United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2004 No. 25

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 2, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

SOCIAL SECURITY: TAXING BENEFITS, LIMITING CHOICE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last week the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, gave some seniors all over the country a little bit of a scare. But his suggestion that Congress should consider reducing Social Security benefits for future retirees was just that, a suggestion by the chairman. Current beneficiaries and near retirees should not worry. All of us, including myself, will fight to protect the benefits of current and near retirees. They should receive nothing less than 100 percent of what they have been promised.

What seniors should take from this conversation, though, is that Social Security is just that, a promise from our government. It is not a real asset in your name. If it were, you would have a little more flexibility and decision-making on how you plan to use it for your retirement. Currently, Social Security gives retirees a one-two punch: first, taxing their benefits; and, second, discouraging productivity among early retirees by limiting their earnings.

I would like to talk about the first of these shortcomings today, taxation of benefits after you receive the check.

Until 1984, Social Security benefits were exempt from the Federal income tax. For years, many analysts questioned the basis for the IRS rulings and advocated that the tax treatment of Social Security be the same as for other pension income, because there are other options for retirement planning today than traditional pensions, other options that are taxed differently, thereby serving as an alternative retirement planning tool. I am referring to the nearly 7-year-old Roth IRA account. But first let me explain further about Social Security taxation of benefits.

If a Social Security beneficiary files a Federal tax return as an individual and his combined income is between $25,000 and $34,000, he may have to pay income tax on 50 percent of those benefits. If his combined income is above $34,000, up to 85 percent of his Social Security benefit is subject to income tax. That hurts. If he files a joint return, he may have to pay taxes on 50 percent of his benefits if the spouse's combined income is between $32,000 and $44,000. But, Mr. Speaker, if that couple's combined income is more than $44,000, up to 85 percent of those folks' Social Security benefits are subject to income tax. Of course, to help discipline your money management, the pain of the IRS withholding the taxes along the way is available. So after a lifetime of seeing your paycheck eroded by taxation, inflation, you are not done when you are a senior receiving your Social Security benefits.

My objection, Mr. Speaker, to this is that we are limiting retirees' options on how they plan for their own retirement. For some of us, a preferred option while we are young in our working years might be to not have our retirement savings withheld before payroll taxes. Maybe we are willing to pay annual income taxes on all of it each year in exchange for the long-term security of knowing it will be free from taxation later, on earnings and withdrawal. Some would rather pay Uncle Sam up front like this. This is why the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 authorized the new Roth IRA to provide tax-free income from after-tax contributions.

But there is a bill that remedies this taxation of benefits when a senior thought he or she was on the receiving end, not the contributing end, of life. I am proud to cosponsor the bill of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), H.R. 434, the Social Security Benefits Tax Relief Act of 2003, which would repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits that President Clinton signed as a bill.

Again, this is all about choices. Social Security is one of our government's most popular domestic programs. Since its inception at the heart of the Great Depression, it has become the primary and often sole source of income for millions of Americans. However, it, like so many other staid Federal Government programs, is a one-size-fits-all program for an American people who want to try different sizes and have different choices. Just as we prefer choice in our health care, rather than a government-run system, some retirees, at least future ones, might

Printed on recycled paper.

prefer choice in retirement vehicles, and Social Security does not offer that.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that current and near retirees need not fear alteration of their current benefits. But we should glean something from Chairman Greenspan's comments. As examination of the program occurs, let us consider all the aspects, lack of individual assets; noninheritability to one's children; penalties for early, partial retirement; and the taxation of one's benefits, that make it less than a truly secure choice and system.

THE BUSH BUDGET AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, finally some of my Republican colleagues are waking up and seeing the fiscal mess that they have created here in Washington. This morning, the headline in The Washington Post read: ''Some GOP Lawmakers Aim To Scale Back Bush Tax Cuts.''

Mr. Speaker, somebody really ought to tell the President about this. He is still running around the Nation telling anyone who will listen that he wants Congress to make all of his tax cuts permanent. These are the same tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest Americans and have turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into a $3 trillion deficit over the next 10 years.

The article in The Washington Post quotes my Republican colleague, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, the vice chairman of the House Budget Committee, as saying, and I quote, ''We would be foolish to extend all the tax cuts now.'' Again, these are the words not of a Democrat but of a Republican, the vice chairman of the House Budget Committee, saying that we would be foolish to extend all the tax cuts right now.

I ask, what is turning some Republicans against their President on this issue of tax cuts? Maybe they finally realized the true ramifications of their fiscal insanity over the last 3 years when Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said just last week that fully implementing President Bush's tax cuts would require cuts in Social Security down the line. Chairman Greenspan's comments illustrate the destructive effects of reckless Republican economic policies, policies that have led to record budget deficits, lower economic growth, and a substantial risk to the Social Security benefits that millions of seniors depend on.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush took office 3 years ago, the projected budget surpluses were enough to cover the cost of Social Security during the baby boomers' retirement years. When then-Governor Bush was campaigning for the Presidency, he promised that any tax cuts he proposed would leave Social Security solvent. That was candidate Bush. But 3 years later, Chairman Greenspan says that, due to the fiscal situation this Republican Congress and President Bush have created, Congress may be forced to begin cutting promised Social Security benefits.

My Democratic colleagues and I will not let this happen. Hardworking Americans have paid a portion of their wages into Social Security their entire careers, and Washington has always known that we have an obligation to pay them benefits when they retire. Instead of making American seniors pay for the Bush administration's fiscal recklessness, the President should work with Congress and get their spiraling deficit under control.

Democrats, Mr. Speaker, believe that fiscal responsibility is the way to create prosperity for America and secure the retirement of America's seniors. The government needs to get back to balanced budgets and fiscal discipline as soon as possible to ensure that we can protect the Social Security trust fund for future retirees. My Democratic colleagues and I believe that our parents and grandparents should be able to enjoy their golden years and not live in fear of poverty.

Another reason some Republicans may now be skittish toward making all tax cuts permanent would be the latest estimates out of the Congressional Budget Office. Last Friday, CBO estimated President Bush's budget for the upcoming year would generate $2.75 trillion of additional Federal debt over the next decade. CBO also says that, despite the President's claims, his budget fails to cut the deficit in half by 2009. Could it finally be that some Republicans are realizing what many of us on this side of the aisle have known for almost 3 years, that President Bush lacks any credibility on our Nation's fiscal situation?

In order to prevent a total fiscal collapse, it is time for President Bush and my Republican colleagues to face reality and repeal the President's tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans. It is time President Bush and congressional Republicans stand with our Nation's children who will be forced to bear the brunt of the cost of their fiscal irresponsibility. It is time the President and congressional Republicans stand with our Nation's seniors and baby boomers that need Social Security and Medicare strengthened, not raided. Chairman Greenspan and the CBO have sent a wakeup call to Washington Republicans, and I hope after reading this article in today's Washington Post that some of those congressional Republicans are finally listening.

TWELVE CONSENSUS PRINCIPLES TO REDUCE SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, with a $500 billion deficit, it is clear that Congress must cut spending and reform our budget process. Like our predecessors in the 1980s, we must come together not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans to share equally in the cuts so that the Federal budget is brought back into balance.

We all support a balanced budget. It is the right thing to do, and it is also the moral thing to do. Our Founding Fathers created the Federal Government as a limited institution whose mission was clearly defined. Some things the Federal Government was to do well. Many things were left up to the States. When the Federal budget is out of balance, it calls into question our ability to sustain core Federal functions: defense, Federal law enforcement, and the retirement security of Americans under Social Security and Medicare.

I believe the Federal Government should fulfill its current promises to Americans currently in uniform and retirees before making any additional promises. Service in Congress is about making tough choices. For too long we have said, You get yours, I get mine and the kids get the bill. This must end.

Recently, Republican moderates and conservatives joined together on 12 budget principles. The Moderate Tuesday Group and the Conservative Action Team agreed on a surprising list of definitive budget proposals that will bring our budget back into balance even faster than the White House has proposed. What are these principles?

First, that we have automatic spending reductions if spending exceeds the amount in the congressional budget resolution. If we find that there is an uncontrolled debt above that which is set by Congress, we will have across-the-board spending cuts for all discretionary and mandatory accounts except Social Security and Medicare. Second, we have numbers in the budget that are enforceable. The current budget identifies 20 separate budget functions that are not enforced. They should be replaced with enforceable, one-page budget numbers that set four levels of spending: mandatory spending, spending on defense and homeland security, nondefense discretionary spending, and emergency spending.

Next, we should budget for emergency spending. Emergency spending requests should be included in a budget rainy-day account. Our budget should also have the force of law. The current budget resolution, which is not signed into law by the President, should be reformed into a joint budget resolution that is signed into law and enforceable under our code.

Next, we should have the protection of earned benefits, such as Social Security and Medicare, so that the automatic cuts do not fall on our retirees who worked hard, played by the rules, and are depending on the support of this core Federal function. Next, we

should show spending increases clearly. Under our current baseline budgeting, we automatically include inflation adjustments for Federal programs. This should be replaced by a straightforward comparison of last year's spending compared to proposed new spending.

Our seventh principle would block spending outside the budget. We need to update the pay-as-you-go rules in the budget that would allow a point of order to lie so that any Member could prevent consideration of a proposal that did not also include offsetting cuts to pay for itself. Our eighth principle is that we would review government programs and set up another Grace Commission, which worked so effectively in the 1980s, to eliminate wasteful and duplicative spending.

□ 1245

Our ninth proposal is to have an enhanced rescission power by the President so that he could identify critical programs, probably pork barrel programs, that he did not support spending on, send up a package to the Congress, which would then ensure a rapid up or down vote on the President's spending rescission proposal.

