facilities and where the inspections were to be carried out.

The earlier U.N. mission to Iraq was accused of spying for the United States. Therefore, Hans Blix indicated that he had to make the distinction between his possible use of intelligence and his team's ability to conduct an independent and neutral investigation of Iraq's WMD facilities. Blix admitted using CIA reports in a November 28 interview with CNN but cautioned that he would not allow his team to be dictated to by a foreign government.

Some have suggested that the U.S. failed to provide the arms inspectors with useful information. At this point, this Member believes that this is simply not true, not true at all. We are going to find out about that, however, when we complete our investigation. Hans Blix actually received, I think, unprecedented access to intelligence.

The U.S. provided the U.N. weapons inspectors with the ability to task and assign U.S. U-2 surveillance aircraft operating over Iraq. He told the U-2s where to go and what to target. This is virtually unheard of, U.N. civilians ordering U.S. pilots on hazardous missions. Why did we do this? Why did we give a U.N. official this extraordinary opportunity and authority? In the words of Hans Blix, "The U-2 data will improve our ability to carry out our inspections."

If there was a problem in timely response to intelligence, the problem was in the U.N.'s ability to act on information after they had received it from the United States or from other sources. This is not really too surprising since there were literally hundreds of Iraqi agents or personnel whose job it was to slow down the inspectors, to send them in the wrong direction, or to make sure they would end up in the wrong place, or to report on their progress so that deception and deceit and cover-up could take place before they arrived. This is not a failing of the United States but, rather, the inability of UNMOVIC to overcome Iraqi denial and deception techniques.

The gentlewoman, I hope, would understand that if there were problems in communication of intelligence, much of the problem was the U.N. reluctance to rely on U.S. sources. This is addressed in an article in USA Today and I do not cite it except that they are quoting Blix. They were reluctant, they said, to rely on U.S. intelligence for fear that Iraq would accuse them of spying for the United States, an accusation that Iraq made, of course, the

first time we had inspectors in. Here is a quote:

"Still smarting from their admission that U.S. intelligence gave inspectors secret missions during the last round of inspections in 1998, U.N. officials have deliberately curbed access to the CIA and allied intelligence agencies."

The ground rules established by the U.N. stipulated that the CIA would not equip the inspectors, unofficial discussions between the CIA and the inspectors were prohibited, and only the U.N. would be allowed to analyze the data that was collected.

We have got a lot to look at. Members will have access to some of this very information across the board in an unprecedented fashion. This is a responsibility of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. We have the capabilities. We have the intent. I would say we ought to be given the opportunity. Therefore, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. I hope it will be rejected.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have enormous respect for the sponsor of this amendment. She is prepared to vote her conscience in this House, even if she is a minority of one. I think that is admirable, courageous and her constituents should be enormously proud to be represented by her. I am certainly proud to serve with her.

I listened carefully to the comments made by the gentleman from Nebraska. Frankly, I agree with them. I think that is the context of the search for weapons by the U.N. inspector. However, agreeing with them does not get me to his conclusion. My conclusion is that we should support this amendment because it contains a specific request for a discrete investigation that would be of value in understanding precisely what information was shared with the U.N. weapons inspectors.

It may turn out that more was shared than we know. It may turn out that less was shared than we know. And it may turn out, and I think it will, that what the gentleman from Nebraska had to say includes the context in which it was shared. Nonetheless, I think this investigation could provide a constructive baseline in understanding the difficulties of conducting U.N. inspections.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the specific matters to be studied under this amendment are not to my knowledge currently part of the scope of our Committee's review. We are not specifically investigating what information was shared with the U.N., though we certainly could, I suppose. Thus, I believe the amendment is helpful and I would urge us to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to support the Lee amendment. I thank the ranking member for her support. As this House, our Nation and

the world debate the quality of the intelligence that the war in Iraq was fought over, it is too easy to forget that our troops were not the first to search the Iraqi desert for weapons of mass destruction. United Nations inspectors spent a decade searching for and destroying illegal Iraqi weapons facilities, but in the days and months leading up to the war, they were scorned for their failure to find weapons of mass destruction.

This resolution calls on the GAO to investigate how much cooperation the United States intelligence agencies gave United Nations inspectors. Understanding about that cooperation with the United Nations, or lack thereof, will give us a better picture of the efforts this Nation took to avoid war with Iraq. If America did not fully share its intelligence with U.N. inspectors, Congress needs to find out why.

The fact is that the rhetoric leading up to the war in Iraq led many Americans to believe that finding weapons of mass destruction would be absolutely easy, that the U.N. inspectors must have been grossly incompetent. But I do not believe that to be true and I think that our inability to find weapons of mass destruction now requires the United States to reexamine the rhetoric and the events that led up to the war. We need to find out beyond reports from USA Today if our U.S. intelligence agencies were cooperating fully with the U.N. inspectors. And we need to find out if the prewar rhetoric reflected the intelligence we shared with the United Nations.

This amendment is about getting answers to questions that we are all asking in this country. I urge my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

□ 2015

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have given this amendment very careful consideration, and I appreciate the effort. I do believe we have got the matter handled already in the committee, and I will tell the gentlewoman that; and I would invite the gentlewoman upstairs to talk to us about it in a classified setting if she would like to.

The reason I say that I think this is unnecessary is I think it is duplicative of work we are doing that, frankly, we are best prepared to do. But I would like to point out there are a couple of problems with the United Nations that we have been working with for quite a number of years, and I think we, frankly, have the expertise to judge better than anybody else. Perhaps our sister body in the Senate, Senate Intelligence Committee, would dispute that; but I would say that either the Senate or us are going to do a pretty good job on this, and in fact we are both working on it.

The question of how much information we shared with the U.N. is a fair question to ask, and the answer is we shared a remarkable amount, more

than they could handle. It turns out as we heard from the gentleman from Nebraska's (Mr. BEREUTER) comments that the U.N. inspectors were very worried about being called spies of the United States and there was quite a debate about taking any information from the United States at all lest this be a U.S.-driven thing and Hans Blix did not want that and he said so publicly a number of times and said that frankly they could do the job fine without us.

But notwithstanding, we had been working with them for some time and giving them some good information and frankly at some peril because the U.N. leaks like a sieve, and there are some things about the U.N. that are worth noting. Not all the members of the U.N. are particularly friendly to the United States of America, and that brings us to the question of do Americans want us to be sharing our crown jewels and our sovereignty with nations who may not want to be particularly helpful to us and some who may actually want to be harmful to us.

So there is a question there of whether our American constituency would like us to keep this in control in the House or get it out where some other people might want to make some mischief for the United States of America and our security. And I am very much aware of that because we have actually had problems in the past that are documented, which I am not going to go into but which are documented, where materials and information was not properly safeguarded or was willfully given to the wrong people in the U.N. That is not a good track record and I think would not be prudent of us to ignore.

I would say that for some time U.N. weapons inspectors had unprecedented access to U.S. intelligence information. Whether they used it or not or wanted to use it was their problem, including analytical reports. We obviously protected our sources. We had imagery from the U-2 reconnaissance aircraft, which I think everybody knows now. Probably what some people do not know which I believe I can say is that the U.N. inspectors had the ability, the task to request how that U-2 was used. That is rather remarkable, turning over an asset like that to another country, a set of countries.

I believe everybody knows that Colin Powell played intercepts for the Security Council that are frankly things that do not happen in our committee very often. They do not play intercepts for us very often. So I would say an unusual amount of information, perhaps more than I would have approved of, was given to the U.N.

And there is a problem with the U.N. that I want to go into a little further, and it is an appearance problem; and it is one I think we are better prepared to handle in the House than an outside group trying to come in here. There is a lot of feeling, I think, that the U.N. does not always get it right in terms of

our national purpose or national mission, and I would point out that the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June is the Russian Federation. I would like to also point out, and I think I can say this in a responsible way, that there are an extraordinary number of Russian espionage activities going on in our Nation's capital as I speak, even though we are on a friendly basis. Nations do spy on each other. Russians are still in a little bit of their paranoia and their conspiratorial mode that there are things to find out about us that if they just ask us, they will not believe the answer; so they have to spy on us. We have a good friendship with them, but it has got a ways to go. There is a little bit of a problem there.

There is a problem with Syria which is on our terrorist list being on the Security Council. These kinds of things lead one to pause about how we do business, and these are matters which we are well aware of on our committee. And on the Commission on Human Rights, which has recently been in the news at the U.N., it is clearly true that the U.N. took a slap at the United States by throwing us off that commission in order to put Cuba on it. That is not really great. The chairmanship of that committee, I understand, right now is Libya. Libya's human rights record is not worth commenting on, it is so terrible. Zimbabwe? Give me a break.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, when we take a look at this, the U.N. business is a complicated, complex business. We work closely with the Department of State, I&R, and others in this. We for years had a good working relationship. I do not think it is necessary for us to abandon that relationship or supplement it. So I am going to urge that we do not mess with what we have got now. If it turns out that there is a need to do that down the road, I will come back and admit it. But I do not think we are there at this point; so I will thank the gentlewoman for her amendment and the spirit in which it is offered.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me just thank the gentleman very much for his response and for this debate, but I want to reiterate the purpose of this amendment, really, and it has nothing to do with whether one supports or opposes the United Nations. Basically, this amendment requires the GAO to conduct a study, a report, that would be submitted in an unclassified form but may contain a classified annex with regard to the sharing of information between our intelligence agencies and the

United Nations leading up to the war against Iraq. I believe the American people have a right to know this and this is what this sentiment of this amendment is, and I would urge the gentleman to reconsider.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I well understand the purpose of the gentlewoman's amendment, and what I am trying to say and outline for her is that dealing with the United Nations with intelligence is an extraordinarily complex issue, and I do not think there is a particular body in Congress that has more experience than the oversight committees on intelligence, House and Senate. And I therefore say give us a chance to do our job and I think she will understand. If the gentlewoman wants to know how much intelligence has been shared with the U.N., I guarantee we can find out upstairs.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman again for that response; but, again, this amendment allows the American people to know what that information was in a declassified form. This amendment allows for a classified index, and I believe in terms of the fact that U.S. tax dollars were of course used in this war that people, the American people, just have a right to ask these questions and have the right to know. This has nothing to do with whether one supports or opposes the United Nations.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, this is not supporting or opposing the U.N. I will tell the gentlewoman flat out that I do not have the capacity to declassify information. Our committee does not. We can get involved in a process, but the declassification question is another issue which I would love to enlist her support on on how we can make it better, but that is not part of this amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will once again remind Members to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) will be postponed.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2417) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER
TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

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

There was no objection.

MEDICARE: H.R. 1 TURNS BACK
THE CLOCK

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I worked on the markup of the prescription drug bill, the Republican Medicare privatization bill, the other day; and I really could not figure out why Republicans were in every case doing the bidding of the drug companies and in every case doing the bidding of the insurance companies.

□ 2030

I asked the chairman if it could be perhaps that because the drug compa-

nies contributed about \$80 million to campaigns last year, about 85 percent of that to Republicans, and the chairman said that could not be it. I asked if because our committee markup on two different occasions was delayed, stopped until the next day, stopped early because President Bush was headlining a major Republican event honoring the CEO of Glaxo Wellcome, one of the largest drug companies in the world, in this case a British drug company. He said that had nothing to do with it. I asked if it could be perhaps because President Bush was in the midst of raising millions of dollars this year from the drug companies and the insurance companies, if that is why the Republican drug bill was written by the drug industry and the insurance industry, and he said no to that.

Now, I will take the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce at his word, that Republicans were not at the beck and call of the drug and insurance industry because the drug and insurance industry so richly funds the Republican Party. I will take them at their word.

But I finally figured out the reason that Republicans always do the bidding of the drug and insurance companies and why the Republicans want to privatize Medicare is because they just do not much like Medicare. And while that may sound strange to some Members of this House or anyone else that might be watching, I think we need to look at the history of Medicare.

In 1965, there were only 11 Republican Members of Congress out of 150 or 160 or so, only 11 Members of Congress on that side of the aisle that actually supported the creation of Medicare. Gerald Ford, later to become President, opposed it. Bob Dole, later to be a Senator and then a presidential nominee. Opposed the creation of Medicare. Strom Thurmond, a longtime, longest-serving Senator in U.S. history, opposed the creation of Medicare. Donald Rumsfeld, now the Secretary of Defense, was a Member of the House in those days and he opposed the creation of Medicare. Basically, almost every single Republican opposed the creation of Medicare. They made all kinds of comments about big government and socialized medicine, all of those kinds of things they said because they just did not want a government health care program like Medicare.

Then, during the Reagan administration, Republicans tried several attempts to privatize Medicare. They cut reimbursement for hospitals, they cut reimbursement for doctors, they tried to scale back the Medicare benefit for seniors, but they really could not get much through a Democratic Congress. But then, the day came in 1995 when Newt Gingrich came on the scene as the new Speaker and Newt Gingrich literally waited fewer than 100 days, literally fewer than 100 days until he tried the beginning of the dismantling of Medicare.

What Speaker Gingrich did was he tried to cut Medicare \$270 million and

then to turn around and give a major tax cut, taking the money from Medicare, and giving a major tax cut to the wealthiest people in sight. Does that sound familiar? That is what they are basically doing today, giving tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent. In this case, the tax cut for millionaires is \$90,000.

Speaker Gingrich also made a statement. He said, "We can't get rid of Medicare"; this was back in 1995. He said, "We can't get rid of Medicare in round one because we don't think that is politically smart, but we believe it is going to wither on the vine."

Bob Dole that same year bragged to a conservative group, a group of conservative politicians who do not like Medicare; sort of the Republican line. He said, Bob Dole said, I was there 30 years ago fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, trying to stop it from ever being created.

So it is pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, that it may not be just the fact that Republicans raise a ton of money from the drug companies and a ton of money from the insurance companies, and that is why they are for Medicare privatization and that is why they want to turn Medicare over to the drug and insurance industries. It may not be that; it may be that they have an honest, philosophical difference with us and with 90 percent of the American public. They just do not like Medicare. They voted against creating it. They bragged about voting against creating it. Speaker Gingrich voted to cut it on several occasions.

And now in 2003, with a Republican President, a Republican Senate and a Republican House, this is their golden opportunity to privatize Medicare. That is what this vote is all about this week. The Republicans, at the behest of the insurance companies and the drug companies, want to privatize the health care system that has worked for America's seniors.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the new Republican star in their efforts to privatize Medicare, in their efforts to dismantle Medicare, has said, and I will end with this, Mr. Speaker, he said, to those who would say the bill would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is, from the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), Republican chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, we certainly hope so. Old fashioned Medicare is not very good. We want to end it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to vote "no" on the Republican plan, vote "yes" on the Democratic plan that will preserve Medicare and provide a solid prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

THE SONS OF COLVILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in honor of Minnesota's 135th Infantry.

It is hard for us to imagine what it must have been like in the spring of 1861 when cannons announced the first battle of the Civil War by firing on Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. Minnesota's first Governor, Alexander Ramsey, happened to be in Washington on other business. Upon learning the news, he raced to the White House to become the first Governor to volunteer troops for the Union Army.

A few nights later, in Red Wing, Minnesota, William Colvill used his considerable size and agility, as he stood almost 5 feet, 5 inches tall, to elbow his way to the front of the line to become the first volunteer in the first regiment of the first State that volunteered troops to preserve the Union.