Our 10th proposal is to have a clear presentation of the government's full debts and liabilities. The Federal Government must account for its full share of accrued costs of covering pensions, retired pay, and other health benefits so we make sure that we know exactly financially where we stand.

Our 11th principle is that we should have a clear presentation of the debt owed to the public. An intergovernmental debt should be separated from other public debt in disclosures.

And our final, 12th, principle is that we need to enforce the rules of Congress. Points of order raised against proposals intended to lift the uncontrolled deficit or to waive these restrictions should be unwaiverable as several other provisions in our rules allow. This would help us control the deficit. It would help us bring this problem together, and now it is our job to reach across the aisle to make this a bipartisan proposal.

MEDICAL ISSUES AFFECTING OUR SOLDIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, listening to the last speaker here on the floor, I almost had the feeling he was a Member of the minority, as though enforcing the rules was something that on his side there was not the possibility to do.

But I digress. I really came here to question the war. I have questioned the war in the past, and I really am here to stand and question what the Pentagon is saying and not saying about medical care and about medical issues affecting our soldiers.

The Pentagon has claimed no ill effects from the use of depleted uranium. I have piles and piles of information that comes out of the Defense Department or the War Department, whatever one wants to call it, that says that there are no problems with depleted uranium. Over the weekend British newspapers reported that the British Army, the British Army, our allies, are telling their soldiers in Iraq that DU, depleted uranium, can cause ill effects. They give them a card that tells them that they can go and have their urine checked, and they have a right, they should ask about it if they are having any problems whatsoever.

Now, one has to wonder about our War Department sending our troops out there into war and continually denying that there are problems with depleted uranium in the face of the effects that we have seen among Iraqi women and Iraqi babies in southern Iraq as a result of the 1991 Gulf War. A 600 percent increase in leukemia among children, a 600 percent increase among women delivering children having deformed babies, 600 percent, and our government continues to decide that they can say there is no problem.

Now, the Brits, for whatever reason, are more honest with their troops. They are not saying there is not danger out there. They are saying there is danger and here is how they can check to see if it is bothering them.

I know as a doctor that the evidence is not conclusive. The issue needs to be studied. It needs to be directly gone after to find the answer.

Today I picked up the newspaper. One can learn a lot, as Yogi Berra said, if one reads the newspaper. If people read the newspaper today, there is a story about a G.I. from Tennessee, a nice young kid from Tennessee who went to war and got his shots like everybody else and nearly died from an anthrax vaccination. We have had arguments with sailors and Marines and soldiers for the last couple of years that there were some problems with the vaccinations. But, in fact, no, no, no, we are told they are going to war, they have got to have one of these. And the fact is that we now have the evidence that some of the fears of our troops were legitimate. Just because somebody is a corporal or a private or a lance corporal does not mean that he does not understand or that he cannot be right. One does not have to have a colonel's eagle on their shoulder or stars for a general to be correct. And we have treated our troops as though it was in their minds or, I do not know, some explanation.

This young man has not recovered yet, but his medical claim is still pending. They do not want to blame it on the vaccination even though it happened right after. And there are other stories. I could go on with stories. But they remind me of my experience since 1968 in the Vietnam War when we sprayed defoliant all over the trees and it fell down on the troops and everybody said Agent Orange is no problem, Agent Orange is no problem, and we really did not deal with post traumatic stress disorder.

On Thursday night when I got home I finished up what I was doing, and I turned on the TV at 10 o'clock, and I caught a program called Without a Trace. It is a story of a young man who comes back from Iraq. His business has gone to pieces because his brother has not been a very good businessman. His girlfriend is having a relationship with her boss. And he is pretty depressed, and he goes out and gets involved in a couple of armed robberies and tries to straighten his life out. That, my friends, is post traumatic stress disorder, and it is coming as the 100,000 people come home. We must be prepared to deal with that and acknowledge it when we see it. It is our duty to the people that have served for us.

THE CURTAILING OF INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disturbed last week when I read that the Speaker of the House may use his authority and his power in the House not to extend the investigation into what happened before 9/11, what it is we did that was right and what it is we did that was wrong, what it is we knew and what it is we did not know that led to the tragedy of the World Trade Center and the tragic loss of life there and the largest terrorist attack against this Nation on this soil. I was deeply disturbed that somehow the investigation into that would be curtailed, that the commission would not be given the time that it believed professionally was necessary to arrive at those answers, when I think about the families and how important those answers are as to what were the real circumstances under which their family members died and perished in the World Trade Center. I was deeply disturbed that the President said that he would only talk with two members of the commission, that there apparently is a concerted effort to take those members of the commission that appeared to be the most intent on getting to the bottom of these issues and these questions on behalf of our Nation and on behalf of our security and on behalf of the families, that they would not be allowed to talk with the President, to interview them, that they would not be allowed to share their notes, those who got in to see the President.

It is very troubling because the image of 9/11 and the tragedy of 9/11 is absolutely seared in the mind of every American, those images and that tragedy. And for us to suggest that in any

fashion this commission's work would be curtailed, not be given the time or the documents necessary, this is a matter of our national security so that it will never ever happen again. This cannot be about people in various agencies of the United States Government covering their tail because of something they did or did not do that may have helped us detect that act before it happened or have us understand what we need to do in the future.

As I see that effort by the administration to curtail this, and now apparently it is going to go forward, they are going to get the 2 months, I am also deeply concerned that I see the administration involved in some dramatic rewriting of history. When David Kay came back from his search for the weapons of mass destruction, in his meetings with the House and the Senate he told the American public and these two bodies that we all had it wrong. I am not sure that is quite accurate, because there in fact is a whole body of evidence that has been developed within the Intelligence Community, within the international Intelligence Community, within the State Department, and elsewhere that was present at the time suggesting that in fact maybe many of the reasons and the conditions in which this administration said we are going to war did not exist. They certainly did not exist in the clarity that the administration presented them to the Congress or to the American people or to the international community. And now it appears that the President is trying to say because he got it wrong everybody had it wrong. That is just not the case. That is just not the case. And yet we now have commissions to look into that matter.

Tragically, this administration again is trying to curtail what those commissions can look at and not look at. The Senate may be allowed to look at one piece of evidence but not other pieces of evidence. The House may or may not have access. And then the President has his own commission which is supposed to investigate the administration but has been appointed by the administration. A little bit of a conflict of interest there. But these commissions are important, and these questions are important because, again, it goes to our national security.

And there is another set of families, just as there are the 9/11 families and those communities that suffer that tragic loss of those thousands of individuals, there is another set of families of those who have been sent off to fight in Iraq, over 500 that have been killed, thousands that have been wounded, so many that we have visited that are multiple amputees, that have lost their arms, lost their legs, lost the sight of one eye, that their life is changed forever. They are entitled to the answers and understanding how is it that this decision was set forth to go into Iraq when in fact we see substantial evidence suggesting, and as said by the CIA Director, ''We never said this was an imminent threat.'' The President wants to suggest that if we make that the test, the real threat against the United States, before we commit the lives of young men and women in this country, that somehow the only other option is it will surprise us. No, that is not the test, Mr. Speaker, but we will have more on this. But I think the American public ought to start to consider the level of interference that is being engaged in by this administration to keep these commissions, both congressional and civilian commissions, from getting to the bottom, to the real answers that are directly related to the future security of this Nation.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

As we await the unveiling of spring's beauty, O Lord, we stand in the bright promise of Your presence.

Warm our hearts with sincere love and our efforts of reconciliation, that we may be ready to engage in the seasonal battles of justice and the work of restoration under law.

Guide the President and all the Members of Congress, that they may be Your instruments of renewal in the strength and security of this Nation.

We long for the full revelation of Your power and mercy, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCNULTY 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

COMMEMORATING THE 184TH BIRTHDAY OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, this month we commemorate the 184th birthday of a great woman in the history of our great country, Susan B. Anthony.

Susan B. Anthony was one of the many exemplary feminist leaders who is now known not only for her fight to gain women the right to vote but also for her great courage in her stand against abortion. She saw abortion as a great offense against human dignity.

She recognized the incomparable worth of every person and realized that whatever goes against life, whatever violates the integrity of the individual, whatever insults human dignity is a poison to society.

Susan B. Anthony fought tirelessly to safeguard the dignity of motherhood, which she believed to be an inherent right for all women.

So as we honor Susan B. Anthony, as a pro-life feminist and suffragist, I ask my colleagues to remember those who have fought to respect, protect, love and serve life, every human life.

SCHOOL LUNCH STIGMA

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address an issue many low-income school children face every day as they go through the lunch line: embarrassment. Embarrassed that their parents cannot afford to pay for daily meals so they are singled out in the lunch line in front of their peers as participants in the free or reduced lunch program.

I was encouraged to see a program in one of my local school districts, Lake County, Florida, that uses technology to enable every child to go through the school lunch line without being identified as a free or reduced school lunch recipient. Regardless of family income, every child has the exact same debit card which either their parents deposit money into or is funded by the program.

Today, I am introducing the Pride in the Lunch Line Act, which will amend the National School Act to allow schools access to existing Federal funds to purchase technology like that used in Lake County. It will reduce the stigma for students, and it will reduce the paperwork for our schools.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. Let us help children eat their lunch with pride.

PRAISING CONGRESSMAN KINGSTON

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, an economist once said that it is easy to spend money that you do not earn or for which you do not have to take responsibility. That seems to sum up the way we operate around here lately.