Minnesota's First Regiment fought with distinction in many of the bloodiest battles in the Civil War, including Fredericksburg, Bull Run, and Antietam. American history has a special footnote, however, to commemorate their actions on July 2, 1863 in that most famous of Civil War contests, the Battle of Gettysburg.

General Winfield Scott Hancock, commander of the Union forces, saw the vulnerability of General Sickles' New Yorkers, who had moved forward, leaving a huge gap in the Union line. Hancock noticed that the First was positioned somewhat south of the middle of the long Union line on Cemetery Ridge. He nervously rode up and asked, Colonel Colvill, how long can you hold your position? Colvill, who spoke in short, crisp sentences firmly answered, "General, to the last man."

Now, this was no idle boast. By the end of that day, the regiment would suffer 82 percent casualties.

That single phrase, "to the last man," survives today as the motto of the Minnesota National Guard detachment that traces its heritage to the Minnesota First Regiment.

When the regiment headed off to war from Fort Snelling in 1861, they were 1,023 strong. After Pickett's charge at Gettysburg had been repelled only 2 years later, just 67 men could answer the call.

The Minnesota First went on to see action in the Spanish American War and served with distinction in the Philippine Insurrection. During World War I it was mustered into service, but did not see action as a unit.

That changed in 1941 when war clouds gathered far across the sea. The 135th Infantry became the first division to be activated and shipped out. Advance units of the 135th sailed to Africa to take on the famed Africa Corps of Field Marshal Rommel. Despite being outmanned and underequipped, the 135th turned back the Desert Fox and his Army.

After World War II, the 135th once again saw action in Korea.

Today, the 135th is a battalion; no longer a regiment. It has five compa-

nies compared with 20 years past. It is concentrated in southeastern Minnesota as a member of the historic 34th Red Bull National Guard Division.

That is why, this July 11 through 13, the thin ranks of the 135th Infantry's combat veterans of World War II and the Korean War, the "Sons of Colvill" as they are known, will gather to remember. They will close ranks in Mankato, Minnesota, to honor those who have fallen and to remember one more time the sacrifices of a generation.

Once again, they will listen to the special music that identifies the 135th: "March of the Red Bull Lesions," "The Old Gray Mayor," "The Sons of Colvill." It will be a final hoo-ah for the surviving men of World War II, and it will be one more commemoration for the thinning ranks of the Korean War vets. And, it will be one last chance for us to say, "thank you, well done, oh good and noble servants. You have brought hope and freedom to millions who will never know your names."

Mr. Speaker, I salute the brave Minnesotans who have given so much to keep the lamp of liberty burning brightly throughout the world. To the families of those who have made the supreme sacrifice, we cannot adequately salve the wounds that will never heal. The best that we can say is that we will never forget.

May God bless you. May God continue to bless our country and all who defend her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

WOMEN AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) said, this is *deja vu* all over again. Here we are, once again, discussing ways to help seniors afford the prescription drugs that they need and must have and, once again, the majority insists on a sham proposal that gives seniors nothing more than a false sense of security.

I am here tonight with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) to remind everyone that as we debate proposals to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, the decisions we make

will overwhelmingly impact the mothers, grandmothers, sisters, and aunts across this country. Women are living longer than ever, and they are living longer than men. That is good news. However, the poverty that many women experience during their final years is certainly not good news.

There are several reasons women's golden years are not so golden. While most women have worked their entire lives, a good portion of this work was not in the paid workforce. You do not earn a pension for the time spent caring for children or elderly parents. When many of our mothers and grandmothers were in the workforce, they were denied equal pay for equal work, therefore earning less. Some worked only part-time, trying to balance the responsibilities of their jobs and their families. As a result, they have made less over their lifetimes, and now their monthly Social Security benefit is considerably smaller than their male counterparts.

These women deserve financial stability and still, the Republican prescription drug proposal denies them the security that comes with knowing that they can afford to pay for their medical care. Not only will the majority's plan not help senior women, it will push Medicare beneficiaries into HMOs, creating more instability. I am not speculating; I have watched it happen in my district.

Just a few years ago, the Health Plan of the Redwoods, a good, small HMO that served my constituents in Sonoma and Marin Counties, went bankrupt. After first limiting services and physician payments, they had to close their doors. This bankruptcy interrupted care for a number of my constituents, a great number of them senior women.

We should not force Medicare beneficiaries to accept the same kind of instability in exchange for a prescription drug benefit. The Republican plan ignores the proverbial 800-pound elephant in the room: the astronomically high prices of prescription drugs.

Take a minute and think about the reason our senior women cannot afford prescription drugs. It is because prescription drugs are too expensive. To me, it is good, old-fashioned, common sense that we should take steps that address the root of the problem and find ways to reduce these prices. But the majority apparently does not enjoy the same common sense that my democratic colleagues and I do.

Their plan specifically forbids the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating lower prescription drug prices. Can my colleagues imagine that? The Republican plan prohibits the Secretary of Health and Human Services from trying to make the cost of prescription drugs lower.

□ 2045

Private insurance companies then must on their own negotiate with far less bargaining power. The Veterans Administration has proven that negoti-

ating can result in lower prices, but the Republicans have once again proven that they care more about the profits of the pharmaceutical companies than the bottom lines or about senior women.

Many older women have little or no financial security. But there is one thing even more dangerous than that, and that is a false sense of security. Millions of women will read the newspapers; they will be delighted to learn that there is now a Medicare prescription drug benefit. But imagine their surprise, imagine the surprise of the typical elderly woman when she learns that her so-called benefit will require her to pay \$4,000 of the first \$5,000 in annual drug expenses. And that is on top of a monthly premium that is yet to be determined.

Frankly, I find it shameful that the majority claims that they are delivering a drug benefit to seniors when in reality the plan will cover only a small portion of their expenses. And it will actually outlaw practical steps to reduce these expenses in the first place. I dare my Republican colleagues to tell their mothers what they are doing to Medicare.

After a lifetime of hard work, both in and out of the home, our mothers and grandmothers deserve better than this fraudulent plan the republicans are pushing. We can do better and we must.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN NOT FAIR TO OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the previous speaker on several issues, and that is that we should delay this bill and try to improve it. And I am going to make comments suggesting that it is not fair to seniors, but it is not fair to our kids and our grandkids. I have four children, and they are trying to save money to send my grandchildren to college. And one question I would pose is, why should they pay more taxes to pay for seniors' prescription drugs?

The retiring seniors that we are going to see over the next 10 years are probably the wealthiest seniors this country has ever had in the past, probably will ever have in the future. Mr. Speaker, we now expect a vote on the addition of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare on June 26. And this vote would authorize the largest expansion of our entitlement programs since we amended the Social Security bill back in 1965 and added Medicare. So Social Security, because of the allure of more senior votes, Members of Congress and the President decided to expand the benefits to seniors to add Medicare.

When Medicare was under consideration in 1965, a few Members realized the sort of burdens that would come to place on future taxpayers, and Chair-

man Wilbur Mills of the House Committee on Ways and Means predicted in September of 1964 that the costs of even part A of Medicare, which was then under consideration, would soon exceed projections and that ever-increasing taxes would be needed to finance it. He predicted it would come to pass that Medicare costs would leave Congress hamstrung, facing uncontrolled increases in costs and to the indefinite future. Mills dropped his opposition to Medicare under pressure from the President of his own party, but he was right about the program's consequences.

This summer, as Congress considers the largest single expansion of any entitlement program since 1965, we should consider how a prescription drug benefit will burden future workers and taxpayers and not give seniors what they expect. The Federal Government is in serious financial problems. When the baby boomers start retiring in the next 10 to 12 years, we see more people going out of the workforce, if you will, paying in to Social Security and taxes and taking out benefits from Medicare and Social Security.

When the Federal Government comes to a pinch in another 12 to 15 years, guess what is going to happen to the prescription drug program that has been promised? Number one, I suggest that government, Congress and the President will say, well, to reduce costs, we need to spread the costs over a wider segment of the population, and so we are going to require all seniors, regardless of whether you have prescription drugs in your retirement program or not, regardless of whether you have a good insurance program that covers prescription drugs, we are going to require everybody to take the government's system.

Guess what comes next as government faces this fiscal pinch? Rationing, and then the government will follow what many other countries have done such as Canada and many other countries that have government-run programs. They are going to say, well, we are going to limit the prescription drugs that are available to seniors. This proposal suggest that \$400 billion, and it is pretty much used up, is going to be required for spending in the next 10 years for prescription drugs. We should think carefully about the consequences of making a whatever-it-costs commitment into the indefinite future.

I chair the Subcommittee on Research in Science and the medical technology is now expanding more rapidly than our ability to pay for it. That means the medical technology of the future is going to be very impressive and very successful on maintaining our health and helping us to live longer. In fact, the future has suggested that in the next 20 years, anybody who wants to live to be 100 can do so, but it will cost money. And we are sort of programming that we will pay for those benefits, whether it is \$40,000 a treatment or \$60,000 a treatment after they

finish their first deductible and the 3,000 or whatever we end up with. And that is another question, none of us have read this bill yet.

It now looks like a bill we will consider this week will add prescription drug benefits with minimum offsets for Medicare. It is not fair to our kids to add this responsibility to everybody else's kids and grandkids and my 10 grandkids, and I would hope we look more carefully at this and review it over the Fourth of July recess and come back and try to have a better bill.

This will add enormous liabilities to a Medicare system which is already predicted to be insolvent. Economists calculate that the newly created unfunded liability of such a reform is \$7.5 trillion. This means that a prescription drug bill that adds 12 percent to Medicare's costs comes with a present cost of \$7.5 trillion, or a bit more than the entire public debt. You add this to an unfunded liability of \$9 trillion for Social Security and you end up saddling our kids with a huge debt.

These projections assume that prescription drug costs will grow at the same rate as the rest of Medicare, and that the prescription drug benefit will not be expanded over time. Recent history would suggest that prescription drug costs are growing more rapidly than the rest of Medicare. In 1965, OMB projected that Medicare would spend \$9 billion in 1990. The actual figure was \$67 billion. Having projected \$26 billion in spending for 2003, we will spend \$245 billion. Because medical technology—the cost of prescription drugs will be much higher.

This drives home the point that any expansion of Medicare imposes a cost on taxpayers. Such a reform basically transfers the burden from retirees to taxpayers. More accurately, it means that we are transferring costs from us to our children and grandchildren. We're spending now and sending the bill to people who are yet to be born or too young to defend themselves.

This is selfish and it is wrong. I'm not against a prescription drug benefit if it is responsible. But it must not place heavy and increasing burdens on workers, taxpayers, and the economy in the future. I oppose the bill that is now under consideration because it does not meet this test.

Once again, we have not had an opportunity to see and review a bill on an important topic before we are required to vote on it. It is rumored, in fact, that changes are still being made. Few members will actually know exactly what's in this bill until after it has passed.

I believe that the better approach would be to release the bill tomorrow and then delay the vote until after the upcoming Fourth of July work period. That would allow all of us in Congress to read the bill, consult with our constituents, and make a fully informed decision on a program that could profoundly affect our future and that of our children and grandchildren.

I urge Congress to reject the bill tomorrow so we can take a more responsible and deliberate approach to reforming an important program like Medicare.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN SHOULD BENEFIT SENIORS, NOT DRUG COMPANIES

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Congress to pass a prescription drug bill for our senior citizens, not for the insurance and the pharmaceutical industries. The Bush administration continues to sell our Federal domestic programs to corporations and to industry donors.

Today, hundreds of seniors stood against the Republican prescription privatization plan. They blew the whistle on this. They blew the whistle on this deceptive legislation; and tonight, we too are blowing the whistle. Their bill will dismantle Medicare as we know it.

This prescription drug bill does not provide affordable drugs under Medicare. Instead, it leaves seniors, particularly women, to pay the price for pharmaceutical advertising and insurance industry lobbyists. Democrats have been fighting against these industry economics for years, and we know what a good Medicare prescription drug benefit looks like. It is affordable and available to all. It is inclusive and provides drug coverage for all communities, rural and urban. It includes all seniors and all walks of life without establishing a means tests or a voucher system.

Last week, the House Republicans under the leadership of really the Bush administration released their prescription drug benefit. The Republicans contend that seniors should be forced to use private insurance companies for drug coverage rather than Medicare in order to force competition. But the bottom line is the Republicans are really providing a benefit to the insurance industry and to the pharmaceutical industry.

The industry would have the ability to design their own prescription drug plan. The industry would decide what to charge and which drugs seniors can get. The Republican plan exploits seniors and the disabled by requiring private insurance plans to stay in the program for only 1 year. This could leave seniors vulnerable to unavailable plans, rotating doctors and shifting prescriptions. Just thinking about all of these threats to our seniors really does make me sick.

Tonight I want to focus on women and remind the Republicans of the voters really that they are ignoring. Women in this country will suffer first hand if the Republican prescription privatization bill passes, not only because we live longer, but because we pay into the Medicare system longer. Almost eight out of 10 women on Medicare use

prescription drugs regularly, though most pay for these medications out of pocket. Women on Medicare spend 20 percent more on prescription drugs than men. And in 1999 alone, women on Medicare spent \$430 more a year on medications than men. The Republican bill puts women, it puts our seniors, our disabled really on the industry's chopping block. It should make you really cringe to witness the corporate welfare that the Republicans are creating for the insurance and pharmaceutical industry in their bill.

Since 1980, drug prices have increased by over 256 percent, while the consumer price index on which Social Security's cost-of-living adjustments are based rose just 98 percent. And in their bill they will not even allow our Secretary of Health and Human Services to discuss and negotiate lower prices for their medications. How shameful that is.

In the Bay Area, specifically in my home town of Oakland, California, my elderly and disabled constituents are paying up to \$2000 more a year for basic drugs than in Canada, Europe and Japan. These disparities may seem bad now; but under the Republican plan before us, they will only get worse. I could go on and on, but the point is that seniors and the disabled are paying on average 89 percent more than our international counterparts. This is just dangerous and downright unfair. It is bad public policy.

Our senior women are having to make hard decisions about which drugs they can afford and if they should really buy drugs or pay for food. There is a better way.

Democrats have a low-cost prescription drug plan that does not pit seniors against one another, but makes access to prescription drugs a reality for all. The plan has incorporated many of the components of another plan called the Meds Plan, which many of us are supporting.

Under this plan, we ensure that seniors and people with disabilities have affordable, comprehensive and guaranteed access to prescription drug coverage. The proof is in the details. A \$25 a month premium, a \$100 a year deductible, an 80/20 cost-sharing between Medicare beneficiaries, a \$2,000 minimum for Medicare beneficiaries, and a sliding scale for low-income individuals for up to 150 percent of the median.

Under the Republican plan, let me state that the bill that the Republicans have put forward will really punish people for getting sick. The Democrats will not punish our seniors for getting sick. The Republican plan gives authority to insurance companies and HMOs to really prey on Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries. The Democratic plan reduces the costs of drugs. The Republican plan does not. The Democratic plan does not end Medicare. The Republican plan does.

The Democratic plan does not end Medicare. The Republican plan does.

The Democratic plan reduces the costs of drugs. The Republican plan does not.

In short, the Democratic plan brings our country one step closer to insuring access to all people for much needed care, while the Republican Prescription Privatization plan is a divisive tool that will enrich the insurance and pharmaceutical industry.

The Republican plan gives authority to insurance companies and HMOs to prey on Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries.

Unlike the Republican bill, the Democrats won't punish you for getting sick.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican Prescription Privatization bill.

HELL IN A CUBAN PRISON

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) had a wonderful idea the other week. We should speak every single week about the men and women who are languishing in prisons in the totalitarian state of Cuba, that island that has been for 44 years oppressed by a totalitarian dictator. So each week we bring forth, a number of us here, different political prisoners and speak specifically about their cases to remind our colleagues and those who will listen about the horrors just 90 miles from the shores of the United States.

□ 2100

The following are excerpts, Mr. Speaker, from a letter from dissident Juan Carlos Gonzalez Leyva who is blind. These excerpts of a letter were sent out of his prison in Holguin, Cuba, as recorded by his wife Maritza Calderin. The letter was sent to the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

To Sylvia Iriondo of mothers and Women Against Repression. This is a letter, Mr. Speaker, sent out of prison by Juan Carlos Gonzalez Leyva.

After 13 months in prison, I have not been tried or sentenced by any court even as efforts have been made to persuade me to betray God and human rights and collaborate with the dictatorship. Since mid-December, State security used inmate Joe Prado, as he calls himself, to throw in my cell a substance that produced a burning sensation on the skin and nasal congestion, a great deal of phlegm and bronchial inflammation. The situation still continues.

Since January, they have added another substance to the sawdust they throw at me. This one gives me the sensation of millions of bugs constantly running all over me. It causes a great deal of itching and prevents me from sleeping. I do not know if this is a biological substance or chemical agent, but I know it is not insects because when I touch my skin there are no actual bugs that I can feel, although this sensation is palpable.

Normally the sawdust shower is a daily occurrence. Yesterday it started

around 6:00 p.m. when I was on my knees praying. The sensation is that of a multitude of bugs suddenly coming down on my face and my body. This torment continues until 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning.

The inmate follows me everywhere. I have to eat out of a can that I try to keep covered all the time because he will throw the nausea-provoking substance into the food.

Sometimes I feel as if I have a chain attached to my body and the weight of the world on my shoulders. I feel that I am going to collapse, that I cannot take this anymore, but I pray to God, and Jesus Christ gives me strength. It is a constant struggle, a constant torture.

On February 1, I placed my mattress in front of the cell's iron bar doors to get some fresh air. Officer Fabu, the unit chief, snatched the mattress away from me, threw me on the floor, took me by the neck and dragged me. He told me that if I wanted to sleep, I could sleep on the bare floor with the dirt, other prisoner's shoes, roaches, ants, mice, et cetera.

One night they threw so much of the substance into the cell that it was as if the walls were boiling. So I had to retreat to my bed and resign myself to do without the little bit of fresh air I was getting through the iron bars.

The substance also causes acute pain in both of my eye sockets. The pain is so severe that at times it seems my eyes are popping out. Every day the unit chief threatens me with death if I continue the hunger strike to protest the prosecution's request of 8 years in prison.

They do not allow me to speak to my lawyer and I do not have religious assistance or access to any information. I am only allowed to listen to the round tables and the State-run newscasts. For the skeptics, I can say that hell does exist and Satan shows all of his faces here.

In here, I listen to the weeping of young and old women, their terrible and frightful laments forever embedded in my mind. They plead because they are locked in cells that are like drawers where are held men, women and the elderly, the sick and the incapacitated. They plead because the four walls become a grave site.

These are catacombs where people scream but the sound is drowned out by a hermetically sealed metal door. When the women plead, the prison guards laugh and say, "What they want is a man."

I trust God and our Lord, Jesus Christ, to give me the strength to face any situation, whether to live in squalor, as I live now, or to die and meet my Lord and my God.

The political prisoner of Cuba, Mr. Speaker, 90 miles from the shores of the United States, an island that has suffered 44 years of totalitarian and oppression while the world does nothing, but we do not forget and we will not continue denouncing the horrors of the

totalitarianism that the people in Cuba suffer and we will not stop struggling until Cuba is free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CHECK WITH THE SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time, in 1989, there was a bill that had passed the United States Congress and was signed into law called the catastrophic health care bill, and it had bipartisan support, and all of the national organizations of senior citizens supported that legislation, and it was supposed to provide catastrophic coverage to senior citizens for health care.

One problem, no one had really checked with rank and file senior citizens to find out if they wanted this legislation that caused them to have the highest effective tax rate of any Americans, to pay for benefits that they thought simply were not worth it. In other words, the senior citizens sat down with their calculators and figured out they were not interested in this legislation that had passed.

This is a photo that appeared on the front page of the Chicago Tribune in August of 1989. Here we see some senior citizens who are clearly very angry, with signs surrounding an automobile in which was the chairman of the powerful House Committee on Ways and Means. These senior citizens were not exactly in a friendly mood and were telling this chairman in no uncertain terms that they wanted the repeal of the catastrophic health care bill.

It was not very long afterwards that this sparked a rebellion of senior citizens across the country, and in a rare occurrence in this body the catastrophic health care bill was repealed.

I think this should serve as a warning to all of my colleagues. Check with the senior citizens. You can sit here all day and all night and say the problem is that Medicare is outdated, that it is antiquated or you can say what the Chairman of the powerful House Committee on Ways and Means of today said, To those who say that the bill proposed by the Republicans would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is we certainly hope so. Seniors listen: We certainly hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the seniors are listening. Old fashioned Medicare is not very good, says the chairman, the Republican chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

You better check with those seniors, because what they tell us is they like Medicare. They want Medicare. The only thing wrong with Medicare is that it does not cover enough, like prescription drugs, but what they like about it is that it is a known benefit, it is a known premium, and it is there for them when they need it.

Another word that is used all the time is choice. We are going to give senior citizens choices now. Well, I have to tell my colleagues, in all the years that I was the executive director of the Illinois State Council of Senior Citizens and in all the years that I was in the State legislature and now in Congress, never has a senior citizen come up to me and said, Congresswoman, what I want is a choice of HMOs, a choice of insurance companies, send me those brochures so I can pick, tell those insurance agents to get me on the phone so they can pitch their insurance company to me.

Seniors want the kind of choice they get under Medicare, a choice of doctors, a choice of hospitals, a choice of specialists. That is the kind of choices that they want.

In fact, the only choice under this Republican bill is the choice that HMOs and insurers get, not senior citizens, because private drug plans, HMOs, get to choose what premiums to charge. There is no uniform benefit of premium under Medicare.

Private drug plans get to choose the copayments that they will charge. Private drug plans get to choose what pharmacies are in their network. They get to choose what drugs are covered. So if you want to give the HMOs and the insurance companies that kind of choice, then this bill is for you, but if you want to give senior citizens what they really want, then you are going to expand Medicare the way the Democrats have proposed, by giving them a prescription drug benefit under Medicare that they can count on, that they know what the premium is.

This legislation that is passed in the House is going to do exactly what the chairman said. It is going to destroy Medicare. It will be the end of Medicare. That is what happens in 2010 with this bill. So if you do not want to be chased down the street, then all of us better say no to the Republican bill.

HOMELAND SECURITY TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following exchange of letters relating to yesterday's debate on H.R. 1416, the Homeland Security Technical Corrections Act of 2003.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2003.

Hon. CHRIS COX,
Chairman, Select Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COX: In recognition of the desire to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1416, the "Homeland Security Technical Corrections Act of 2003," the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill. Section 11 of H.R. 1416 creates new §5 in the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296). New §5 mandates that any report or notification required by the Homeland Security Act be submitted to the Select Committee on Homeland Security as well as to any other Committees named in the Act. Section 225 of the Homeland Security Act incorporated the Cyber Security Enhancement Act which, among many other things, requires the Attorney General to report to the Judiciary Committee regarding the use of electronic surveillance in emergency situations and requires the U.S. Sentencing Commission to submit a report in response to the Cyber Security Enhancement Act. To the extent that §11 of H.R. 1416 affects these reports required by §225 of the Homeland Security Act, these provisions fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. However, given the need to expedite this legislation, I will not seek a sequential referral based on their inclusion.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1416 on the House floor.

Sincerely,
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 15, 2003.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1416, the "Homeland Security Technical Corrections Act of 2003." As you noted, §11 of the bill falls within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary to the extent it concerns the two reports described in your letter. I appreciate your willingness to forgo consideration of the bill, and I acknowledge that by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary does not waive its jurisdiction over this provision.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in our committee report and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1416 on the House floor.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
CHRISTOPHER COX,
Chairman.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I come before you tonight to talk about the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization

Act of 2003 and to place it in context with the overall goals and beliefs of the President and the Republican party.

The Republican bill, H.R. 1, is quite simply a first step toward the Republicans' goal to privatize Medicare. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to do this for a couple of reasons.

The first is that they firmly believe that the private sector and the free market are always right and that government is always wrong. I am afraid that they have a very narrow-minded and simplistic view of how our economy, our government and our country are supposed to function.

There has been a shift in the rhetoric used during political debate in this country since the election of this President. There has been a conscious effort by his office and the Republican leadership of the House to use language that paints critical issues in simplistic black and white, us versus them, good versus evil, terms, ultimately simplifying the debate into a three word sound byte.

I view this as a very unfortunate occurrence because it allows a certain mental laziness to take over this body. When it is really our duty, it is our duty to debate, to discuss and to think very carefully and critically about very complex and important work that we do in this Chamber.

No one here has more respect for the power, the creativity and problem solving ability of the free market as I do. I am a hard-nosed, show-me-the-bottom-line businesswoman through and through, but my admiration of the market is based on years of deep study of its function and a real understanding of how it works.

My Republican colleagues, on the other hand, seem to feel that the invisible hand of Adam Smith and the hand of God are the same thing but our free market is not an all powerful system without limitations.

The free market is an incredible tool that has advanced many areas of human endeavor, but in order for it to work, it must include one very important ingredient, profit, and without this critical component, the free market system is useless.

Medicare was created in 1965 precisely to address the failure in this market. It was not profitable to treat our seniors with a free market health insurance industry so they found a solution to insuring the elderly. They just decided that they would not cover them. After all, old people get sick too much and insurance companies would have to pay. They figured that if you want to make money in the medical insurance game, insure young, healthy people, not old sick people.

Luckily for America, during the 1960s and 1970s and 1980s Democrats controlled this Congress and they were not satisfied with the solution that would push our mothers and our fathers, our grandmothers, our grandfathers out into the cold. So Democrats set up the government entitlement called Medicare.

□ 2115

We said, we value our elders. Even though the market says leave them behind, we will not. We will protect you and treat you with compassion and the dignity that you deserve in your old age.

So why do the Republicans want to privatize Medicare so badly? Maybe they have amnesia. Maybe they do not remember what happened when we left the health care of aging parents and grandparents to the free markets. Or maybe they are so swept up in their blind faith in the market that they believe that somehow the market will just take care of things. But we have already tried them and it did not work. Remember?

Taking care of the elderly is not profitable, nor should it be. Profit is not always the most important thing. These are the people that reared us. They are the people that took care of us when we were sick. They are the people that taught us right from wrong. I will not be a party to this slap in the face to my parents and to the seniors in my community being offered by the Republican majority of this body. Their bill purports to offer a prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries, but it fails to offer any guarantee that seniors will actually receive it.

The prescription drug plan is only available through private insurance companies or HMOs.

And besides all this, it does not ensure that all seniors will get this coverage. The eligibility of all seniors has been a hallmark of the Medicare program.

If that was not bad enough, in a provision of the bill completely unrelated to creating a prescription drug benefit, the House GOP bill would increase seniors' costs for doctor visits by raising the Part B premium and indexing it to inflation.

This provision is included for no other reason than to raise the cost of traditional Medicare and force seniors into Managed Care Plans.

And who does this benefit? Seniors? I think not. It benefits Insurance Companies and Pharmaceutical Manufacturers—the real constituents of the Republican Party.

Republicans are doing in this bill what they have consistently done this whole Congress: Advantaged the wealthy and the powerful and put the screws to the little guy.

Just last night, DAVID OBEY stood on this floor and asked the Republicans to cut back, from \$88,000 to \$83,000, the tax cut for those whose annual income is over 1 million dollars in order to pay for desperately needed homeland security projects.

The Republicans said “no.” Cutting taxes for the wealthy and powerful is more important.

Just a few weeks ago, I tried to offer an amendment to the tax bill that would have pushed back the start date of the dividend portion of the tax cut for 1 year—just seven-tenths of one percent of the tax cut—to fund homeland security projects to make our country safer.

The Republicans said “no.” Cutting taxes when we are in astronomical debt is more important.

How about the Child Tax credit? “No,” say the Republicans, we are not going to help out poor children or the children of veterans of a war in Iraq where Marines and Soldiers are still dying.

Today, I offered an amendment to the Medicare Bill, in order to offer a real prescription drug benefit to all seniors, and to do it through Medicare.

I hope that the committee will allow this amendment to be considered on the floor of this House. It is an important amendment because it is not designed to protect the profits of the insurance companies or the pharmaceutical industry. It is designed to help our seniors.

It is clear to me and to my Democratic colleagues where the Majority's loyalties lie. From homeland security to education, from veterans benefits to the Child Tax credit, and now finally to the health and well being of our parents and grandparents, the Republican message is clear: We do not care about you.

OLDER WOMEN AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the importance of a health safety net that has worked for the American people. It is our duty to protect the seniors that have contributed to society over their lifetimes. Our older constituents have built or supported most of what America is today and we owe them respect. We owe them the safety net that is called Medicare.

I want Congress to know that not only is Medicare important for the American people, it is a huge issue for America's women. Women, indeed, are the face of Medicare. Women constitute 58 percent of the Medicare population at 65, and women constitute 71 percent of the Medicare population over the age of 85. Women can expect to live on the average 19 years into retirement, while men can only expect to live 15 years. We must take care of our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters. We can do no less.

Across the breadth of the United States, the older and the poorer the woman, the higher the out-of-pocket health costs. The more she needs assistance, the less she will actually receive. Because of barriers to enrollment, close to half of older women with incomes below the poverty line are not enrolled in Medicaid. Research suggests that women on Medicare spend 20 percent more on prescription drugs than their male counterparts. Middle class women who have made wise financial planning decisions, can quickly find that high drug costs will eat away any retirement security they have worked to establish.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you some thoughts on cultural diversity in regards to women and Medicare. More minority women than Caucasian women are uninsured or rely on public rather than private health insurance. Minority women are more likely to

have lower incomes and to live in poverty than other women. The percentage of women on Medicare with incomes of less than \$10,000 a year is a very telling statistic. Twenty-four percent of white women, or 14.7 million; 56 percent of African women, and there are 1.8 million; and 58 percent of Latina women, and there are 1.2 million, live way below the poverty line. Clearly, not only should we strengthen the safety net but we should find out why so many women need that net.

So, Mr. Speaker, a health safety net for the American person is imperative. Our older constituents have built or supported most of what America is today, and we owe them a great amount of gratitude. They should go to bed each evening feeling secure that they have health benefits when they are needed. They should know that their benefits are universal and affordable.

What a shame, a shame, that our seniors have to leave the United States and go to Canada or Mexico, where the same prescription drugs, same ingredients, are much, much cheaper. We have seniors who are eating dog food rather than regular food because they have to pay the cost of these expensive drugs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, these older Americans should be given a benefit that they can rely on, that they will know they can live a quality of life with respect rather than the one they would have to live if we whittle away at Medicare. Let us honor our seniors.

REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Republican prescription drug plan. I represent the fastest growing Congressional District in the United States. I represent the fastest growing senior citizen population in the United States. When I came to Congress, I thought I would modernize Medicare, improve Medicare, strengthen Medicare. I never dreamed that I would participate in the destruction of Medicare. This legislation before us this week destroys the Medicare system.

I oppose this plan. It does not offer a guaranteed prescription drug benefit for seniors. It ends traditional Medicare that seniors in my district and throughout the United States rely on. Under this Republican proposal, there is no guarantee that private insurance companies will offer prescription drug coverage. While Republicans estimate that the cost of the premium would be \$35, the fact is we do not know how much the premium is going to be. Private insurance companies can devise their own plan and raise premiums whenever they want to meet their bottom line rather than meet the needs of our senior citizens.

The Republican plan does not guarantee that seniors will receive any help

with rising drug costs. The plan creates a donut hole in the coverage. Seniors who have more than \$2,000 in prescription drug expenses are responsible for all of their drug costs until they reach \$5,000 in medical costs. And they still have to pay the premium. Forty-seven percent of seniors in the United States fall into this gap.

The plan does not guarantee that private insurance companies will remain in the market for more than 12 months. Seniors could be forced to change insurance plans with different doctor panels every year. Seniors know and trust their doctors. Many seniors have received care from the same doctors for years. Placing this burden on our seniors is unconscionable.

The Republican plan does not modernize Medicare. It does not improve Medicare. It does not strengthen Medicare. It dismantles benefits and puts seniors into HMOs and PPOs. In 2010, Medicare will compete with private health care plans. This will result in higher premiums for hospitals and physician benefits. Seniors, particularly women, will bear the burden of these increased costs. Instead of dismantling traditional Medicare, we should strengthen the program to provide the best care for our seniors.

We should be adding a prescription Medicaid benefit to Medicare, and I also support adding a provision to increase Medicare provider reimbursements. Thousands of doctors are leaving Medicare because Medicare reimbursements do not cover nearly enough of the patient's health care costs, leaving the doctors to make up the remainder of the costs. Increasing reimbursements allows physicians to continue treating Medicare patients while confronting rising health care costs.

It makes absolutely no sense to me that we have a Medicare system that allows people to see the doctor of their choice, and when the doctor provides a prescription medication, a senior cannot afford that press medication. How outrageous is that in our Nation?

I also support provisions to simplify the Medicare paperwork process. Today, doctors are spending far too much time filling out forms; not enough time treating their patients. Many doctors say if we could cut through this red tape, they could devote more time to caring for their patients. And what is best for the patient is why we are here tonight.

Las Vegas has one of the fastest growing populations of seniors in the Nation. I owe it to the seniors in my district to support a meaningful prescription drug benefit; a benefit that is available to all seniors who need it, a benefit that does not have significant coverage gaps, and a benefit that allows seniors, and not insurance companies, to choose their doctors and not force seniors to leave the Medicare system that they know and they trust in order to receive desperately-needed prescription medication.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in opposing the Republican plan, sup-

porting the Democratic plan that is easier, fairer, and that our seniors approve and agree with.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the current Medicare debate highlights the need for fundamental changes in the way that health care is provided in the United States. The Medicare prescription drug bill currently before the House fails to address any of the fundamental problems in our health care system.

The need for affordable prescription drugs for our Nation's seniors is one component of the health care reform needed in the United States. And just like last year, this House will pass a Medicare prescription drug bill that fails millions of Americans. The current plan will perpetuate the inequalities in health care suffered by poor and rural Americans, as this plan hurts both groups.

Seniors with incomes between 135 and 150 percent of the Federal poverty level will pay the same deductible and copays as someone with an income 300, 500 or 1,000 percent of the poverty level. The only relief is a sliding scale premium. Those with incomes 150 to 200 percent of poverty will receive no relief at all.

Rural Americans have already faced severe restrictions in their choice of providers. And in 2003, only 19 percent of rural Medicare beneficiaries have the option of enrolling in a Medicare managed care plan.

□ 2130

These seniors are likely to face similar restrictions in the choice of prescription drug plans, without a fall-back prescription plan through Medicare. This discrimination against certain seniors is intolerable. Not only does the current plan restrict access to drugs, but it also could limit what drugs seniors can take. In 2002, 55 percent of all Medicare private plans covered only generic drugs, provided no coverage for brand names. This means that those who must take a specific brand-name medication for which no generic form exists or need a new, more effective drug cannot obtain them. The answer is not to provide more private prescription drug plans.

The current Medicare prescription drug bill only perpetuates the failures of our health system. The solution to the current crisis lies in a prescription drug benefit that helps to contain prescription drug costs, provides better access to generic drugs, and is built into Medicare. Absent a comprehensive solution that provides medical and prescription drug coverage for all Americans, there is no excuse for restricting the access of our Nation's seniors to prescription drug coverage. Our seniors

need a comprehensive standard benefit for all. We cannot afford to further privatize Medicare, offer different plans to different people, and threaten the program that has provided health care for over 39 million people.

Our Nation's seniors need a uniform, comprehensive plan. Absent a comprehensive solution that provides medical and prescription drug coverage for all Americans, there is no excuse to do anything less. The solution to the current crisis lies in a plan that helps to contain prescription drug costs, provide better access to generic drugs, and is built into Medicare.

Just as hospital and physician coverage is assured by Medicare and includes a standard benefit for all seniors, so must prescription drug coverage. In the complex world of medical insurance, it is crucial for us to provide reliable coverage under one plan to reduce confusion on the part of Medicare beneficiaries. We cannot afford to further privatize Medicare, turning it only into a health voucher program by the end of the decade, and threatens the program which has provided health care for over 39 million Americans. Let us be real and have a real prescription drug program for our seniors.

AMERICANS SHOULD COME FIRST IN PRIORITIES

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with a number of our preceding speakers who have talked about the importance of Medicare and why their principles and values are different than some of our other colleagues.

Tonight I would like to address another subject in the closing days before our July 4th district work period, and that is a child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the president of Pakistan was here and the President of the United States guaranteed \$3.5 billion to Pakistan. He came in, got a nice reception at Camp David, and flew out with a check for \$3.5 billion. That is equal to the amount that it would cost to provide the 12 million children, 6.5 million working families a full \$1,000 tax credit in this country; yet they are not receiving it.

In Pakistan they came in, smiled, shook hands, and walked out with \$3.5 billion. In America, 12 million American children will be left without a tax cut as they go into the summer months. As their parents buy clothes and shoes and backpacks for the coming school year, they will not have the full \$1,000 child credit.

Two weeks ago, The New York Times reported that we are providing 200,000 Iraqis \$20 a day for no-show jobs. I come from Chicago. We know something about no-show jobs. We think we understand no-show jobs. Yet while we provide these Iraqis \$20 a day, 200,000 of

them for the last 2 months, that comes to about \$1,000, we have 200,000 active duty GIs who in the Republican tax bill are not provided the full \$1,000 tax credit. Somehow we have put in this administration and in this Congress more priority on the 200,000 no-show Iraqis who are getting \$20 a day than our active men and women who are getting shot at and could lose their lives. They deserve a tax cut.

I noted the other day in our commitment to Iraq for reconstruction, we committed to 20,000 units of housing reconstruction; and yet here in America under the President's budget, there are only 5,000 units of public housing. We committed to 13 million Iraqis getting universal health care, half the population, yet not a dime for America for the uninsured who work full time. We committed to rebuilding 12,500 schools in Iraq, yet in many of our schools across this country, there are no dollars for investment in modernization.

What make Iraqis and the investments in Iraq more important than investments here? I support rebuilding Iraq, given the war; but we should not deconstruct here in America. We have set a set of priorities and principles in place that has put America behind where we put our priorities overseas. This administration needs to remember that here at home working families deserve a tax cut, the 12 million children of working parents, 6.5 million working families who will not get the \$1,000 tax cut because this Congress, under the stewardship and leadership of this administration, is too busy.

Yet the Premier of Pakistan came in and walked out with an equal amount of dollars, \$3.5 billion. In Iraq, folks will be getting \$20 a day who do not show up for work, yet our GIs on active duty will not get the full \$1,000 tax cut they are promised. Where are the values? Where are the principles that say you should do that? I think I know a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have good values. We have talked about our families, our hopes and faith. If their mothers knew what they were doing here, giving 200,000 Iraqis \$20 a day, denying a tax cut to our GIs, I think they would have another view because those are not the values their mothers raised them with.

In closing, we make choices. President Kennedy once said to govern is to choose. I am saddened that, as we get ready to start sending out checks to the top 1 percent in the sense of wealth, that the 12 million children of working families will have been forgotten and will go without that tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, we will go home with unfinished business as it relates to our values and our principles. We should remember the folks who get up every morning, go to work, try to make that paycheck stretch all the way to the 31st of the month. We should remember what they are trying to do with their children, to know the difference between right from wrong; and what do

we say to them, we are going to keep that speed bump in your way so your day is harder. But somehow, we are putting a better sense of values on the Premier of Pakistan who walked out in one day with \$3.5 billion, equal to the amount it would cost to rectify the error in the conference when the Republican leadership of the Senate and the Republican leadership of the House and the Vice President of the United States sat in the room and cut those kids out of the tax cut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

BETTER PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues tonight. Many of the women of the United States Congress have made a commitment to their constituents to represent them in a very fair manner, but they also recognize the importance of not leaving the sensitivity and the understanding of the needs of the women of America at the door as they take their oath to be Members of Congress.

So today I rise to join my colleagues to emphasize the importance of the Medicare prescription drug debate on the women of America. This is one of the most important debates; and unfortunately, as we rallied today with many of the senior citizens from all over the country, many of them were women. We were not able to say to them that this House had come to a reasonable conclusion and a reasonable proposal that responds to their needs.

The Republican prescription drug plan ignores the needs of our sisters, mothers and grandmothers; and we op-

pose the passage of such legislation. It ignores the reality that women often outlive their male counterparts, making Medicare beneficiaries disproportionately female. It ignores the points that if these females outlive their spouses, in many instances their income is lower. Many might say does that not give them a double benefit? No it does not. In many instances they may be living on Social Security. That is not enough. They may also be living on a small pension; sometimes one is diminished because of the other. Social Security is lowered because you may have a small pension. Many of them are elderly, and many of them are sick. Some of them face catastrophic illnesses.

In the course of trying to live their life, provide housing, food, they have to make choices. I have seen constituents, particularly in the elderly population, who have had to choose prescription drugs over a place to live or the right kind of place to live.

It is very important tomorrow when we debate this issue, if we do, that we concentrate on this enormous deficit as relates to the Republican plan, the doughnut, the hole, if you will, that our dear friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), has so eloquently articulated, the very large gap between the monies you receive and the amount of monies you will ultimately get at a point when you max out, if you will. \$2,000 maybe, and then for a long period of time our senior citizens, those who will be under Medicare, will get no money whatsoever until they reach a certain amount.

Mr. Speaker, this is intolerable. It makes it very difficult for someone on a fixed budget. This makes any decision regarding the future of Medicare critically important to millions of women, and that is because they live in many instances a longer period of time. And many women spend time out of the workforce caring for their children and sometimes for their own parents. Let me add another component. Many women sometimes go into a second generation of raising their grandchildren, and so they have the expenses of their grandchildren; but yet they have the needs of their own health needs. While in the workforce, they often earn less than their male counterparts, and for these reasons women earn less than men over their lifetime and their Social Security monthly benefits are smaller.

As a result, an older woman is more likely to face serious financial pressures, and she needs Medicare to be meaningful. She needs us to close the doughnut. We need a guaranteed prescription drug benefit that provides an even, unending source of guaranteed prescription drug benefit to provide the support that these women need. This is not done by the Republican plan. In fact, what the Republican plan does is it unravels the safety net that has been provided for older women.

The proposal replaces a real safety net with a false sense of security by promising a prescription drug benefit, but allowing women to slip through the doughnut hole, the coverage gap. Imagine a beneficiary's surprise when she discovers that Medicare will not help her cover her prescription drug costs after \$2,000. She must wait until she qualifies for catastrophic coverage with a drug cost of over \$4,900.

Mr. Speaker, we must work closely with colleagues to craft a bill that answers the question of a guaranteed prescription drug benefit. As I close, this issue is crucial to the American psyche, to the American needs of our elderly citizens.

Finally, I want to add just a moment about affirmative action, the decision that was rendered just a couple of days ago by the Supreme Court. Let me congratulate the interpretation which we felt would have always been the right interpretation, that is, that race can be a factor in equalizing the playing field and that the positions held by the University of Michigan were not quotas.

Mr. Speaker, let me say we need to do a better job in serving the American people with a better prescription drug plan that will deal and address the needs of women of America; and thank goodness for the Supreme Court decision on affirmative action.

□ 2145

MEDICARE MODERNIZATION LEGISLATION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, here it is in Washington, nearly 10 o'clock at night and the Republican leadership of this institution does not even have a prescription drug bill ready for us to read as homework tonight. They tell us that we are going to debate this tomorrow, maybe 2 hours at the most, one of the most important changes in our country's history in terms of health care for our seniors. They tell us maybe after midnight tonight we might be able to go up to the Rules Committee to offer our amendments and to have them considered. They will deny most of those amendments, but the interesting thing about going to the Rules Committee after midnight, no press is there. Nobody will know, in one of the most significant pieces of legislation that will be considered in this 21st century. So the American people will not know. The press will not know.

I am here tonight to say I intend to offer an amendment before the Rules Committee that is likely to be rejected, but it is a very important amendment. This amendment says that whatever prescription drug plan is considered here tomorrow, under their very restrictive rules, should do ex-

actly what we do in the Department of Veterans Affairs and exactly what we do at the Department of Defense and that is have negotiated pricing for the drugs that our seniors will buy. Why? You get the best price. Everybody knows when you buy in quantity, you get a cheaper price. It is a very simple concept. But what has the Republican majority in this House, the radical right, done? They have actually put a provision in the bill and here it is. This is the bill that was before the committee and we know this provision will be retained in whatever the Rules Committee considers tonight, but it basically says that it prohibits our government, our Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating with the biggest drug companies in the world to get the best price for prescription drugs for our seniors. So what they are going to do, imagine they have got a provision that prohibits what we do at the Department of Veterans Affairs already and it prohibits what we do at the Department of Defense already in our financial purchasing system which gets our people the best prices. That is in the base bill. My amendment would get rid of that and it would say, hey, if you are going to do it and we have success across our government, just like Canada has success in their country by negotiating with the most powerful pharmaceutical companies in the world, why should we treat seniors any differently? Why should we make them pay higher prices? Indeed, in the Republican bill they make seniors pay any cost of drugs over \$2,000 a year up to a level of perhaps \$3,500 and it might be more because they are drafting the bill somewhere here in the Capitol. I do not know where they are. I went up to the Rules Committee to find the bill and the doors were all locked to the chairman's office.