Last week, my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), took a step to change that. After looking at requests, asking for as high as 30 percent increases from legislative agencies, requested from his subcommittee, he canceled hearings on their requests until they came to their senses. While the other agencies were facing cutbacks, the legislative branch thought it was Christmas morning.

If we are serious about being fiscally responsible, we need to start right here in this branch of government. If we cannot keep ourselves in check, how do we expect other agencies to do so? Fiscal responsibility should start right here. Either we have the courage to cut back or freeze here, or we will not have the courage to cut back or freeze at all.

While we all have a long way to go, the gentleman from Georgia's actions are a step in the right direction. We need to stop robbing from our children to pay for our addiction in spending.

A BUDGET VISION FOR ALL TO SEE

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

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House Committee on the Budget will hold its Members Day hearings as the congressional budget-writing process kicks into high gear around here. As usual in election years, politics will play a decisive role in that budget debate.

This is not entirely a bad thing. Congress' annual priority-setting document is a good tool, a test Americans can use to judge the competing fiscal visions of the two parties. Unfortunately, only one party seems to have done its homework for this test.

The Republican majority, led by the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) of the Committee on the Budget, is working to craft a conference-wide budget that embodies the shared values and priorities of our party.

The Democrat leaders, on the other hand, seem unwilling to go to all that trouble. Nobody seems to know. Rather than take hard positions on hard issues, the Democrat leadership appears ready to turn their backs on those issues and their constituents and leave the American people guessing as to their core values.

On the other hand, the Republican Party's values are clear to everyone who asks. They are the same values that have guided our party and our Nation through difficult times in the past: security, prosperity, and families.

Republicans believe the job the Federal Government is to do is to preserve, defend, and support these three great pillars of American democracy. They will all be there in our budget: resources and policies to fight and win the war on terror and defend our homeland; protect the economy from Democrat tax hikes on parents, married couples and working families, while anchoring discretionary spending; maintain the global competitiveness of the national economy and encourage companies to create jobs here in the United States; and protect and defend American families from a culture of violence and self-indulgence that creeps deeper into our society every day.

Whether people agree with us or not, Republicans will at least have the courage to lay our vision out for everyone to see; and as we move forward in this debate, we can only hope that the Democrats show the budget process and the American people the same respect.

A BETTER MEDICARE FOR SENIORS

(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. Madam Speaker, this past Friday, I had the opportunity to make presentations about the improvements made to Medicare with medical students at the University of South Carolina Medical School led by Mark Versnick and with seniors in the Low Country, where Darren Katz of the Health Leadership Council joined me. I informed them that last year the Republican-led Congress passed a historic bill that finally provides prescription drug coverage for our seniors through Medicare. This was a central issue of recent campaigns, and Republican lawmakers and President George W. Bush have proven that their promises are trustworthy.

The seniors I met with near Sun City at Hardeeville, South Carolina, were happy to learn that their benefits have not changed. Today's Medicare is better for seniors, meeting their needs while keeping costs sustainable. The new voluntary prescription drug benefit allows seniors to lead healthier lives, while preventing disease and avoiding unnecessary hospital visits that will keep costs down.

I am proud of the work we have done to improve Medicare, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to build on this historic success.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

TRIBUTE TO THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOUSE FLOOR SHOOTING

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

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Members of Congress injured in the 1954 shooting in the United States House of Representatives Chamber.

On March 1, 1954, four Puerto Rican nationals entered the House gallery on the southwest corner of the Chamber. As then-Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., concluded tallying the ''aye'' votes on a Mexican immigrant labor program, Puerto Rican nationalists stood up and began waving a Puerto Rican flag and firing at the floor. The terrorists eventually shot approximately 30 rounds before being apprehended.

As we face a new day of terrorist activity, it is important to remember and honor those who suffered as a result of this assault on the United States Congress. Representative Alvin M. Bentley, who was most severely injured in the attack, represented communities in Michigan that I represent now, such as his hometown of Owosso. I would like to take this opportunity to honor him, as well as the other injured representatives: George H. Fallon of Maryland, Ben F. Jensen of Iowa, Kenneth A. Roberts of Alabama, and Clifford Davis of Tennessee.

These five men were proud to serve their country and nearly paid for it with their lives. The simple passing of time should not diminish their memory nor the lesson we learn from that attack. Now more than ever, we must always remember that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. I am, therefore, honored today to recognize those who have suffered and continue to fight terrorism on behalf of the United States Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 1, 2004 at 12:20 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the 2004 National Drug Control Strategy.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

□ 1415

2004 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Committee on Financial Services, Committee on Government Reform, Committee on International Relations, Committee on Small Business, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Select Committee on Homeland Security:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the 2004 National Drug Control Strategy, consistent with the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1705).

Two years ago, my Administration issued its National Drug Control Strategy setting forth a balanced approach to reducing drug use among teenagers and adults. The Strategy set ambitious two- and five-year performance-based goals: (i) to lower the rate of drug use by 10 percent over two years; and (ii) to lower the rate by 25 percent over five years. The success of the Strategy can be measured by its results.

I am pleased to report that we have exceeded our two-year goal of reducing drug use among young people. The most recent survey shows an 11 percent drop between 2001 and 2003 in the use of illicit drugs by teenagers. Among teens, some drugs—such as LSD—have dropped to record low levels of use. For others, we are seeing the lowest levels of use in almost a decade.

Despite this good news, drug addiction continues to challenge far too many Americans. Addiction to drugs destroys ties of trust, family, and friendship, and reduces all the richness of life to a single destructive desire. Almost every American has known someone who has followed the self-destructive path of addiction. Too many Americans want to change a family member's behavior, but are afraid of causing division and, perhaps, estrangement.

Our Strategy proposes a remarkable and unprecedented array of drug control programs, treatment initiatives, and media campaign efforts. But more than any program, it seeks to engage the desire of all Americans to make this a better Nation, facing down the lie of addiction, and offering the hope of recovery.

My Administration will continue to place a high priority on reducing drug addiction in America. I ask for your continued support in this critical endeavor.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 2004.*

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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CAREER OF THE LATE WILLIE SHOEMAKER

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 439) honoring the life and career of Willie Shoemaker and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family and friends on his death.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 439

Whereas Willie Shoemaker was born Billie Lee Shoemaker on August 19, 1931, in Fabens, Texas;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker, nicknamed the ''Shoe'', is arguably the most successful jockey in the history of horse racing;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker won his first race at the age of 18 and had compiled 8,833 victories by the time he retired in 1990;

Whereas in 1970, Willie Shoemaker became the all-time leader in career wins by surpassing John Longden's total of 6,033 wins;

Whereas on March 3, 1985, while riding Lord at War at the Santa Anita Handicap, Willie Shoemaker became the first jockey to total $100,000,000 in purse winnings;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker held the record for career wins for 29 years;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker won four Kentucky Derbies, five Belmont Stakes, and three Preakness Stakes;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker was the oldest jockey to ride a winner in the Kentucky Derby and the Breeder's Cup;

Whereas at Santa Anita in 1990, Willie Shoemaker ran the final race of his storied 41-year career;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker is a member of thoroughbred racing's Hall of Fame and the Texas Horse Racing Hall of Fame;

Whereas on April 8, 1991, just over a year after his retirement, Willie Shoemaker was involved in a car accident that left him paralyzed from the neck down;

Whereas Willie Shoemaker was an honorary Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Paralysis Project of America, whose mission is to accelerate progress toward finding a cure for paralysis caused by spinal cord injury; and

Whereas on October 13, 2003, America was saddened by the death of Willie Shoemaker at the age of 72: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life and legendary career in horse racing of Willie Shoemaker; and

(2) expresses condolences on the passing of Willie Shoemaker to his family and friends.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam 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, H. Res. 439.

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

There was no objection.

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

On behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, and particularly on behalf of the sponsor, our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), I rise in support of House Resolution 439, which honors the life and career of one of horse racing's most legendary figures, Willie Shoemaker.

Willie Shoemaker ranks second all-time among jockeys in career wins, with 8,833. During his unbelievable 42-year career, Shoemaker won each of horse racing's Triple Crown events multiple times. He won the Preakness twice, he won the Kentucky Derby four times, and prevailed at the Belmont Stakes five times. Remarkably, at age 54, while riding the horse Ferdinand, he became the oldest jockey ever to win the Kentucky Derby in 1986.

After entering his first professional race at age 17 in 1949, Shoemaker made his last mount, number 40,352 of his incredible career, in 1990. The following year, he was involved in a tragic auto accident that left him paralyzed from the neck down. Despite being confined to a wheelchair, Shoemaker remained focused on his desire to return to horse racing in any possible capacity. Indeed, he returned to the sport he loved as a trainer in a supervisory role on September 29, 1991, less than 6 months after his accident.

Madam Speaker, perhaps horse racing's greatest and most renowned jockey ever passed away in his sleep last October 12 at the age of 72 at his home in Santa Anita, California. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for working to honor Willie Shoemaker with this timely and deserved resolution, and I urge all Members to support House Resolution 439.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, ''Pound for pound, he's got to be the greatest living athlete'' in racing, writer Red Smith once wrote of Willie Shoemaker. This resolution honors Willie Shoemaker, who was one of the most successful and respected jockeys ever to mount a thoroughbred.

Willie Shoemaker was born in 1931 in Fabens, Texas. He later moved to southern California, where he cleaned stables and began riding thoroughbreds. Once ''Shoe,'' as he was called, began racing, he quickly learned how to win. In his career, Willie Shoemaker won 8,833 races, a record that stood for 29 years.

One of Willie Shoemaker's most memorable rides was in the 1986 Kentucky Derby. He guided Ferdinand through the pack of Derby competitors to victoriously cross the finish line 2½ lengths ahead. At age 54, he became the oldest jockey to win the Kentucky Derby.