But in any case here is what is currently being paid, for example, in the United States. Let us just take one of these drugs here, Norvasc, which is for high blood pressure. Normally it sells in one of our pharmacies for about \$182.99, the Canadian price is \$152.82, and the price at the Department of Veterans Affairs is \$102. It is a definite savings. That is true with a whole series of pharmaceutical products that could be available to our seniors. So what the Republicans are basically saying in their bill to our seniors is, you have to pay the higher price because we won't permit you to negotiate price, we won't negotiate it for you, because our bill fundamentally denies it. This provision was written by the pharmaceutical companies themselves. Gee, does that surprise anybody?

I am only one Member of Congress representing 660,000 beautiful people in the northern part of Ohio. I am only one. Do you know there are six lobbyists for the pharmaceutical companies in this town for every one of me that there is? So basically many times I go home at night and I say to myself,

folks back home, I am all you got and I am sticking with you. And I say to the pharmaceutical companies, I don't take your money, I don't want your money, but I'll show the public where your money goes. Is it any wonder why they put the provision in the base bill that went through the Committee on Energy and Commerce like lightning the other day?

Let us take a look at PhRMA. This group is so powerful that just in the last election cycle, just in one year, 2002, they contributed over \$3 million. Ninety-five percent of it went to, guess, which party? The Republican Party. I happen to be a Democrat. Too bad for the Democrats. They only get 5 percent of the \$3,100,000 that was donated just in the fiscal year 2002. Why do you think they gave all that money to the leadership of this institution? Take a look at Pfizer. They gave 80 percent of the \$1.8 million they just contributed in 2002 to one party, the Republican Party. You can go down the list. Almost all the money goes to one party. So is it any surprise to us why the bill that we cannot find here in the Capitol and we will not even be allowed to talk about until after midnight and we are all staying up late to do that for our constituents, do you really wonder whether this government is on the level?

I urge my colleagues tomorrow to vote "no" on this bill and to vote "no" on these pharmaceutical companies until we can get negotiated pricing in this bill.

TITLE VIII—SECTION 1809(c)(1)(D)

Noninterference—In carrying out its duties with respect to the provision of qualified prescription drug coverage to beneficiaries under this title. The Administrator may not:

- (i) require a particular formulary or institute a price structure for the reimbursement of covered outpatient drugs;
- (ii) interfere in any way with negotiations between PDP sponsors and Medicare Advantage organizations and drug manufacturers, wholesalers, or other suppliers of covered outpatients drugs; and
- (iii) otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing such coverage through such sponsors and organizations.

U.S., CANADIAN, NEGOTIATED VA/DOD PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

Drug name/prescribed for	U.S. retail price	Canadian retail price	FSS negotiated price (VA & DoD)
Glucophage/Diabetes Mellitus	\$69.99	\$30.16	\$60.95
K-Dur 20/Low potassium levels	55.99	29.01	25.58
Norvasc/High blood pressure	182.99	152.82	102.11
Prilosec/Heartburn	134.99	67.71	63.32
Prozac/Depression	302.97	140.69	186.98
Synthroid/Hypothyroidism	39.09	17.82	29.73

Comparison is drawn between drugs of equal dosage and quantity. Sources: Data Compiled from Veterans' Affairs Commission and Alliance for Retired Americans.

2002 PHARMACEUTICAL CONTRIBUTIONS, BY PARTY

Rank	Organization	Amount	Democrats (percent)	Republicans (percent)
1	Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America	\$3,180,552	5	95
2	Pfizer Inc	1,804,522	20	80
3	Bristol-Myers Squibb	1,590,813	16	83
4	Eli Lilly & Co	1,581,531	25	75

2002 PHARMACEUTICAL CONTRIBUTIONS, BY PARTY—
Continued

Rank	Organization	Amount	Democrats (percent)	Republicans (percent)
5	Pharmacia Corp	1,480,241	22	78
6	GlaxoSmithKline	1,301,438	22	78
7	Wyeth	1,188,919	17	83
8	Johnson & Johnson	1,075,371	39	61
9	Schering-Plough Corp	1,057,978	21	79
10	Aventis	954,349	22	78

Source: Center for Responsive Politics.

REGARDING REDISTRICTING
HEARING IN HOUSTON THIS SATURDAY

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to call attention to the House to a racist piece of literature currently being circulated by the Harris County Republican Party to its e-mail subscribers. There is going to be a redistricting hearing in Harris County, Houston, on Saturday and so the Harris County Republican Party is right now e-mailing this information to all its regular subscribers. It says:

"She will be there to express her views. Will you be there to express yours?"

Who is "she"? She is the gentlewoman who is here with us right now, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE. There is a very nice colored picture of SHEILA, whom everyone can see is African American. SHEILA is one of four Democratic Congress Members from Harris County. The other three are white. One African American, three whites. Of course, the gentlewoman appears in this e-mail and there is no picture of GENE GREEN, who is white, there is no picture of CHRIS BELL, who is white, and there is no picture of NICK LAMPSON, who is white, there is only a picture of the one African-American Member.

And so what does it say? "She will be there to express her views. Will you be there to express yours? Reminder: Redistricting Hearing in Houston this Saturday." Then it gives the time and the place and the details. I would ask the gentlewoman from Houston, what does she think about this e-mail posted by the Harris County Republican Party on their Web site?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Obviously I think it is important that we all establish the fact that redistricting is a political process. That, in fact, our lines have been drawn by a duly organized and sanctioned Federal court, that we are in lines that have been reapproved by the voters of our respective districts and that this has not been done in the last 50 years, the redrawing of district lines. I am delighted to be one of four colleagues in the Harris County area, but I am offended by the fact that my picture is

used to provoke members of the Republican Party to attend a hearing that happens to be in my congressional district. It is true that my district by the Republican plan offered by the Republicans of Washington will be a plan that literally destroys the 18th Congressional District, cuts it in half, takes out the heart of that district, the very birthplace of the Honorable Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, will be taken out of the 18th District. In fact, one of my good constituents says that the 18th does not need a bypass nor does it need heart surgery.

And so I do not mind in an open hearing anyone coming. It is an open hearing. But I am certainly concerned. What is the message of my face being utilized over my colleagues' faces? What is the intent of even putting up a picture? They might say, "SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, GENE GREEN, CHRIS BELL and NICK LAMPSON will be present. Will you be there?" That is a fair enough statement. That is a political statement. "The Democrats will be there. Will you be there?" But, no, in subtlety, not even the dignity of the name. I should sound a little bit modest. I would imagine there would be a lot of people who would not know who this is, but they know it is a black face. So maybe they are suggesting that a black person will be there to offer their views. Would you not want to run to the hearing so that you can offer yours?

I think this is a sad commentary. I believe and I hope that as I look at the Web page of Democrats and others who are working to get their constituents to this hearing that we will not stoop to this level. I want to simply say to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District in Texas, come out and have your voices heard. Come out and speak your views. You may agree or disagree with me. But I realize that those who want to be empowered will agree that this plan that they are putting forward does not help the people of the 18th Congressional District or the minorities who are represented in that district or the people that are represented in that district.

By the way, as the gentleman well knows, I represent a very diverse district and proudly so. People from all walks of life. But shame on the Harris County Republican Party. Shame on them for stooping to this level. Frankly, I am going to be reaching out and I am going to ask my constituents to call the Harris County Republican Party and ask them, do they not have a better way of communicating to the people a reasonable expression of soliciting their coming to this particular meeting.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent statement. I would only observe that this type of racist appeal is something that we saw in our State 20 or 30 years ago. I thought we had moved beyond that. I am ashamed for the State of Texas and I am particularly ashamed for the Har-

ris County Republican Party that they would stoop to racism in the year 2003.

FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Federal Government is so big and bureaucratic that it cannot do anything in an economical or efficient way. In fact, we read and hear about so many examples of waste of Federal money that we too often take it for granted or shrug our shoulders about it.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported recently that the Defense Department "couldn't account for more than a trillion dollars in financial transactions, not to mention dozens of tanks, missiles and planes." Listen to what this story said:

"Though defense has long been notorious for waste, recent government reports suggest the Pentagon's money management woes have reached astronomical proportions. A study by the Defense Department's Inspector General found that the Pentagon couldn't properly account for more than a trillion dollars in monies spent. A GAO report found defense inventory systems so lax that the U.S. Army lost track of 56 airplanes, 32 tanks and 36 Javelin missile command launch units."

This story, Mr. Speaker, was not based on reports from some antidefense group. It came from studies done by the Defense Department's own Inspector General and the General Accounting Office of the Congress. This comes on the heels of the Congress overwhelmingly voting for the biggest increase in defense spending ever. And now the Defense Department wants another mega-billion increase and a mega-billion supplemental appropriation, all taking place after we downsized the military by about 1 million troops and closed several bases. All of us want to support the military, but surely we cannot just sit around and allow such horrendous waste to continue.

Then there is the case, Mr. Speaker, of Eric Rudolph. The FBI spent untold millions and had hundreds of agents involved over several years in this manhunt. The FBI should be embarrassed that Rudolph was finally found by a rookie local small-town police officer who had only been on the force for about 9 months. And he found him in Rudolph's home area. We give far too much of our law enforcement dollar to Federal agencies which make only a very tiny fraction of the arrests, probably less than 1 percent. What we need to do is give far more of our law enforcement money to local police and sheriff's departments. They are the officers who are fighting the real crime, the street crime that people want fought.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, talk about waste, we have spent hundreds of billions, with a B, on our intelligence agencies over the last 10 or 15 years. We spend more on intelligence than all the rest of the world combined. We will vote to authorize even more spending on intelligence tomorrow. Yet during this time our intelligence agencies missed the coming down of the Berlin Wall; they missed, failed to predict, the breakup of the Soviet Union; they missed on 9/11. Worst of all, they missed or exaggerated on Iraq. Even the *Weekly Standard*, probably the most pro-war publication in America today said, "The failure to discover stocks of WMD material in post-Saddam Iraq raises legitimate questions about the quality of U.S. and allied intelligence."

Columnist Josh Marshall, writing in *The Hill* newspaper asked: "Did we have bad intelligence? Did political appointees dismiss good, but less threatening intelligence? Or was damning intelligence actually cooked up for political purposes? Those are all legitimate questions. But when Congress starts trying to get at the answers, we should be open to the more complex but in its own way no less disturbing possibility that at least some of the main proponents of this war were so consumed by their goal to crush Saddam and so driven by ideology that they fooled themselves as much as anyone else."

These are good, legitimate and very important questions. Another good question: Why did the National Security Agency find out "about the attacks of 9/11 by watching CNN," as reported by intelligence expert and author James Bamford?

□ 2200

This is an agency that we built a plush supertechnical \$320 million building for a few years ago at a cost of \$320 a square foot. Probably the most important question of all, why are we getting so little and so much of that for all these hundreds of billions of taxpayer money?

The standard response of all Federal departments and agencies when they are criticized is that they were underfunded. If they had just been given more money, this or that problem would not have occurred. These agencies, if anything, are overfunded, far more money than any company in the private sector. Our intelligence committees are filled with good people; but no one seeks to serve, much less is appointed, to the intelligence committees unless they are strong supporters of the intelligence community. Once they are on the committee, they are heavily courted by the intelligence agencies. So it will be very difficult for a member of these committees in either body to ask the really tough questions that need to be asked. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope for the sake of our own taxpayers and for the future of national security of this Nation that someone on one of the intelligence committees will start

asking the hard questions and demanding the truthful answers that our citizens deserve.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this evening on the east coast. It is 10 o'clock, and our schedule is such that in the House of Representatives tomorrow we should be debating on this floor a bill to provide a more modernized Medicare delivery system which will focus on the needs of those receiving Medicare, mostly seniors, senior citizens, and also those with disabilities, their needs for medication. And as I am speaking, one of the last to speak this evening, remarking on the particular needs that women have, women my age because I am in that category who live longer and perhaps have worked out of the home less because of the needs of caring for both children and sometimes elders, and, therefore, pensions and other means of having security and retirement are not quite as readily available. So this burden weighs heavily on me. As I speak this moment, deliberations are under way for the rules for which we will debate this legislation tomorrow, and we will see what comes out of our time together on the floor of the House tomorrow.

It is a momentous occasion because in my time of being a Member of Congress, having come to this place out of the health care field, having been a public health nurse for quite a few years in my community on the central coast of California, I have listened to my constituents in this new role of being their representative in the House of Representatives, the people's House, which by its very definition connects us to the citizens for whom we have this great opportunity and responsibility of being their voice here in the Federal Government to make sure that their needs and their inspiration and their motivations are heard.

So I take seriously when many folks in my congressional district tell me that they are the ones who are buying these medications because their heart ailment or their arthritis or their different chronic conditions are requiring them to take medications, that they really cannot afford these if they are retired or living on a fixed income because of Social Security requirements and also maybe their pension.

These are not exorbitant amounts usually. They do not consider themselves poor. They have worked all their life, done well really, the Greatest Generation is what many have called them; and yet they find themselves struggling at a time when they had looked to their government with the promise of Medicare, which they had seen there for their parents, this program that

was instituted in the 1960's, and they say why is it that I cannot pay for my medications? They are so expensive. I go one month and it is a particular cost, sometimes \$100 or several hundred; go another month and it has been practically doubled in price. It is terrifying for seniors who face perhaps hospital stays if they do not take their medication. The blood pressure shooting up, consequences and side effects to conditions that they want to control so that they can live independent lives, not to be dependent on their children or on others or on society, God forbid, having lived independent lives.

So I carry this burden to Congress, and I am proud of being part of a country that had the wherewithal and the mindset, first of all, to start the Social Security system so that we recognize that we really do want to respect the security needs of our seniors; and then when we recognized that health care was beyond the reach of many of them in the 1960's, we devised a plan. I was not here then, of course; but I saw that it made such an impact on citizens that I was working with and dealing with living amongst my own family members to see that Medicare could be there because the private sector, the insurance companies found that this population was hard to insure. These are the years when people need their medical doctors and their sometimes hospital stays and often medications to stay alive and to stay healthy, and Medicare has been a blessing because people are living longer. I think there is a direct connection.

Now we face this crisis. I commend this administration and this Congress foreseeing that this is a time that we must do something about this. But we now must do it in the right way. We have seen that a public provision is what is needed for Medicare. We must also make sure that we do not go off that track and try to privatize this one aspect of it. We have had that option, and that itself was rather an experiment to offer Medicare+Choice. A few years ago that became very popular. That has not worked in my area on the central coast of California, and it is rural.

I will wrap this up by saying that the decisions that we will make tomorrow will have tremendous ramifications, and we need to learn from the people we represent and listen to them and do what they have asked us to do, which is to keep this plan a public plan as it has been, provide the prescription medication in the way that we know that will serve their needs best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE REPUBLICANS' MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, many of my Democratic colleagues took to the

well this evening to talk about their concerns over the Republican Medicare bill, the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill that we expect to come to the floor here in the House of Representatives tomorrow. But I have to start out this evening by pointing out unfortunately that we do not really know what bill is going to come up tomorrow. We are waiting. Many of us are actually waiting right now to see what the Committee on Rules will do. The Republican bill has not actually been filed yet, and the latest information is it may not be filed until 11 or 12 o'clock and Committee on Rules will then consider the bill an hour after that, which might be one or two o'clock in the morning, and at that time Members, particularly Democratic Members, would be asked to come, review the bill very quickly obviously, and suggest any amendments or changes they might have to the Republican bill.