Willie Shoemaker made an impression on our Nation not just as an athlete but as a person. In 1957, Shoemaker was poised to win the Kentucky Derby when he misjudged a finish line and eased up too soon, losing the race. He turned his mistake into something positive by honoring Ralph Lowe, the owner of the horse Shoemaker was riding, who handled Shoemaker's loss with grace. Shoemaker endowed the Ralph Lowe Trophy to be presented annually to a distinguished racing competitor for good sportsmanship.

After he was severely injured in a car accident, Shoemaker used his talents in other ways. He served as honorary chairman of the Paralysis Project and served as director of the Shoemaker Foundation, which provides support to those injured in horse racing.

This resolution honors Willie Shoemaker and expresses condolences to his family and friends. Though his loss is certainly felt by many, the memory and legend of Willie Shoemaker and his perseverance will endure. People will certainly remember him as a great jockey, but also remember him as a great humanitarian. He used his ability, his presence not only to win races but to help us all understand that when you give of yourself that is when you are really at your best. Willie Shoemaker was the best.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to urge support for this resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring the life and career of Willie Shoemaker, arguably the most successful jockey in the history of horse racing.

Willie Shoemaker, also known as the ''Shoe'', had a storied career, beginning at age 18, and continuing on for 41 amazing years. In that time he compiled 8,833 victories, including four Kentucky Derbies, five Belmont Stakes, and three Preakness Stakes.

It was in my district, at Arcadia's Santa Anita park, that Willie Shoemaker was truly at home, and where he so often made history. There, on March 3, 1985, while riding Lord at War at the Santa Antia Handicap, he became the first jockey to total $100,000,000 in purse winning. On February 3, 1990, Santa Anita hosted the final race of his long career, after which Shoemaker went on to become a trainer.

Tragically, Shoemaker was critically injured in an auto accident just over 1 year after his retirement. But though paralyzed from the neck down and confined to a wheelchair, he refused to give up his love for horses. Just 6 months after his accident, Willie was back at Santa Anita, where he supervised training activities.

When Willie Shoemaker passed away at his San Marino home on October 13, 2003, at the age of 72, the world lost a true sporting legend and an exemplary human being. I therefore urge my colleagues to join with me in remembering and honoring his life and legendary career.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, on October 13, 2003, America was saddened by the death of Willie Shoemaker at the age of 72. Born in Fabens, TX, which I represent, Shoemaker has truly been an inspiration to his family and his community alike.

Arguably the most successful jockey in the history of horse racing, ''Shoe,'' lead the life of champions. Competing for the first time at the age of 18, Shoemaker retired in 1990 with an impressive 8,833 victories. Accomplishments such as winning four Kentucky Derbies, five Belmont Stakes, and three Preakness Stakes established Shoemaker among the elite; Willie Shoemaker is a member of thoroughbred racing's Hall of Fame and the Texas Horse Racing Hall of Fame.

On April 8, 1991, just over a year after his retirement, Willie Shoemaker was involved in a car accident that left him paralyzed from the neck down. Paralyzation did not diminish Shoemaker's character or spirit. As an honorary Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Paralysis Project of America, the progress toward finding a cure for paralysis, by spinal cord injury, was greatly accelerated.

I would like to thank the lead cosponsor of this resolution, Mr. DREIER of California, for his work on this resolution, as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member for helping bring this resolution to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor such an outstanding individual from my community. I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution. Our strongest condolences goes out to his family and friends as we honor the life and legendary career in horse racing of Willie Shoemaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 439.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN ATCHLEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3769) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 137 East Young High Pike in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the ''Ben Atchley Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3769

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

SECTION 1. BEN ATCHLEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 137 East Young High Pike in Knoxville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the ''Ben Atchley Post Office Building'' .

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Ben Atchley Post Office Building.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration, H.R. 3769.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3769 would name the post office building at 137 East Young High Pike in Knoxville, Tennessee as the Ben Atchley Post Office Building. No tribute could be more fitting than to name a facility of the United States Government after one of our most patriotic public servants, Senator Ben Atchley.

Ben Atchley has served for 32 years with great honor and distinction in the Tennessee State Legislature. He served for 4 years in the Tennessee House of Representatives and has served the last 28 years as a State Senator from Knox County, Tennessee. Senator Atchley has served for most of that time as the Senate minority leader, but in a coalition with conservative Democrats he has really had effective control of the Tennessee State Senate. However, I think it is fair, and I think people on both sides of the aisle would agree, he is perhaps the most respected and admired figure in the entire government of our State of Tennessee.

He is a long-time personal friend. He is an outstanding family man, with his wife Sue and two children. He is a recognized and very respected figure in the Presbyterian Church, having received the very first Barnabas award, the highest award ever given to a lay member of the Presbyterian Church.

He has served as the National Chairman for the Ethics Committee of the National Association of State legislators. He has been a leader in his business, in his profession of life underwriting and in the mutual fund business. He has received the Distinguished

President Award of the Optimist International.

Ben Atchley has been outstanding in every conceivable way in both public and private life. He also served from 1948 to 1958 in the Naval Reserves. He has served his community, he has served his State, and he has served this Nation. I think it is very accurate to say that this country is a better place today because of the service of Senator Ben Atchley.

So it is with great pride and a special privilege that I have introduced this bill to name this post office facility after him in tribute to his years of public service, and I urge support for this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3769, legislation naming a postal facility in Knoxville, Tennessee, after Ben Atchley. This measure was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) on February 4, 2004 and unanimously reported by our committee on February 12, 2004.

Ben Atchley was born in Knoxville, grew up in the area and attended the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. He served in the Tennessee State Senate from the 90th through the 103rd general assemblies. Prior to serving in the State Senate, Mr. Atchley was a member of the State House. As a member of the Tennessee State Senate, Senator Atchley served as the Senate Republican leader from the 95th through the 103rd general assemblies.

As a seasoned politician representing District 6 in Knoxville, Tennessee, Senator Atchley has enjoyed a very successful career. I note that he is retiring this year after 32 years in politics. He has also been very involved in community and business organizations.

Madam Speaker, what I find most interesting about Senator Atchley is that, according to his secretary, his first apartment, after he got married, was directly across the street from the post office being named after him. The Senator also worked right next door to the same post office where he had a job with South Central Bell Telephone Company. And his high school, Young High School, was a stone's throw down the road from the post office. This postal designation was definitely meant to happen.

So I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the contributions of Senator Atchley and urge swift passage of this bill.

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

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

First, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for his very kind and fitting and appropriate comments in regard to this legislation, and I simply would like to note that our congressional delegation from the State of Tennessee consists of five Democrats and four Republicans. I think we get along about as well as any delegation in this entire Congress. All nine Members of the House Congressional delegation from Tennessee very quickly and eagerly joined this legislation and cosponsored it.

Ben Atchley has been a very loyal Republican, but he has as many friends on the Democratic side as on the Republican side. He is truly a great, great American, and I urge passage of this bill.

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

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3769.

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. DUNCAN. Madam 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.

URGING INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CALLING ON CHINA TO END ITS HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 530) urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the 60th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce a resolution calling upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 530

Whereas the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, is the most important international forum for discussing human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance;

Whereas according to the Department of State, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to commit well-documented human rights abuses against the Chinese people;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has yet to demonstrate its willingness to abide by internationally accepted norms of freedom of belief, expression, and association by repealing or amending laws and decrees that restrict those freedoms;

Whereas the Government of People's Republic of China continues to ban and criminalize groups it labels as cults or heretical organizations;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has repressed unregistered religious groups and spiritual movements and persists in persecuting persons on the basis of unauthorized religious activities using such measures as harassment, surveillance, job discrimination, exorbitant fines, prolonged detention, physical abuse, incarceration, and closure or destruction of places of worship;

Whereas international human rights organizations have documented that torture, maltreatment, the use of confessions extracted through torture, and other abuses while in detention are rampant in the Chinese legal system;

Whereas the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners has been particularly harsh;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China launched a brutal campaign to eradicate Falun Gong from their country;

Whereas since this time large numbers of Falun Gong practitioners have been arrested, subjected to harsh reeducation efforts, and some have even been tortured to death;

Whereas Falun Gong practitioners continue to report harassment and acts of violence at the hands of foreign nationals which have occurred against them during peaceful protests in the United States and other countries;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation is currently investigating the possibility of links between attacks against Falun Gong practitioners in the United States and the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas Catholics who remain faithful to the Pope and in communion with Rome face continuing restrictions, including difficulties holding worship services, obtaining building permits for churches, and training clergy;

Whereas Protestant house church leaders are facing increased pressure to register with the official Protestant church or face harassment, detention, and destruction of their places of worship;

Whereas many Catholic and Protestant leaders and believers have been imprisoned or subject to house arrest including Su Zhimin, a Catholic Bishop who was reportedly arrested in 1997 and who is currently reported to be in very poor health;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to exert tight control over the religious and cultural institutions of Tibetan Buddhists and Uighur Muslims, using torture, arbitrary arrest, and detention without public trial against these individuals for peacefully expressing their religious or political views;

Whereas the whereabouts of Gendun Choekyi Nyima, the boy identified by the Dalai Lama as the 11th Panchen Lama, are still unknown;

Whereas Gendun Choekyi Nyima was 6 years old when the Chinese authorities took him and his family away in 1995;

Whereas it is believed that the Chinese authorities are holding him in a secret location;

Whereas Tibetans caught displaying photos of the 11th Panchen Lama or the Dalai Lama face harassment, fines, and detention;