And I would suggest that that is certainly not the way to operate, particularly on a bill that is so important. I think all of us agree that Medicare is one of the most important programs that the Federal Government has ever offered, and to think that most of us will come here tomorrow and will not have even had the opportunity to see the bill and that the Republicans in having this Committee on Rules meet late at night where they would consider amendments would do such so late when most Members will not even be able to offer an amendment, it is just really a travesty of the process; and I have to believe that it is intentional. I do not think there is any question about it. The last vote today in the House of Representatives was about 5 o'clock. Why could all this not begin during the day or just after the session ended? Why does it have to take place at 12 o'clock midnight or even later?

It puts a great deal of fear in me, and it is pretty obvious from looking at some of the proposals that have already been considered in the committee, both in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, where I serve, as well as in the Committee on Ways and Means, that what the Republicans have in mind essentially kills Medicare. And I know that is a very severe thing to say. Many of my colleagues have said that this evening, that the Republican Medicare prescription drug proposal actually kills or destroys Medicare, and one might say to oneself how could we make such a statement? What is the basis for our making that statement? And I would say that the real reason we say it is because if we look at the Republican bill here in the House, it essentially privatizes Medicare. What does that mean?

The Federal Government operates a Medicare program. It is a Federal program operated by the government. And what the Republicans are proposing in this bill is that rather than have the government run a health care program

for seniors and pay out the money for the program to the doctors and the hospitals, that rather they would give seniors a certain amount of money. We call it a voucher. And those seniors would instead under the Republican plan be expected to go out and purchase their health insurance privately just like somebody might who is younger.

The problem with that, though, is that historically when Medicare was started back in the 1960s under President Lyndon Johnson, the majority of seniors could not find health insurance. They were unable to buy health insurance because the way insurance works, it is like a pool, and people who are older tend to be frailer, tend to be sick or tend to have to go to the hospital more. Those are not the people that insurance companies want to sell a policy to because they cannot make any money. And most of the insurance companies have told us that effectively they are not going to sell those insurance policies because they still cannot make any money today.

Nothing has changed from the 1960s until this year. Seniors are still the most vulnerable and the sickest population, the population that has to go to the hospital and to the doctor most often. Why in the world would anybody want to sell an insurance policy to seniors or at least to a lot of seniors?

What we are seeing here is that the Republicans, maybe because of their ideology, maybe because of their being beholden to the insurance companies, whatever reason there is, they essentially want to set up a system whereby the traditional Medicare that we have, which is a government program that guarantees certain benefits, would now essentially be privatized and they would get a certain amount of money and hope that they could go out and buy health insurance in the private market. It is a very vicious, in my opinion, thing to do. It is a wrong thing to do because Medicare has been a very successful program.

If we look at Medicare at the time when Lyndon Johnson signed the first bill, the situation for America's seniors has just changed dramatically. Most seniors had no health insurance. Many of them could not afford any kind of significant health care. They had to go to a clinic or they had to go to charity care in order to pay for their health care, but all that has changed. Right now America's seniors have high-quality medical care, and they have protection from the devastating causes of illness because of this Federal program. And each of the 40 million Americans served by America today can attest to the program's stability, its affordability, and universal nature that has touched all seniors as well as disabled people alike. So why do the Republicans want to change that? What possible reason could they have to change it?

I would hope that the Republican majority would realize that if they do pass

legislation that changes and drastically changes Medicare and privatizes it that they are not really modernizing the program and what they are effectively doing is killing the program.

□ 2215

Now, I cannot say that I am optimistic about what the Republicans might do tonight in the Committee on Rules. It just seems like many Republicans, because of their ideology, want to dismantle Medicare or they want to privatize drug coverage, or they want the prices of prescription drugs to continue to soar. It really gets to my second point which I think was very well made by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), just a little earlier this evening.

She pointed out, essentially, that not only do the Republicans, in their effort to change Medicare and, I say, essentially destroy Medicare, not only do they not want to continue the traditional government program that we have had so successfully under Medicare, but in putting together what they claim will be a prescription drug program, which is the reason, theoretically now, why they are changing Medicare, is because they want to provide some kind of prescription drug program. However, they are doing it in a way that does not really add a meaningful prescription drug benefit, and that makes seniors pay a lot of money for their prescription drugs and, in some cases, more out-of-pocket than they would have to pay now, even without a benefit program. But, most of all, they do not want to address the issue of price.

Mr. Speaker, when I go around to my senior citizens, they tell me they like Medicare but, they say, the only thing they do not like about Medicare is that it does not cover prescription drugs, and the reason they feel that it should cover prescription drugs is because the cost of prescription drugs has gone up so much that they simply cannot afford to pay for those prescription drugs out-of-pocket.

Now, one might say to oneself, if the real problem with prescription drugs is the increasing costs, then why do the Republicans not want to do something about it? Why do they not just say in their bill that one of the ways that we are going to help senior citizens is by saying that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Administrator in Washington of the Medicare program, could take the buying power of all of these senior citizens and essentially negotiate lower prices? I mean this is what the HMOs do now, they negotiate lower prices when they buy prescription drugs. This is what the Veterans' Administration does. This is what the military does. They try to negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs, as the gentlewoman from Ohio said, by buying in bulk.

But what we find in this Republican bill is that they not only do not want to do that, in the same way that they

were concerned about insurance companies, wanting to help them, now they want to help the drug companies by not allowing any mechanism in the bill that would lower drug costs or that would allow the Federal Government to lower drug costs.

So what we have, and the gentlewoman from Ohio pointed it out very effectively, we actually have in the Republican prescription drug bill a clause which is entitled the "Noninterference Clause" that says, "In carrying out its duties with respect to the provision of qualified prescription drug coverage to beneficiaries under this title, the Administrator," and that refers to the Medicare Administrator, "may not require a particular formula or institute a price structure for the reimbursement of covered outpatient drugs; interfere in any way with negotiations that are taking place between some of the other elements of the plan; or otherwise interfere with the competitive nature of providing such coverage through such sponsors and organizations."

This is a little roundabout way of saying that the Administrator of the Medicare program cannot do anything to interfere with price. He cannot negotiate price reductions. He cannot say to the drug companies, well, one of you give me a better price than the other. And the reason for that is because essentially, they do not want the drug companies to have to worry about possibly losing some money or not making as much money because the price goes down.

I only mention this by way of introduction, because there are a lot more things that I want to say tonight about the Republican bill that is going to be before us tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. But I only say this because I think that the sort of hallmark of this Republican legislation, and the greatest criticism that I have and that most of my Democratic colleagues have about it, is one, it tries to destroy Medicare by privatizing it, which may be, in some ways, a boon to the insurance companies or a way of helping the insurance companies; and secondly, it does nothing about lowering the price of prescription drugs, which again I think is some significant effort on the part of the Republicans to help the prescription drug companies.

So instead of looking at this legislation as a way of trying to help seniors improve Medicare by simply adding a prescription drug benefit, what we see is the Republican Party and the Republican leadership in the House essentially being in bed with the insurance companies and the drug companies to make sure that whatever is offered for Medicare and for prescription drugs does not in any way harm them or their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any problem if an insurance company or a drug company wants to make some money. There are a lot of drug companies in my State of New Jersey, and God bless

them, they should make money and they should hire more people. But it is ridiculous that in crafting this legislation that is so important to the future of America's seniors, that the two things that are most important, the two things that are most important to the Republicans is that they do not do anything to hurt the insurance companies or anything to hurt the drug companies. I think that says a lot about where they are coming from with this bill that we expect to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who is the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Health and who has been here every night talking about the need for a prescription drug benefit, but realizes, as I do, that this Republican bill falls short and, in fact, hurts the Medicare program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my friend, and the fabulous work he has done and the courage he has shown in standing up to very powerful interest groups in this country in supporting and fighting for a drug benefit.

I noticed something that the gentleman just said as I was sitting here watching this evening, that this bill does nothing to hurt the drug industry or the insurance industry. In fact, this bill, by and large, was written by the drug and insurance industries.

Let us talk for a moment about price. When any of us, Republicans or Democrats, people on that side of the room and people on this side of the room, go to a town meeting or go to a senior center or walk down the street or walk downtown or walk through a shopping mall and talk to people of all ages, especially seniors, but people of all ages about the whole issue of prescription drugs, the first thing they say is, why are our drug prices higher than the drug prices anywhere else in the world? And these are prescription drugs generally made in the United States, developed in the United States, manufactured in the United States. And, in fact, these drugs often, much of the research and development for these drugs was done in America and funded by U.S. taxpayers through the National Institutes of Health.

So we have the most profitable industry in America, 20 years running, whether it is return on investment, return on sales, return on equity, the drug industry, we have an industry that enjoys the lowest tax rate in America, in large part because of what this Congress and this President have done in giving them tax advantages. And, on top of that, we have an industry where much of the research, almost half of the research and development which leads to this industry's profits, to the drugs this industry manufactures, almost half of the research and development has been done by taxpayers, a full half has been done by taxpayers and by foundations. We put

all of that together, and then we say, why is it fair that this industry charges American consumers more than consumers in any other country in the world?

I have sponsored a dozen or so bus trips to Canada for seniors in my district and people who are not seniors, on some occasions. It is about a 2½ hour ride from Lorain in my district. We have taken trips from Medina and we will take them from Akron. It is about a 2, 2½, 2¾ hour drive to Canada. They buy their prescriptions, they have saved literally hundreds of dollars per person, sometimes even more than that.

But why should drugs made in the United States and, in many cases, underwritten by taxpayer research, why should those drugs cost two and three times more here than they do in Canada? The reason is, frankly, because of the drug industry's influence on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The reason is President Bush's close alliances with the drug companies and the fact that the drug industry funds large parts of his campaign.

The gentleman from New Jersey may remember a couple of years ago, last year when we considered this drug bill about this time of year, we were in the middle of our committee work and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN) recessed the committee for the day at about 5 or 6 o'clock because all of the Republican Members had to go off to a fundraiser headlined by President Bush, sponsored by the CEO of Glaxo Wellcome, a British drug company who makes millions of dollars a year, sponsored by them and headlined by President Bush. President Bush personally thanked the CEO of Glaxo Wellcome for all of the work they did in raising literally millions of dollars. Then, it is no surprise that come election time, the drug industry put in literally \$80 million, hard money, soft money, independent expenditures, all the way, directly or indirectly, they put money into campaigns, they put that kind of money into these political campaigns. We can see the chart, if the gentleman from New Jersey would point out the chart next to him and in front of me, about drug company contributions, and if the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, the gentleman mentioned Glaxo. Down here I guess is line 6, GlaxoSmithKline in the last congressional campaign gave \$1.3 million to congressional candidates. Twenty-two percent went to Democrats, 78 percent went to Republicans. And then if you look at all of the PhRMA, which is the prescription drug trade company, they spent \$3.1 million, 5 percent for Democrats, 95 percent for Republicans. So those statistics alone give us an idea of where the money is going.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the issue is partly campaign money, but the real issue is the fact that Republicans and President Bush have invited the drug

companies into their offices, into the Oval Office to meet with the President's people, into the Lincoln bedroom, if you will, in terms of putting big amounts of money into the White House, big amounts of money into President Bush's campaign and getting out pieces of legislation that benefit them.

In this country we continue to pay two and three and four times what the Canadians pay, the French pay, the Germans pay, the Japanese, the Israelis, the Finns, the Brits, all of the wealthy countries in the world, we pay two and three and four times what they do. And this drug bill, written by the drug companies and introduced by the Republicans, there is nothing in this bill, nothing in this bill to get prices under control. And that is what is outrageous, when the drug industry continues to fleece the American public. And it does not just hurt every senior who reaches into his pocket to pay the high cost of drugs, it is also what it does to American business, what it does to GM, or what it does to GoJo Industries in Akron or what it does to Inyicare in Elyria.

On the one hand, taxpayers are paying for all of this research and, on the other hand, Medicaid and other tax-supported institutions in this country are paying high prices for prescription drugs. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to explain, if I could just briefly, and then I would ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) to comment on it as well, why I say that what the Republicans are proposing here is basically a boondoggle for the insurance companies as well as for the drug companies, and why, the very fact of the Republicans trying to do their bidding is going to destroy the program.

I talked earlier about two things. I said on the one hand, we know that insurance companies, generally speaking, do not want to cover senior citizens because they are older, they are frailer, they are more expensive. So in suggesting in the bill, in mandating, I should say, in the Republican version of the bill, in the House version, that by a certain year seniors will get a voucher and they will have to go out and shop for their insurance privately, we know that no insurance company is going to want to offer that insurance.

So what the Republicans do is they subsidize the private insurance companies. Basically, at our Committee on Energy and Commerce Committee markup the other day when we were both there, some questions were asked by the Democrats about how this process is going to work. How is it that you are going to give a voucher to seniors and they are going to go out into the private sector to buy insurance instead of Medicare when we know that insurance companies do not want to offer that coverage because they cannot afford it? The response that came back from the Republicans and the counsel for the Republicans: we will just keep

giving them more and more money, higher and higher subsidies, until someone finally provides this type of insurance privately.

Now, what does that do? That means that these insurance companies are going to have a windfall, but they are not going to provide the same kind of coverage that seniors have now under the government-run Medicare program, so the seniors are going to get less services and the Federal Government is going to be paying more money. It undermines the very nature of the program and simply lines the pockets of the insurance companies. Talk about that, and then we will go to the drugs.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, Congress continues, as they have done with Medicare HMOs, as President Bush has pushed for, and as the Republicans in their drug plan, cowritten by the drug and insurance industries suggest and propose, we have continued to "subsidize" is one word, "pay off" is another one; we continue to dump more and more millions and tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars, ultimately billions of dollars we dump into these insurance companies, and what are we getting?

There was a study put out literally today by a group called Families USA, a group that represents seniors and especially families around the country, a large organization.

□ 2230

They did a study of the average salary of CEOs for big insurance companies, the big HMOs that will benefit from this Medicare privatization plan. So understand, President Bush wants seniors out of traditional Medicare, put them in these private insurance HMOs. Now the average pay for the CEOs of these largest insurance companies, HMOs that will be handling Medicare if the Republicans get their way, is more than \$15 million.

Now, contrast the \$15 million salary, plus I am not even counting stock options and all that, but just their base salary, contrast \$15 million the CEO of the insurance companies make with the \$130,000, which is what the CEO, if you will, Tom Scully of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services makes, the agency that runs Medicare for our government.

So you have got \$15 million on the average for the CEO of the insurance companies which will run Medicare if the Republicans get their way, versus \$130,000 running Medicare the way it is done now, traditional Medicare.

You make one other comparison. You have the insurance companies are spending three and four times on administrative expenses more than Medicare spends. Medicare's administrative expenses are between 1 and 2 percent. Insurance company Medicare expenses are between three and four times that amount. And then the last comparison if you are in traditional Medicare, you stay in Medicare. They do not cut you

out. They do not throw you off. They do not decide to abandon you. They do not take your plan out of the county. If you are in a private Medicare HMO, even with these big salaries they are paying the executives, maybe because of that, they pull out of a county. They drop tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of seniors out of their plan.

One CEO in particular, United Health Care, a big insurance company HMO, paid Norm Payson, last year he was paid \$76 million. And that \$76 million could cover about 30,000 seniors for prescription drugs. So look at what you have got. You have got big salaries, high administrative expenses, and organizations that will dump seniors out, that is, unreliable care; or you have lower salaries, smaller bureaucracy, a government program which will never ever dump seniors, which will provide reliable care, which will always be there for those seniors.