Whereas in January 2003, the Government of the People's Republic of China executed a

Tibetan man named Lobsang Dhondup without due process and despite repeated assurances to United States officials that his case and that of Tenzin Delek Rinpoche would be would reviewed by the Chinese Supreme People's Court;

Whereas this review never happened and Tenzin Delek Rinpoche remains on death row, in the second year of his suspended death sentence;

Whereas enforcement by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its one-child per family policy has been cruel and inhumane and has included the use of forced abortion and forced sterilization;

Whereas this one-child per family policy has led to the abandonment and infanticide of baby girls and a disproportionate number of male children in China, which will have serious and detrimental sociological impacts on China for years to come;

Whereas 14 years after the 1989 pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square, many protesters remain in prison and no independent investigations have taken place regarding the massacre that occurred during those demonstrations;

Whereas authorities in the People's Republic of China have continued their efforts to extinguish expressions of protest or criticism and have detained and sentenced scores of citizens associated with attempts to organize peaceful protests, to expose corruption, to preserve their ethnic minority identity, and to use the Internet for the free exchange of ideas;

Whereas many prisoners in China are confined to state run psychiatric hospitals for simple acts of expressing their thoughts on political issues, like veteran human rights activist and prisoner of conscience Wang Wanxing;

Whereas many Chinese prisoners are in Laogai, forced labor camps in which inmates are subject to various forms of cruel and forced labor;

Whereas the International Committee of the Red Cross and other international human rights organizations have been denied access to the Chinese prison system;

Whereas it well documented that organs taken from executed prisoners are sold for use in transplants in China and abroad;

Whereas the percentage of transplant kidneys estimated to be derived from executed prisoners in China has been put as high as 90 percent of all transplanted kidneys in China;

Whereas organs reported to be harvested from executed prisoners in China include corneas, kidneys, and hearts;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China agreed during the December 2002 session of the United States-China Bilateral Human Rights Dialogue to invite, without conditions, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the United Nations Special Rapporteurs on Religious Intolerance and Torture, and the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to visit China;

Whereas none of these visits have taken place in the last year and, in the case of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, two agreed upon trips were canceled because of unacceptable conditions placed on the visit by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the United States decision not to introduce a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China at the 59th Session of United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva was based, in part, on the belief that the aforementioned agreements signaled a good faith commitment on the part of Chinese officials to improve human rights practice in China;

Whereas when well-founded, balanced, and accurate resolutions regarding human rights in China were raised in previous sessions of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the Government of the People's Republic of China strongly pressured other countries to oppose the consideration of those resolutions;

Whereas since the last session of the United States China Bilateral Human Rights Dialogue, a number of very troubling incidents have occurred, including—

(1) the arrests of a number of democracy advocates,

(2) the detention and torture of 18 Tibetans who were forcibly repatriated from Nepal with the cooperation of Chinese officials, in contravention of international law,

(3) the ongoing forced repatriation of North Korean nationals, who upon return to North Korea will face almost certain arrest, torture, or even death,

(4) the arrest and sentencing of Internet essayists and labor protesters,

(5) the execution of Lobsang Dondrup and continued detention of Tenzin Delek Rinpoche, and

(6) the continued refusal to allow access by United States diplomats and family members of the accused to the trials of those detained for political or religious activities;

Whereas the People's Republic of China has signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, but has yet to take the necessary steps to make the treaty legally binding;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China is a party to the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to Refugees and its 1967 Protocol;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China is a party to the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and

Whereas the Constitution and laws of the People's Republic of China purport to provide for fundamental human rights, however, the protections of these rights are often ignored in practice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States Government should continue to insist that the People's Republic of China adhere to fundamental human rights principles and allow its citizens the full enjoyment of those rights;

(B) at the 60th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, Switzerland, the appropriate representative of the United States should introduce a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and meet internationally recognized standards for human rights;

(C) the United States Government should take the lead in organizing multilateral support to obtain passage by the Commission of such a resolution and should draft the resolution in such a way as to highlight specific human rights abuses;

(D) all countries with representatives at the 60th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission should support passage of such a resolution and resist efforts by representatives of the People's Republic of China to oppose the consideration or passage of such a resolution; and

(E) United States Government officials and officials from other governments should continue to speak out in international forums and elsewhere against Chinese repression of religious and political freedom, persecution of Tibetans, Falun Gong practitioners, Catholics, Protestants, and Uighur Muslims, the unjust arrest and detention of religious leaders and political dissidents, harsh conditions in Laogai and other prisons, coercive family planning policies, and the forced return of North Korean refugees; and

(2) Congress urges the Government of the People's Republic of China—

(A) to take the necessary measures to stop the persecution of all religious practitioners and to safeguard fundamental human rights;

(B) to stop the forced return of North Korean refugees, to allow the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees access to North Koreans inside China, and to work with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to develop a viable solution to the humanitarian crisis involving North Korean refugees;

(C) to end its coercive one-child per family policy and ensure that no national, provincial, or local government officials subject women to forced abortions or sterilizations;

(D) to immediately hold an open and transparent investigation into the 1989 crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square, to release all the prisoners held in connection with that event, and to pay compensation to the families who lost their loved ones;

(E) to release from detention all prisoners of conscience, persons held because of their religious activities, and persons of humanitarian concern;

(F) to release the 11th Panchen Lama identified by Dalai Lama and allow him to undertake his rightful role;

(G) to allow the Chinese people to practice freely and openly their religious beliefs;

(H) to adhere to the provisions and guidelines of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the 1951 Convention Relating to Refugees and its 1967 Protocol; and

(I) to allow, immediately and without restrictions, visits to China by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the United Nations Special Rapporteurs on Religious Intolerance and Torture, the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

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

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

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

Despite the hopes and expectations of some that robust trade with China would usher in at least a modicum of respect for basic human rights and fundamental liberties, the simple fact of the matter is that the dictatorship in China oppresses, tortures and mistreats tens of millions of its own citizens.

According to the U.S. Department of State, the government's human rights record remains poor, and the government continued to commit numerous and serious abuses, and the repression is getting worse. The State Department Human Rights Report went on to say there was backsliding, their word, backsliding on key human rights issues, including arrests. Abuses include killing, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, and forced confessions.

Amazingly, many years, 15 years after Tiananmen Square when we saw

people protesting the government asking for simple liberties and simple rights, carrying around a facsimile of the Statue of Liberty, 15 years after that there are still some 2,000 people remaining incarcerated in prison camps and detention centers. That is unconscionable this many years afterwards.

I remind my colleagues that people who argue that if we just traded with the Chinese, that things would get better. Back in 1989, the trade deficit was about $6 billion. Now it is $124 billion and counting. It goes up by the day. We trade; they torture, abuse, incarcerate, arrest and mistreat.

Some years ago soon after Tiananmen Square, it brought this to life to me and I was thinking about it this morning, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I went to Beijing Prison No. 1, a prison where 40 Tiananmen Square prisoners were being held. They were like modern-day concentration camp victims. Their heads were shaved. Men who had been out there protesting, asking peacefully that the government allow just some basic liberties that we take for granted in the United States and in many other nations of the world, and yet for that the book was thrown at them and there they were making jelly shoes and socks for export to the United States.

The torture does not stop with those who demand political freedoms. On the religious front there is ongoing aggressive repression of those who want to practice their faith as they see fit. We see Falun Gong practitioners who are routinely rounded up and beaten and abused, and hundreds have been tortured to death while held in captivity.

I remember meeting in 1994 with a Catholic bishop by the name of Bishop Su. He now, counting all of the years to date he was in Chinese prisons, has spent 27 years of his life being mistreated in Chinese prison and detention centers. Here is a man whose only violation of the law was to practice his faith with faithfulness. He is a very holy man. In 1994 when he was out of prison briefly, I met with him, and there was not one ounce of malice or hate in him for the dictatorship that was so abusing him. He spoke of forgiveness and reconciliation and how he hoped some day China would be free; and for that, he has been severely punished.

After I left, he was made a captive again and spent 9 days. Then he went into hiding, and in 1997 was recaptured again and put back into prison. In mid-November, we discovered that this great man was still alive and was getting some medical care under heavy guard. Here he is 27 years, a Roman Catholic bishop, and he is just a tip of the iceberg.

Protestant underground believers, Catholics who are underground Falun Gong, Tibetan Buddhists, and Uighur Muslims who have been rounded up under the pretext of post-9/11 saying somehow they are committing acts of terrorism, they are good, honest people, and the government of China enslaves them and mistreats them.

As my colleagues know, China has been designated a CPC country, a country of particular concern, by the U.S. State Department because of its ongoing violations of religious liberties and rights. And as my colleagues know, since 1979 there has been the one-child per family policy. The policy says if the second child happens to come along, he or she has to be aborted. Heavy fines are imposed upon the women, particularly. They call it social compensation fees. Sometimes it is six times the annual salaries of the parents compelling them to abort that baby. Forced abortion and forced sterilization are commonplace in China.

This resolution calls upon the government to cease that horrific attack on the human family and upon women. It is a violation of their basic human rights. It is violence against women, and the child as well.

What this resolution does in a nutshell, it calls on the administration, it calls on all interested parties at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, which will convene in mid-March, to take up a resolution to just bring out the facts and bring out the basic lack of human rights in China today and not bury it under the table, which unfortunately all of us have done to some extent; and certainly, the U.N. has done it for years.

I would hope that the administration, and I believe they will, will try to get such a resolution passed. We have tried six times. We have not succeeded. One reason is that the Chinese government is very adroit at intimidating other countries or giving them foreign aid so they will back what we call a no-action motion that is offered in Geneva. Even with that as a possibility, and most likely a probability, I think we have a moral duty and obligation to raise it and raise it as aggressively as we can for the victims and those who will be victimized in the future.

Madam Speaker, despite the hopes and expectations of some that robust trade with China would usher in at least a modicum of respect for basic human rights and fundamental liberties, the simple fact of the matter is that the dictatorship in China oppresses, tortures and mistreats tens of millions of its own citizens.

According to the U.S. Department of State, the government's human rights record remains ''poor,'' and the government continued ''to commit numerous and serious abuses,'' and the repression is getting worse. The State Department Human Rights Report went on to say there was ''backsliding, on key human rights issues, including arrests. Abuses include killing, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, and forced confessions.''

Amazingly, 15 years after Tiananmen Square when we witnessed courageous Chinese protesting government abuse, asking for simple liberties and elemental rights, even carrying around Tiananmen a facsimile of the Statue of Liberty, 15 years after that historic outpouring there are still some 2,000 people incarcerated in prison camps and detention centers. That is unconscionable.

I remind my colleagues that the people who argued that if we just traded more with the Chinese, that things would get better on the human rights front. Back in 1989, the trade deficit was about $6 billion. Now it is $124 billion and counting. It worsens by the day. We trade, they torture; we trade, they abuse; we trade, they incarcerate; we trade, they arrest and mistreat.

Right after Tiananmen Square, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I went to Beijing and visited Prison No. 1, a prison where 40 Tiananmen Square prisoners were being held. They were like modern-day Nazi concentration camp victims. Their heads were shaved. These men had been out there in Tiananmen protesting, asking peacefully that the government allow some basic liberties that we take for granted in the United States and in many other nations of the world, and yet for that they where hunted down, tortured and jailed. In the prison they were making shoes and socks for export to the United States.

By now most Members know that the torture does not stop with those who demand political freedoms. On the religious front there is ongoing aggressive repression of those who want to practice their faith as they see fit. We see Falun Gong practitioners who are routinely rounded up and beaten and abused, and hundreds have been tortured to death while held in captivity.

I remember meeting in 1994 with a Catholic bishop by the name of Bishop Su. Bishop Su is a saintly man of God who has spent 27 years of his life being mistreated, tortured and oppressed in Chinese prison and detention centers. Here is a man whose only violation of the law was to practice his faith with faithfulness. He is a very holy man. In 1994 when he was out of prison briefly, I met with him in Beijing and there was not one ounce of malice or hate in him for the dictatorship that was so harsh and cruel to him. It was stunning. He spoke of forgiveness and reconciliation and how he hoped some day China would permit religious freedom; and for that, he has been severely punished.

After I left, he was arrested again and spent 9 days in jail. He was released and then he went into hiding, and in 1997 was recaptured again and put back into prison. In mid-November, we discovered that this great man was still alive, for we feared he might be dead, and was getting some medical care under heavy guard. Here he is 27 years in Chinese jails, a Roman Catholic bishop, a holy man, and he is just one example of many.

Protestant underground believers, Catholics, Falun Gong, Tibetan Buddhists, and Uighur Muslims who have been repressed and even more so recently under the pretext of post-9/11 they are good, honest people, and the government of China enslaves them and mistreats them.

As my colleagues know, China has been designated a CPC country, a country of particular concern, by the U.S. State Department because of its ongoing violations of religious liberties and rights. That's a serious designation shared by rogue states. And as my colleagues know, since 1979 there has been the one-child per family policy. The policy says that any child who happens to come along without explicit government permission is to be aborted. Heavy fines and pressure are imposed upon the women, particularly. They call

it social compensation fees. The fee can be six times the annual salaries of the parents, compelling them to abort that baby. Forced abortion and forced sterilization are commonplace in China.

This resolution calls upon the government to cease their horrific attack on the human family and upon women. It is a violation of their basic human rights. It is violence against women, and violence against the child as well.

What this resolution does in sum is to call on the administration, and on all interested parties at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, which will convene in mid-March, to take up a resolution to bring out the facts and to scrutinize and condemn the lack of human rights in China today and not bury it under the table, which unfortunately all of us have done to some extent; and certainly, the U.N. has done it for years.

I would hope that the administration, and I believe they will, will try to get such a resolution passed. We have tried six times. We have not succeeded. One reason is that the Chinese government is very adroit at intimidating other countries or giving them foreign aid so they will back what we call a no-action motion that will be offered in Geneva. Even with that as a possibility, and most likely a probability, I think we have a moral duty and obligation to raise Chinese human rights abuses and raise the issue as aggressively as we can for the victims who cannot speak or fend for themselves.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and before addressing the substance of the resolution I would like to thank its author, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). He has been a leader on human rights issues, particularly as they relate to China.

This resolution calls upon the administration to offer a resolution on China's human rights record at the upcoming meeting of the Human Rights Convention in Geneva. Given the human rights situation in China, it is imperative that the United States take a leadership role in galvanizing the world community to hold China accountable for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

Last year the administration did not offer a China resolution at the Human Rights Commission, which has been only the third time since 1989 that the United States had given China a pass on human rights. In announcing its decision, the administration asserted that China had made progress on human rights and religious freedoms. Madam Speaker, this was a profound mistake.

China took America's unwillingness to lead the charge in Geneva as a sign of weakness, as a statement that China human rights issues had faded from the consciousness of the American public policymakers. Not surprisingly, human rights situations in China grew worse over the past year, not improved. Dissidents jailed remained behind bars; and incredibly, even some protesters from the 1989 Tiananmen demonstrations continue to be imprisoned. Chinese authorities have arrested average citizens who download or post politically sensitive materials on the Internet and have moved to place greater restrictions on Internet access.

The Chinese government also continues its brutal crackdown on the Falun Gong spiritual movement and unregistered Christian churches. According to the State Department's 2003 Human Rights Report, China continues to deny internationally recognized labor rights, the rights of workers to organize. In addition, forced labor prisons remain a serious concern and a problem.

Labor leaders in northeastern China fighting for the rights of unemployed workers from state-owned enterprises were tried and sentenced to long jail terms for their advocacy. Furthermore, China has not adopted a comprehensive policy to combat child labor. In urban areas children often work as street laborers. The State Department notes that children work in coal mines which often operate far from urban centers out of the view of law enforcement officials. This unacceptable policy puts the health and safety of children at risk. It is time for China to address this issue for once and all.

Finally, this resolution will send a strong message to China that the imprisonment of Tibetan political prisoners is unacceptable. The release of one of Tibet's most prominent political prisoners and the longest serving female political prisoner was a positive step, but it is not sufficient. Hundreds of Tibetans remain imprisoned for their political or religious beliefs, detainees are regularly tortured and exiled Tibetans have only limited access to their country. We must continue to put pressure on China to promote the human rights of the Tibetan people.

In short, Madam Speaker, the decision last year to treat China with kid gloves produced a backsliding on human rights, not progress. I hope the administration does not make this mistake again. True political change and representative government will eventually come to China. But, unfortunately, we cannot know whether it will take 5 years or 25 years. But regardless of how long it takes, leaders of a new democratic China must believe that the United States stood with them in their time of darkness. An American-sponsored resolution in Geneva exposing China's poor human rights record accomplishes this vital task. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the man who authored the International Religious Freedom Act 5 years ago.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and others who have been strong supporters with regard to speaking out on behalf of those being persecuted in China.

I heard the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) talk about the Tiananmen Square demonstrators. We saw them making socks. I still have the socks in my office. That was 15 years ago.

Madam Speaker, I ask Members, what were they doing 15 years ago? For the last 15 years, what were you doing? For the last 15 years, these men and women have been in prison, and very few people really speak out.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. Every Member of Congress should be outraged that the men and women in China are routinely being persecuted by the government. Every Member of Congress and everyone in the administration ought to imagine a country and think about a country where factory workers have no workplace safety, labor and environmental protections, and are required to work 80 hours a week for no more than $110 per month for goods exported. Imagine a country which boldly supplies missile and chemical weapons technology to countries that harbor terrorists.

□ 1445

Imagine a country that oversees a network of espionage operations against American companies. The Chinese have a spying program against American industry second to none. The KGB could not hold a candle to what the Chinese Government is doing. Imagine a country which is plundering a neighbor and wiping out its religion-based culture. Imagine a country which tortures and imprisons Catholic bishops. There are 11 Catholic bishops according to the Cardinal Kung Foundation in prison today. Eleven. You almost never hear anybody speak out on behalf of them. You have a large number, 250, 300 Protestant house church leaders. I had a Protestant pastor come by to see me 2 weeks ago, a pastor that we had helped and worked with; he had been in prison 10 years. He said his last job in a slave labor camp was making Christmas tree lights. A Protestant pastor in a Chinese prison making Christmas tree lights to celebrate the birth of Jesus. What is wrong? Yet you never really hear anybody speak out with regard to that.

Buddhist monks and nuns, persecuted severely. Keep in mind the leader of the Chinese Government now is the guy who brought down all of the persecution of those who were Buddhists with regard to the Drapchi prison and what took place in Tibet. As the gentleman from New Jersey said, the Muslims are being pounded left and right. If you need a new organ or kidney, you can go to China and for $50,000, they will go into the prison, take your blood type, take his blood type, find a match, kill him, take him away, transplant the kidney for $50,000.

Slave labor camps. There are more slave labor camps in China today than there were when Solzhenitsyn wrote that Nobel Prize-winning book, ''Gulag Archipelago.'' There are more in China today than there were then. We all know what country this imaginary country is. It is China.

The other day I was coming in and I heard Simon and Garfunkel on the radio sing the words of ''The Boxer.'' It really struck me: ''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.'' This administration and this Congress hears only what it wants to hear and disregards the rest.