It is a pretty easy choice. You have the Republican plan, the privatized plan; or you have the Democratic plan, traditional Medicare, which seniors in this country have used and plans that have obviously served seniors well for 38 years.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree with the gentleman completely. And my only point I am trying to stress here tonight and the gentleman certainly made the same point is because of the fact that the Republicans want to cater to the insurance interests and to the prescription drug pharmaceutical companies' interests, they are essentially going to destroy the Medicare program, in other words, if you look at the insurance aspect. If they keep giving more and more larger subsidies to private insurance companies so they will eventually cover senior citizens, there will be so little money left in the traditional Medicare program that is government run that it will be broke. The government will not be able to pay for it anymore.

So essentially by giving all this money to the private insurance companies to get them to try to insure seniors, we will make it much more difficult for the traditional Medicare program to operate.

Let us go to the prescription drugs part. We know there are several problems with the Republican plan on prescription drugs. First of all, it is not very generous. In other words, you will have to pay a lot more than out-of-pocket and not get much of a benefit. In the case of the House plan, there is a huge doughnut hole so that if your expenses are over \$2,000 until maybe \$4,000 or \$4,500, you get no benefit. In the case of the Republican plan in the Senate, it only pays for 50 percent of your coverage. So seniors are going to have to pay a lot of money out of pocket, and they are going to have to get very, very little in return. In addition to that, in order to get the plan, they have to join an HMO. So, again, here we go back to the same thing again which is the Republicans are saying if

you wanted to get any kind of drug benefit, and it is not even a good benefit, you have to join an HMO; and if no HMO wants to join the drug plan, we will give them more money so eventually they will.

But the real problem is we know that unless something is done by the Federal Government to control the price of the drugs, the cost of the drugs is going to rise and the Federal Government will not be able to pay for the program. In other words, I am saying because you do not have any way of controlling prices either through negotiation or some other means, the cost of prescription drugs is going to continue to go up and the drug companies are going to get all of this money.

But at the same time, the Federal Government is going to have an increasing problem paying for it. In other words, if you were able to control prices in some way by having the Secretary or the Medicare administrator negotiate prices, you would save money for the program and you would not have to keep shelling out all these dollars or limiting the generosity of the program so that seniors do not get much of a benefit. They are going to kill the whole idea of the drug program by not having some limitation on price.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It can be so simple. In Canada, what the Canadian people do, what the Canadian Government does is they have created a small office with a board called the Pricing Board and the Pricing Board negotiates on behalf of 29 million Canadians with individual drug companies, German companies, French companies, American companies, Canadian companies. They negotiate price and then the drug is sold, for every drug manufactured, then the drugs are sold to retailers, sold wholesale into Canada at those much, much lower prices because they have negotiated them on behalf of 29 million Canadians. Then the drug stores negotiate, and they end up with much lower prices.

So it would not be difficult for this Congress to figure out a way, there are a dozen ways, the Canadian way is a very simple and effective way obviously because you can tell from the prices there, but it is not difficult to come up with a way to bring prices down.

The reason that the Republicans have not chosen any of those methods is anybody's guess; but it is hard to believe that they are doing it for any other reason than their political closeness, if you will, political allegiances to the big drug manufacturers.

I know it offended our chairman in the markup and it offends some Republicans, including the President, to suggest that their behavior on this bill is connected to their drug company contributions. But when you saw the drug companies spend 80 or \$90 million last year, 85 percent of it going to Republicans, when they spend that kind of money, it is hard to believe that the

Republicans would do anything without the drug companies' approval.

I would argue the Republicans have not just not done anything without drug company approval. I suggest they have turned over the writing of the legislation to the drug companies. They could not have done a less effective job. They could not have done a worse job of controlling prices, of ratcheting drug prices down than this bill does.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) pointed out, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) pointed out earlier this evening, this bill not only does not do anything to try to restrain prices, to ratchet prices down; it expressly prohibits the government from doing anything to get the price down. It is so logical to say to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, all you have to do is negotiate on behalf of U.S. consumers, Medicare beneficiaries or the entire consuming public of all ages. You simply need to negotiate price.

Another way we could do it is say that Medicare should pay no more than the Canadian price or the average price of the G-7 nations, the largest economies in the world, whatever price they are paying. There is a lot of ways to do it; but the way not to do it is the Republican way of doing nothing and actually prohibiting the government from doing anything from getting prices down. The higher prices are hurting seniors individually, hurting American business, and American competitiveness in this economy that continues to drift, continues to stagnate; and it obviously is hurting U.S. taxpayers because we are paying too much for drugs.

I yield back because I think the gentleman wants to share with other Members of the House the language that is actually in the Republican drug bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely. And I mentioned this noninterference clause, and I will mention it again. Before I do that, just quickly, I know we have spent a lot of time tonight, not only us but our Democratic colleagues earlier this evening, talking about what is wrong with the Republican plan. Maybe we should quickly explain what our alternative is, and the gentleman talked about it in terms of the price.

We are saying forget about all this nonsense of changing Medicare and privatizing Medicare. Forget about all this nonsense about having to go to an HMO to get your prescription drugs. Just take the same Medicare program that has been so successful and add a prescription drug benefit in the same way that we added a few years ago a program under part B that pays for your doctor bills.

In other words, without getting too complicated, Medicare part A pays for your hospitalization. Medicare part B is a program where you pay a certain amount of money per month for a premium, and when you go to your doctor there is a \$100 deductible for the whole

year, and 80 percent of the costs of your doctor bill is paid for by the Federal Government and 20 percent is paid for by you. Very simple program. You pay a small premium, 80 percent of the costs by the Federal Government, 20 percent co-pay by you, a \$100 deductible which is not much. You might go through that on your first doctor visit.

What we are saying is do the same thing with the prescription drug benefit. Add another part to Medicare, charge \$25 a month for a premium, have a \$100 deductible for the first \$100 drug expense you pay in the course of the year; and then after that, 80 percent of the cost of your prescription drugs are paid for by the Federal Government and 20 percent are paid for by you up to a certain level, 3, \$4,000 catastrophic when it is all paid for by the Federal Government.

But most important, what we put in the Democratic alternative which is what my colleague from Ohio mentioned, is we have mandated that the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Medicare administrator has to negotiate lower prices because now that person has 40 million seniors that they can negotiate in bulk as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) said and try to get a lower price.

Now, if you do that, you save so much money that you can afford to essentially have a program that covers all seniors and gives them a guaranteed benefit and does not have any doughnut hole or time, if you will, when they are not covered. I used this chart during the Committee on Commerce of a dunking doughnut, and I said the GOP is dunking seniors because one out of every two seniors is in the hole. I guess it is a cute way to say that under the House Republican plan one out of two seniors is going to be in a situation where at some point they are going to have to pay 100 percent of their drug costs because the Republicans say that up to \$2,000 we will pay a certain percent, but after that we will not, and so for one out of two seniors they will be in a situation where they do not have any coverage during the course of the year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is exactly my argument. Under the Republican plan, you just simply do the math, and we know that seniors around the country will do the math. I hope they do the math before tomorrow when we vote on this bill because once they have, they will see they are not getting very much in this benefit. For a senior in the United States under the Republican plan who has \$5,000 in drug costs, the government will only pick up \$1,000. Four thousand of that will come from out-of-pocket costs. So \$5,000 drug costs, saving only 20 percent of that. The government will only pay 20 percent. The senior will pay \$4,000 out-of-pocket costs. What is so disingenuous about the Republican plan is that it is hard to figure out because they charge a premium. They say it might be \$35, but the only time it has ever been tried

it was \$85 a month. Then there is a \$250 deductible. Then they pay 20 percent of the first \$2,000, but after \$2,000 they pay zero percent. The government does of the next \$2,100. It is very complicated.

That is what you are talking about. The Democratic plan operates the same way traditional Medicare does. It is a simple \$35 premium, \$250 deductible, 20 percent co-pay, and then 100 percent coverage by the government of catastrophic coverage if you have huge drug bills.

It is very simple by the way the Democrats do it because it operates the same way that traditional Medicare does. Seniors know how Medicare operates. The Republican plan is so confusing, so Rube Goldberg-like, so complex, so difficult to understand, I challenge my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle to try to explain it. I do not think anybody can explain it very well. But they will have to explain it when seniors see, if this bill passes, seniors see how difficult it is to understand that.

The point the gentleman made too is that not only is the Democratic plan simple and the Republican plan a Rube Goldberg, complex, almost unfathomable kind of plan, but the Republican plan does nothing to keep prices down. And the Democratic plan gives the Secretary of Health and Human Services the right to negotiate and bring prices down the way the Canadians do and to reimport drugs, to bring drugs in from Canada if they are not cheap enough in the United States.

□ 2245

And that simply makes all the difference in the world; that our plan is simple, and our plan will bring drug prices down, and our plan is a generous, adequate benefit for America's seniors.

Mr. PALLONE. And again, because the gentleman and I feel very strongly about the fact that we feel the Republicans are just catering to the insurance companies and to the prescription drug companies, the very reason why the Republican plan, in my opinion, is so complicated and ultimately, I think, breaks Medicare and destroys Medicare is because they are going out of their way to try to cater to these two special interests. Because to the extent that they feel the necessity of privatizing and having seniors eventually buy private health insurance, they are essentially breaking the system.

And in the same way because they refuse to have any kind of negotiated price and bring prices down, they are making the prescription drug program essentially not a generous plan because what they want to do essentially is have more seniors buy drugs at higher prices but not allow them to have a plan that is really something that is going to be meaningful for them and help them.

I feel strongly what is going to happen if this Republican plan were to ever become law, and hopefully it does

not, but probably what would happen is most seniors would not opt for it because they would find it is not worth having. And just to illustrate that, I think pretty dramatically, the Consumers Union put out a report on June 17, just a week ago, that was entitled "Skimpy Benefits and Unchecked Expenditures. Medicare prescription drug bills fail to offer adequate protections for seniors and peoples with disabilities." And in talking about how skimpy these benefits were and why most seniors probably would not opt for them, they gave some examples which I thought were pretty significant.

Specifically, we found, the report says, that the average Medicare beneficiary, without prescription drug coverage, spending \$2,318 in this year, 2003, would find that his or her out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs, including premium deductible copayments and the donut, are higher in 2007 despite the new prescription drug benefit, and would total \$2,954 in real 2003 dollars.

So what they are saying is for the average Medicare beneficiary, who spends about \$2,300 a year in out-of-pocket costs, if they had to pay the premium and they were under the deductible and the copayments in the donut hole that the Republicans here in the House have proposed, they would actually end up spending more money out-of-pocket with the Republican plan than they are spending now. So why in the world would anybody buy it?

What is going to happen here is that the senior citizens are going to realize that this is not even worth having, and they are going to vote with their feet. They are not even going to take advantage of the plan because they are going to realize that it is worthless.

Here is another example. A Medicare beneficiary with the relatively low expenditures in 2003 of \$500, in other words these are the seniors that do not spend much for drugs, maybe a third of the senior population, would find his or her out-of-pocket payments for prescription drugs are \$790 in 2007. So, again, if they do not spend much money on prescription drugs, they would have absolutely no reason to opt for this Republican plan.

Then they go to a person in the top third of prescription drug spending with costs of \$3,000 in 2003 would find his or her out-of-pocket costs reaching \$4,000 in 2007.

I do not want to go on and on here with this, but the only point I want to make is that it is such a hoax. Because we can talk here all night about why they are privatizing and why that is bad or why they have the donut hole or why they are not doing anything about price, but the bottom line is nobody is even going to want this plan. Why in the world would they even buy it when it is going to cost them more if they have it, for most seniors, than if they do not?

That is what all the senior groups are pointing out. This is a huge hoax because most seniors will calculate and figure out it is not even worth having this plan. That, I think, is the worst aspect of all. Because there is all this hype, with the President getting on TV and saying we are going to do this plan and we are going to provide prescription drugs, and it is not anything anybody is even going to want because it is not worth having.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the President has been bringing Members to the White House today and lobbying them, and I also know the President this week has raised a lot of drug company money and insurance company money. The President is using the power of the Presidency trying to get people to pass this. And from the reports coming out of the meetings from Members whom I have talked to, in both parties, the President is not talking about the details of the bill. He is just saying you have to do this for me. We need a prescription drug benefit. Seniors deserve it. But he is not doing the math for them.

If every Member of Congress tonight, tomorrow morning, before we vote on this tomorrow during the day would sit down and calculate, listen to the discussions like this and calculate individual numbers about what seniors are going to get, and then would look at what drug prices are, as the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) pointed out, what drug prices are in Canada, France, and Germany, what they are in the United States, and how this bill does nothing about that, and then look at how this bill privatizes Medicare in 2010, I think Members, particularly if they began to listen to what people at home are saying, would have a very different take on this bill, no matter what the President said, no matter how many campaign contributors that Republican leadership and the President of the United States want to honor by passing this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank my very able colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who led this fight in the committee, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who has helped turn this into a major national issue, finally, as it should be. The sad fact is that here in the House the bill that is going to be produced is, I suppose you could say is a mouse. It will not be a lion that roars for all Americans seniors.

If you earn \$8,000 a year on Social Security, the Republican plan will cause you to pay whatever is left over after \$2,000 of expenses up to the level of, I think it is over \$3,500. You are not covered. Where are you going to get that kind of money if you only earn \$8,000 a year on Social Security?

The amendment I am waiting here to offer, it is now 11 p.m. at night here in

Washington, would require the executive branch to negotiate price across the government for Medicare part D, in the same way as we negotiate for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense. They call it the FSS negotiated price. And I will just go through a couple of these drugs here, but the main point is that the Republican radical right bill forbids negotiated pricing in Medicare. It actually, in title VIII of the bill, forbids negotiated pricing, which we already do in the VA, in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Let us go through a couple of the costs. If you look at a drug like K-Dur 20, which helps if you have low potassium levels, U.S. retail price for that is \$55.99, the Canadian price is \$29, and the price that is negotiated through the Department of Veterans Affairs is \$25.58. A negotiated price, because you have group buying, reduces the cost to all.

To send an individual senior out there in their own little canoe in a very big ocean, they have very little consumer power. Only with group buying, as we do through the Department of Veterans Affairs, do you really get the same kind of prices that the Canadians have. Group buying. Yet the Republican bill denies that negotiated price.

Another drug. If you look at Prozac, for depression, U.S. retail price over \$300. The VA negotiated price \$186.98. It is obvious. It is obvious, is it not, that a negotiated pricing is what should be embedded in the bill? But it is not in there. In fact, it is forbidden.

If we really want to understand why, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) have really become experts at identifying what is going on around this Capitol, we should take a look at the contributions of the major pharmaceutical companies. Take a look at a company like Bristol-Myers Squibb, who gave over a \$1.5 million in the year 2002 for lobbying Members of Congress. Eighty-three percent of those funds went to the Republican side of the aisle. Millions and millions of dollars from companies that make billions by overpricing the American consumer. It is very clear that they have at least six lobbyists here for every one of us.

So here we stand at a few minutes to midnight waiting for the Republicans to produce a bill. Nobody knows where they are. The doors are closed. Such an important bill that will serve our people, hopefully serve our people, for generations to come. We cannot even find the bill. What are they doing? Where are they?