I had an opportunity several weeks ago to go to Berlin. We went to a train stop called Grunewald Station. It is where they took people who were Jewish and put them on trains and sent them away. I was there kind of late. As it was getting dark, I looked out, I looked at big, large homes that were all around this station. I said to myself, these people must have known what was taking place in 1941 and 1942 and 1943. They had little signs of how many were put on the trains in 1942 and 1943. Thousands and thousands. It got down to 1944 and 1945, in one train 17 or 18. But the people that lived in the neighborhood had to know what was taking place.

We have a 71-page report that the State Department has put out. So it is kind of like saying, We did not know. But we know. We cannot now say, We do not know what's taking place in China. The one-child per family, the human organ transplants, the slave labor camps. We cannot say we do not know because you get the 71-page report and you read it, 71 pages about China.

Later on when the Chinese Government falls, and it will fall, they will go the way of the Ceausescu government; and God bless Ronald Reagan when he spoke out and called the Soviet Union the Evil Empire and put the cruise missiles into Europe when nobody else wanted them. But they will fall and when they go back and open up the records, nobody will be able to say, we did not know, because now we know. We read the human rights report that came out of the State Department 3 days ago.

Madam Speaker, I am going to put the rest in the RECORD and just say this administration ought to follow this resolution. If it does not follow the resolution and yet it followed that 71-page report, I do not see how it can live with itself. Let me just say, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer said, it is cheap grace for the Congress just to pass a resolution urging them to do a resolution. We ought to be doing a lot more and speaking out on behalf of those who are being persecuted.

Many people will tell you when the Reagan administration and the Carter administration used to go to the Soviet Union, they always met with the dissidents. They went into their apartments. They had them into the embassy. Somewhere there are bracelets with their names on them. They stood in solidarity with the people in the Soviet Union that were being persecuted. I find that when delegations, both congressional and executive branch, go to China, they meet with the leaders. They have their shark fin soup, and they meet in the big halls; but they do not meet with the people.

We have a lot to learn, we in Congress and in the administration, to emulate President Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan always spoke out on behalf of the persecuted. Sharansky will tell you that his life got better when Ronald Reagan and the Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, raised the Sharansky case. He sometimes just got more food. He got more visitations. We need the administration, one, to introduce a resolution. Secondly, this Congress ought to do more or else the words from Simon and Garfunkel, ''The Boxer,'' ''Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest,'' will in essence be the theme song for us in the United States where we say Congress hears only what it wants to hear and disregards the rest.

Madam Speaker, there are 71 pages. We cannot ever again say we did not know, because now we know. I urge the strong passage of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 530 urging the United States to introduce a resolution highlighting China's human rights record at the 60th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights this month. Every Member of Congress should be outraged that men and women in China are routinely persecuted by the Chinese Government.

Imagine a country where factory workers have no workplace safety, labor, or environmental protections and are required to work 80 hour-weeks for no more than $110 per month to produce goods for export.

Imagine a country which boldly supplies missile and chemical weapons technology to countries that support or harbor terrorists.

Imagine a country that oversees a network of espionage operations against American companies.

Imagine a country which is plundering a neighbor and wiping out its religion-based culture.

Imagine a country which tortures and imprisons Catholic bishops, Protestant church leaders, Muslim worshipers, Falun Gong followers, and Buddhist monks and nuns just because of their faith and systematically destroys churches and confiscates bibles.

Imagine a country which has a thriving business of harvesting and selling for transplant kidneys, corneas, and other human organs from executed prisoners who are thrown in prison with no trial or sentencing procedures.

Imagine a country which maintains an extensive system of gulags—slave labor camps—as large as existed in the former Soviet Union that are used for brainwashing and ''reeducation through labor.''

That country is not imaginary. It is the People's Republic of China.

I was appalled last year when the United States administration chose not to introduce a resolution condemning China at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights meeting in Geneva. We were told over and over again that China's human rights record was improving and that change was coming.

The recently released State Department country reports on human rights unequivocally states that over the last year China didn't improve its human rights record. In fact, there was backsliding.

I would like to share with you some facts from that 71-page report.

The Chinese government has failed to demonstrate its willingness to abide by the internationally accepted norms of freedom of belief, expression, and association.

Citizens lacked both the freedom peacefully to express opposition to the political system or the right to change the system.

Violence against women (including imposition of a birth limitation policy coercive in nature that resulted in instances of forced abortion and forced sterilization) continued.

Last year alone the government executed more prisoners than any other country.

All over China Catholic Bishops and Priests are in jail, some for decades at a time, simply for practicing their faith.

Over 250,000 persons are serving sentences in ''reeducation through labor'' camps.

As many as 2,000 people remained in prison for their activities during the June 1989 Tiananmen demonstrations.

The government used the international war on terror as a justification for cracking down harshly on suspected Uighur separatists.

The government continues to deport thousands of North Koreans, who face persecution upon their return.

And the list goes on.

China cannot fool the international community any longer. The Chinese Government continues to commit well-documented human rights abuses against the Chinese people.

America must be a country that stands up for basic decency and human rights. America must speak out on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves—men and women who are being persecuted on account of their religious or political beliefs.

Our foreign policy must be a policy that helps promote human rights and freedom. Not a policy that sides with dictators who oppress their own citizens.

The facts are before us. The United States can no longer say that things are improving in China.

Each day we fail to speak out is another day that a Catholic Priest is arrested.

Another day a Falun Gong practitioner is tortured. Another day that innocent voices are silenced.

Will the United States step up as the leader of the free world and sponsor a resolution on China, or will the world sit by and watch China suppress its citizens for another year?

How will history judge us? We must not be afraid to act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution that outlines the deplorable record of China's authoritarian regime, a regime which continues to systematically violate the most basic human rights of all of its people and the civil and political

liberties of all of its citizens. State security personnel are responsible for extensive abuses such as political and extrajudicial killings, lengthy incommunicado detentions, and the use of torture. Police target certain dissidents for incarceration in psychiatric facilities, subjecting them to unspeakable punishment. National, racial, and ethnic minorities remain subject to intense persecution and discrimination. Thugs employed by the regime frequently launch campaigns to crack down on opposition and pro-democracy groups. Freedom of movement, speech, assembly, and association are severely restricted. The controls on religious worship have intensified. Church leaders and other faithful are harassed and repressed with fines, detentions, physical abuse and, yes, torture. Many houses of worship have been destroyed. Catholic and Protestant leaders and believers have been imprisoned or subjected to house arrest.

This cowardly, dictatorial regime has harassed, imprisoned, and tortured members of the Falun Gong group, sending women, children and men to torture camps for doing nothing but exercising their most basic, fundamental rights of freedom of conscience and belief. This deplorable action by the Chinese authorities has included the brutal torture of followers, particularly women, who have been arrested, gang-raped, and brutally beaten. They have been demoted or dismissed from their employment. They have been held in prison. They have been sent to labor camps and psychiatric hospitals, all because they chose to live by the strength of their convictions and refused to renounce their beliefs.

Additionally, trafficking in persons, mainly women and children, for forced prostitution or illegal forced labor continues, placing this segment of the population in constant risk of slavery. The gross violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the Chinese regime and the deteriorating situation in China are highlighted in the Department of State's Human Rights Report released last week. The China report says: ''The government continued to commit numerous and serious abuses. There was backsliding on key human rights issues during the year.''

The People's Republic of China must be held accountable for its deplorable actions. Constant pressure from the U.S. and the international community is vital if any improvements are to take place in China.

Madam Speaker, we must support the Chinese people in their efforts and send a clear message to their oppressors that the U.S. is committed to the defense of democratic principles and human rights. This resolution before us is an important part of that strategy. As the U.S. delegation works to ensure debate on human rights conditions in China and to secure the votes for a resolution at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights calling on China to end its terrible human rights practices, let us show them our full support by voting in favor of the resolution in front of us, House Resolution 530.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for their steadfast support for the Chinese people to live free one day soon.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 530, which urges the representative of the United States to the 60th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce a resolution calling upon the government of the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations.

A year ago, the government of the PRC agreed to invite three international human rights organizations to China without conditions. Those three organizations were the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, the U.N. Special Rapporteurs on Religious Intolerance and Torture, and the U.N. Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Two visits were scheduled, but the arrangement was that they were supposed to come without conditions and none of those visits has taken place precisely because of unacceptable preconditions imposed in violation of its own promises by the government of the People's Republic of China.

The failure of the PRC government to follow through on its promises once again is instructive. First, it demonstrates the lack of commitment and good faith on the part of the PRC to acknowledge and improve the human rights conditions for the Chinese people. Second, it reveals a PRC strategy to assuage international concerns with bare rhetoric and deceptive practices in order to advance the political and economic interests of its rulers. Most importantly, it shows that additional pressure is necessary to improve human rights in the PRC.

Several cases have been cited. In fact, the pattern of hundreds and thousands of cases has been cited during this debate. I will add just one more, the case of Dr. Yang Jianli, the U.S.-educated scholar of democracy. In June 2003, this House unanimously approved legislation calling for Dr. Yang's release. His case is one more example of the unwillingness of the PRC government to fulfill its promise, or to follow its own law. The PRC has held Dr. Yang Jianli, whose wife and children are citizens of the United States, without access to a lawyer, without the right to contact his family, and even without a court ruling against him. This indefinite detention is a violation of international standards and the PRC's own criminal law.