I would say to the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), this is no way to run the country. You should have had this bill on the floor 2 weeks ago. We should have gone through every line so every Member here would understand what is in it. But rather than that, you are having your fund-raisers. And, in fact,

Pfizer Company just contributed \$200,000. That was the price of one of the big seats at the roundtable dinner President Bush just had, and they were able to contribute. You think there is no connection? We were not born yesterday, were we?

So we have a bill that forbids negotiated pricing, even though we know that is one of the few protections we can offer seniors. The Democratic bill provides a real defined benefit. Every senior qualifies. It has a \$25 premium per month. It does not force you to pay those high costs, over \$2,000. It has negotiated pricing. It is for everyone. And it lets you keep your doctor. It lets you have negotiated pricing, and it does not make you go into an HMO, a Medicare HMO, which have all failed in most places in the country. And that is what the Republican bill does, it tries to privatize that and put you out of the overall Medicare system.

So I just want to thank my colleagues for being here tonight and allowing me to share in this special order, and thank you both for your royal, royal fight to in order to get fair and affordable prescription drug coverage for all of our seniors.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield for just a moment, and I know the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is here, but the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) just talked about privatization, as we have. We know that ideologically, in addition to the drug company and the insurance industry contributions to the Republicans and how that seems to affect their thinking, we also know that some Republicans just do not like Medicare. There is a history of it.

Donald Rumsfeld, Gerald Ford, and Bob Dole voted against it when it was created 38 years ago. Newt Gingrich tried to cut it so he would have money for his tax cuts. Same old story. But the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), who is the number one point man in this entire Congress to privatize Medicare, he said this morning, and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is the Republican chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, he said, "To those who say that the bill would end Medicare as we know it, our answer is, we certainly hope so. Old-fashioned Medicare isn't very good."

That is like Newt Gingrich saying Medicare would wither on the vine and Bob Dole, just a few years ago, before he ran for President, saying I fought the fight to try to stop Medicare from being created. These guys do not like Medicare.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to say, they operate on the premise, and they keep saying it over and over again, I have heard it on the other side in the well, on the Republican side, that Medicare is broke, Medicare needs to be fixed, and Medicare does not work. It is not true. They say those things in order to set up Medicare to be changed significantly.

The bottom line is my seniors tell me Medicare works. Medicare is good.

That is what the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is essentially saying, keep this line up that Medicare is bad and broken, then you can make all these changes because you say you are going to improve. But it is not being improved. It is actually being destroyed by what they are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to join my colleagues from Ohio, the gentlewoman and the gentleman from the Buckeye State, as we talk this evening. And as my colleagues have eloquently expressed, I want to associate myself with their remarks.

I think Roosevelt said it best of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle: The Republicans seem frozen, frozen in the ice of their own indifference. Their indifference to what this proposal will mean to the elderly. The hypocrisy of having this much-needed benefit not take effect until 2006 shows the indifference of Members having to return to their districts and go to senior centers and telling them that the much-awaited benefit that they so desperately need will not be there for another 3 years. We can afford trillions in tax cuts, but we cannot afford to put into effect a program that will benefit them.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has pointed out this evening, the most galling thing for seniors and for Members of Congress, several on the other side of the aisle who have recognized the importance of using the full faith and credit of the United States Government to leverage the cost of prescription drugs, at the end of the day, this is a cost issue. When we think about it, what we have done is asked our senior citizens to subsidize not only all the private plans in the United States of America and all the programs that are available to Federal employees, but basically all the programs available around the globe because pharmaceutical companies have stated that while those prices can be fixed, the only prices in the industrialized world that are not those that are imposed on the backs of those who can least afford them, the seniors of the United States.

All this lip service to the Greatest Generation ever is dashed when we talk about the hypocrisy of making a program available 3 years from now. For someone in my district who has to make the choice between the food they put on their table, heating and cooling their homes, and the prescription drugs that they need to take, we have turned them into refugees from their own health care system. They have to board buses and go to Canada in order to get the drugs at a price that they can afford. We are a better Nation than that. The indifference of the other party to the needs of these elderly, the indifference in their proposal.

I come from the insurance capital of the world. The HMOs are not going to cover a program that is actuarially infeasible to make a profit on. To have a program that is full of the so-called doughnut where we know that the elderly will fall into this hole, and the programs could be pulled at any moment with no specific guarantee, none of the entitlements that are under the Medicare system. And the further indifference, to try to delude the elderly into thinking their plan comes under Medicare by creating a new subsection which basically defers responsibility to the future and to companies that are unwilling to write the prescription drug benefits.

I applaud the gentleman for being down here night after night. When I go to my district, my constituents ask why are the Democrats not saying anything? And as the gentlewoman from Ohio said, it is because all of the deliberations are taking place behind closed doors, and what can and cannot be said will be determined after midnight upstairs on the third floor with no member of the press present, with no C-SPAN cameras covering what goes on in the Committee on Rules, and that will ultimately determine the fate of seniors and whether or not Democrats will be able to put their proposals side by side and have them voted up or down.

I thank the gentleman for waging this fight. I fear we will have to take this fight to the streets in order to get our point across.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and to say it is important to remind ourselves why Medicare was first set up. The gentleman talked about actuarial soundness.

We have Medicare because the private market will not serve this segment of American society. That is why Lyndon Johnson worked so hard after 50 years of Democratic effort to enact Medicare in this Congress. To say to seniors you can go out in a private HMO Medicare, we will call it Medicare but it is really not Medicare because it is not guaranteed, all of the HMOs dealing with Medicare in my region have collapsed.

They are not going to be there. It is just like physicians trying to take assignment. How many physicians do not take assignment even today? Do we think that without Medicare we are going to be able to serve this population? We have to have the strength of group buying and of the Medicare program nationally for this drug benefit or, indeed, for all seniors across this country to be helped.

I want to thank these fine Members of Congress, but Americans first, who are here tonight, to be voices for those who expect us to do the job for 40 million people who cannot be in this

Chamber tonight; and I am proud to be here a few minutes before midnight with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who understand the Johnson-Roosevelt legacy and refused to cower before this radical right wing which has taken control of this Chamber.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I think all of us feel very strongly that we want to look at this practically. We are not ideologically driven. We are not driven by campaign contributions. We just feel it is time to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare; and we feel strongly that Medicare works, it is a good program. It is not something that needs to be scrapped because the seniors are not telling us they do not like Medicare.

The simple thing the Democrats say is we need a prescription drug benefit. It is time for that. Let us simply add it to the existing Medicare program. Let us set it up like we do with part B and have a low premium and a low deductible and 80 percent of the cost paid for by the Federal Government. And as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) said, we have to have negotiated prices because otherwise the cost of the program is going to become so prohibitive the Federal Government would not be able to pay for it eventually.

Ms. KAPTUR. It will just become an entitlement program for all of these pharmaceutical companies to load up and raid the pockets of seniors across this country, bankrupt them, really.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. We are going to have the debate tomorrow, I hope. I just do not understand why something which is so simple is not understood by our Republican colleagues, and I come to the conclusion that they are in the pocket of the special interests, whether it is the insurance companies or the pharmaceutical companies. Otherwise it does not make sense.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would add it is pretty clear there are two things going on. One is the huge contributions from drug and insurance interests and connections between that and the Republican plan, essentially since it is pretty clear those interest groups wrote the plan.

Second, they just do not like Medicare. There is clear evidence of a 38-year history of that. But the proof is in the pudding. One, it is what the legislation looks like. The second way the proof is in the pudding is that this debate is held in the middle of the night. The Committee on Rules will meet later this evening. It is already 5 after 11 in Washington. The Committee on Rules will meet behind closed doors with no C-SPAN and no reporters basically there to make these decisions.

And while the Senate is debating their plan, which is moving toward some bipartisanship, for several days, we will have a debate tomorrow of only a few hours. That will be the end of it. The Republicans do not want the public to learn about this. That is why it

is so important that our colleagues speak out and make sure that people understand the difference between the simple Democratic plan that adequately covers seniors and ratchets down the price of prescription drugs, and the Republican confusing plan which gives very little benefit, is written by the drug companies, pushes seniors out of traditional Medicare into private plans, and does nothing about getting prices down.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank the Members, and we will go onward to the Committee on Rules. Let us hope that they actually meet sometime before midnight. We will certainly carry this forward tomorrow because we are not going to stop until we have the opportunity to have a really good Medicare prescription drug plan.

□ 2310

MEDICARE MODERNIZATION

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, again I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Ohio for their remarks. I plan to attend the Rules Committee meeting, whenever it is called to order, to put forward an amendment, an amendment that I believe is much needed. As I said earlier this evening, I believe ultimately, Mr. Speaker, that this comes down to cost. For us to have the elderly of this country unfairly bear the cost not only of private sector plans, Federal Government plans in this country but around the globe is just flat out unfair. There is no reason why we cannot do for Medicare what the VA does for its veterans. There is no reason why we cannot have formularies, why we cannot have pricing. Those who would argue that this would amount to price fixing have to come to grips with reality, that the price is fixed. In this case it is a price that is fixed on the backs of senior citizens across our country, senior citizens who, as I said earlier, feel as though they are refugees from their own health care plan, who board buses to go to Canada to get prices that they are denied here in their own country. Every western democracy, every industrialized nation in the world has seen fit to leverage the full faith and credit of their governments on behalf of their seniors except the United States of America. The preeminent military, social, culture and economic leader in the world cannot find it within itself to provide senior citizens in this country with a benefit they richly deserve and need.

My proposal is a very simple one. It takes into account what the VA is capable to do for veterans. It takes into account what the private sector offers,

what our own Federal employees are able to receive, what you would be able to get as a prescription price if you traveled to Canada, and says, take HHS, take the Department of Defense and the VA and impacted Federal agencies and have them collectively come up with a price that ultimately takes into consideration the need for research and development but also the need to come up with a fair and equitable price for the elderly. No matter what plan ultimately is conceived, if at the center of that plan we do not address the issue of cost, then we have gained nothing. And to have a plan and to be able to go back to your district and say that we propose a plan that does not take effect until 2006 when in the presidential campaign both candidates and every Member of this body, I daresay, campaigned on the fact that they were going to provide seniors with the prescription drug relief that they needed, to renege on that promise is a travesty. To be frozen in indifference, indifference to the need and wants of our senior citizens, is a sham. We have to speak out about that. Ronald Reagan said that facts are a stubborn thing and the fact of the matter is that seniors all across this Nation pay a disproportionate amount of their moneys to get prescription drugs.

My father, God rest his soul, used to say to my mother, Jesus, Mary and Joseph, Pauline, who won the war? The very nations that we defeated in the Second World War provide prescription drug relief for their citizens and yet we, the greatest country on the face of the earth, cannot find the money. Oh, we have plenty of money to give to the wealthiest 1 percent of this country by way of a tax cut, but we cannot find the wherewithal to come up with a prescription drug program for the greatest generation in America.

RECESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the House adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Mr. PALLONE. I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Does a motion to adjourn not take precedence over any other motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair did not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. There is therefore no question now pending before the Chair at this time, and the Chair may declare a recess.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from Ohio rise?

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to make an inquiry of the Chair as to why the

gentleman from Ohio's parliamentary request to adjourn the House was not received by the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When there is no question pending, the Chair has the authority to declare the House in recess. As such, pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the chair declares a recess subject to the Call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2839. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Vietnam, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2840. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with South Korea [Transmittal No. DDTC 034-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c) and 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2841. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Canada [Transmittal No. DDTC 012-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2842. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to South Korea (Transmittal No. DDTC 043-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 035-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2844. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 036-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2845. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 037-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2846. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 038-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2847. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany,

Ireland, Italy, Norway and the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 010-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2848. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 039-03), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2849. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ridgely, MD [Docket No. FAA-2002-13936; Airspace Docket No. 02-AEA-22] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2850. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D Airspace; and Modification of Class E Airspace; Topeka, Phillip Billard Municipal Airport, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-14347; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-4] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2851. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Clinton, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14460; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-13] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2852. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Davenport, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14461; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-14] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2853. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Independence, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14598; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-21] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2854. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Muskegon, MI [Docket No. FAA-2002-13818; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-19] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2855. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Eureka, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-14847; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-32] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2856. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Moundridge, KS; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 02-ACE-12] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2857. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cavalier, ND [Docket No. FAA-2002-14044; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-22] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2858. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Windsor Locks, Bradley International Airport, CT [Docket No. FAA-2003-14868; Airspace Docket No. 2003-ANE-103] received June 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2859. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-13066; AD 2003-04-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2860. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-13065; AD 2003-04-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2861. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-56-AD; Amendment 39-13120; AD 2003-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2862. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-62-AD; Amendment 39-13119; AD 2003-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2863. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerospaciale Model ATR42-500 Series Airplanes, and Model ATR72-102, -202, -212, and -212A Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-73-AD; Amendment 39-13122; AD 2003-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2864. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting The Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F, DC-10-30F (KC10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, and MD-10-30F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-99-AD; Amendment 39-13114; AD 2003-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2865. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-06-AD; Amendment 39-13140; AD 2003-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2866. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-13137; AD 2003-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2,

2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2867. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-300, AT-400, AT-400A, AT-401, AT-401B, AT-402, AT-402A, AT-402B, AT-501, AT-502, and AT-502B Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-59-AD; Amendment 39-13100; AD 2003-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2868. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Stemme GmbH & Co. KG Models S10 and S10-V Sailplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-52-AD; Amendment 39-13101; AD 2003-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2869. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model HP.137 Jetstream Mk.I, Jetstream Series 200, Jetstream Series 3101, and Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-56-AD; Amendment 39-13102; AD 2003-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2870. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd. & Co KG, Model Tay 650-15 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-13112; AD 2003-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2871. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-300 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate ST01783AT-D [Docket No. 2002-NM-54-AD; Amendment 39-1311; AD 2003-07-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2872. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-18-AD; Amendment 39-13139; AD 2003-09-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2873. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Twin Commander Aircraft Corporation Models 690D, 695A, and 695B Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-56-AD; Amendment 39-13099; AD 2003-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2874. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Quality Aerospace, Inc. S2R Series and Model 600 S2D Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-37-AD; Amendment 39-13097; AD 2003-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2875. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Aerospace Corporation Model K-1200 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000-SW-50-AD; Amendment 39-13123; AD 2001-13-03 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2876. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, -200B, -200F, -200C, -100B, -300, -100B SUD, -400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes; and Model 747SR Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-15-AD; Amendment 39-13124; AD 2003-08-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2877. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-1A11 (CL-600), CL-600-2A12 (CL-601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A, CL-601-3R, and CL-604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-317-AD; Amendment 39-13125; AD 2003-08-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2878. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes

[Docket No. 2002-NM-329-AD; Amendment 39-13128; AD 2003-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2879. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-12 adn PC-12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-CE-02-AD; Amendment 39-13106; AD 2003-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2880. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 222, 222B, 222U, and 230 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-01-AD; Amendment 39-13118; AD 2003-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2881. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F, DC-10-30F (KC10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-42-AD; Amendment 39-13127; AD 2003-08-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2882. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B3 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-05-AD; Amendment 39-13116; AD 2003-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2883. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, B1, B2, BA, and D Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-37-AD; Amendment 39-13117; AD 2003-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2884. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas DC-10-30 Airplane [Docket No. 2002-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-13110; AD 2003-07-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2885. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC120B Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-52-AD; Amendment 39-13115; AD 2003-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

NOTICE

*Incomplete record of House proceedings.
Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.*