Since 1997, the denial of basic rights is beginning to extend even to Hong Kong. Just today, we read in The Washington Post that the PRC is secretly holding a group of Hong Kong residents, including at least three British citizens, and prosecuting them for espionage. What have they done? According to The Post, the charges include discussion of the Tiananmen Square massacre. Madam Speaker, there are many people who should be prosecuted for the Tiananmen Square massacre, but they are most assuredly not citizens of China or British citizens living in Hong Kong; and they are not people who simply talk about this abomination. They are, instead, the rulers who perpetrated this assault on the Chinese people and who continue to occupy positions of high power in Beijing.

We ask the government of the PRC to accomplish simple and humane goals: stop the persecution of religious practitioners; stop the forced return of Korean refugees to the totalitarian half of the peninsula; end forced abortions and forced sterilization of women; adhere to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the U.N. Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and the 1951 Convention Relating to Refugees and its 1967 Protocol.

Madam Speaker, today there appears in the news the fact that the People's Republic of China has announced it is going to change its constitution to include private property as a right of the Chinese people. In practice, the National People's Congress exists mainly to carry out the will of the party leadership; and if the party leadership will not observe its own laws, we can expect nothing to come of this as well.

Article 35 of the existing state constitution proclaims that citizens of the PRC enjoy freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association, of procession, and of demonstration; and that is a lie.

□ 1500

We are here today to urge our government to work to see to it that these lies come to an end and that the People's Republic of China honors the citizens of China with basic fundamental human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I want to thank, first of all, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) of the Select Committee on Homeland Security for his very eloquent statement and to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and especially to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), who is a very strong and steadfast supporter of human rights around the globe, including China, and of course the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who also speaks out boldly on these issues.

I would just say finally, Mr. Speaker, that one of the great leaders of the

whole human rights movement in China is a man by the name of Harry Wu. Most people know about him. He is a man who has an impeccable reputation for honesty, for courage. He spent 19 years in the Chinese laogai system and suffered immensely for it. I will never forget when he helped us organize one of our first committee hearings when I chaired the Committee on International Operations and Human Rights on the laogai. He brought in six survivors of the laogai. One of those survivors was Palden Gyatso, a Buddhist monk who tried to get through security into the Rayburn Building bringing the instruments of torture that are routinely used and deployed to abuse prisoners in the laogai, including cattle prods and the like, horrible, horrific implements, and he was stopped, obviously, by the guards who were wondering what is this all about. We had to go down and usher him through. Those kinds of instruments, Mr. Speaker, are commonplace. Torture is commonplace.

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) talked about all these promises that are made time after time. They sign covenants. They say they are going to do this. The Chinese government routinely does not follow through, and so it will be with the most recent property rights. They make promises, and routinely it is predictable they do not follow through. And I just want to pay a special tribute to Harry Wu for his great leadership.

The ICRC has been trying for years, the Red Cross, to get into the Chinese prisons. They cannot get in because it is closed, because torture is routinely used against political and religious prisoners and against other prisoners as well. If they are arrested for just about anything, the way they get their conviction is to compel a confession out of them by torturing them.

Let me also remind Members, too, and the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) made mention of this as well, forced abortion is commonplace in China. Brothers and sisters are illegal. Women are compelled to have their children destroyed because they do not fit into a grandiose plan by this dictatorship. That too is an egregious human rights abuse. At the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal it was construed to be a crime against humanity. It is a crime against humanity in 2004 as it is practiced in the People's Republic of China. This resolution puts us on record against it and says let us take our case to the UN Human Rights Commission and hopefully we can garner sufficient votes to censure this despicable behavior. I hope we have unanimous support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, first of all, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) of the Select Committee on Homeland Security for his very eloquent statement and to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and especially to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), who is a very strong and steadfast supporter of human rights around the globe, including China, and of course the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who also speaks out boldly on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great leaders in the whole human rights movement in China is a man by the name of Harry Wu. Most people know about him. He is a man who has an impeccable reputation for honesty, persistence, and courage. He is a hero of democracy. He spent 19 years in the Chinese laogai system and suffered immensely for it. His witness is a rebuke to the hardliners in Beijing. I will never forget when he helped us organize one of our first committee hearings on PRC abuse back when I chaired the Committee on International Operations and Human Rights. The hearing was on the laogai. He brought in six survivors of the laogai. One of those survivors was Palden Gyatso, a Buddhist monk who tried to get through security into the Rayburn Building bringing the instruments of torture that are routinely used and deployed to abuse prisoners in the laogai, including cattle prods and the like, horrible, horrific implements. He was stopped, obviously, by the guards who were wondering what is this all about. We had to go down and usher him through. Sadly those kinds of torture instruments, Mr. Speaker, are commonplace in the PRC. Torture is commonplace.—An everyday occurrence.

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) talked about PRC promises made but never kept. They sign covenants. They say they are going to do this. It makes good headlines. The Chinese government, however, routinely does not follow through, and so it will be with the most recent property rights announcement. They make promises, and it is predictable they do not follow through.

The Internation Committee for Red Cross has been trying for years, to get into the Chinese prisons. To inspect and to hold the PRC to account. They cannot get in because it is closed, because torture is routinely used against political and religious prisoners and against other prisoners as well. If you are arrested for just about anything, watch out. The way PRC thugs get their conviction is to compel confessions out of the accused by torturing them.

Let me also remind Members, too, and the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) made mention of this as well, forced abortion is commonplace in China. Brothers and sisters are illegal because big brother in Beijing says so. Women are compelled to have their children destroyed because they do not fit into a grandiose plan of quotas and permission slips by the dictatorship. That too is an egregious human rights abuse. At the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal forced abortion was construed to be a crime against humanity. It is a crime against humanity in 2004 as it is practiced in the People's Republic of China. This resolution puts us on record against China's brutal one child per couple policy. This resolution admonishes the administration to take our case to the UN Human Rights Commission and work to garner sufficient votes to censure this despicable government behavior. I hope we have unanimous support for this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 530, a bill that makes a strong statement of advocacy for human rights and urges the People's Republic of China to adhere to the principles of international law and respect for the fundamental human rights of individuals. This bill is timely in light of the equally urgent crisis that occurs today in Haiti.

We must work to ensure that all of our international neighbors uphold the principles of international law. On July 9th of last year, I participated in a rally held on the Capitol lawn to uphold justice and freedom for the practitioners of the Falun Gong religion.

As I stood that day to support the practitioners of Falun Gong and their unwarranted persecution, I stand today to request that Congress must insist that China adheres to worldwide standards on human rights and toleration.

We as a nation have a unique relationship with the People's Republic of China, and we must take every action to maintain and foster that relationship. Yet we cannot overlook the injustices committed in that nation. The persecution of the Falun Gong, an organization whose three principles are truthfulness, compassion, and tolerance, is a prime example of that very injustice I speak of.

I must preempt my statement by clarifying that this bill will not serve to diminish the strength of our two great nations' relationship; rather it will cultivate an environment of peace and regional security. This bill will send the People's Republic of China a clear message that it must alter its current position on Human rights in order to be a true member of the world community.

As one of our largest trading partners our relationship with China has become closer then ever. We are constantly building new bridges of communication; politically, socially, and economically. Yet we cannot be content with these developments. We cannot sit idly by while China forces women to abort their children and imprisons people based on their religious beliefs. The World Community has set general principles for human rights. The simple fact is that China is not meeting these standards.

The fear of change and diversity has infected the minds of those who are in a position to wield power and physical strength. The situation will not change until we take a clear position condemning China for its human rights abuses.

Because of our unique relationship with the People's Republic of China we have a strong footing upon which to make these claims. By working with China, with the explicit goals of improving human rights conditions in that country, we can make China a better, safer country and create a new and stronger relationship between the United States and China. Our demands that China meet internationally accepted levels for human rights will not serve to hinder China's development, rather it will enable China to flourish.

I will end by saying that we as Americans have a duty to stand up for those who are less fortunate, for those who voices are forced into silence, and for those shackled down by tyranny. We espouse and will constantly fight for human rights, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion in this country as well as internationally. Join me in supporting H. Res. 530.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on International Relations and the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, and as a friend of the Chinese people, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution.

In the three decades since President Nixon made his historic trip to China, that country has undergone a remarkable transformation that all of us in this House should applaud.

Gone are the Red Guards, the mass rallies, and the ubiquitous Mao Suits. Today's, young Chinese enjoy a far better standard of living than their parents. They are often dressed in stylish western fashions. They have access to western movies, books, and the Internet. Bicycles, once the primary means of transportation for millions of urban Chinese, are being replaced by scooters, motorcycles and growing numbers of cars.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one area where the China of 2004 is little changed from the China of 1972: the Chinese government's persistent and systematic abuse of the human rights of its citizens. Even as we deepen and broaden the commercial, diplomatic, and cultural ties with China, the United States must not sacrifice its commitment to freedom, democracy, the rule of law, human rights and religious freedom.

Chinese prisons, labor camps, and psychiatric hospitals are filled with political prisoners. Fifteen years after the 1989 pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananment Square, many protesters remain in prison and Beijing has continued its efforts to extinguish expressions of protest or criticism and have detained and sentenced scores of Chinese citizens associated with attempts to organize peaceful protests, to expose corruption, to preserve their ethnic minority identity, and to use the Internet for the free exchange of ideas.

China's persecution of religious minorities has been especially cruel. China's small Christian population has been subject to persecution and many Catholic and Protestant leaders have been imprisoned or placed under house arrest. Practitioners of Falun Gong, which Chinese authorities denounce as an illegal cult, have been singled out for especially harsh treatment. Some Falun Gong adherents have been tortured to death in Chinese prisons; others have been sent to reeducation camps that have changed little since the days of the Cultural Revolution.

Beijing's obsession with eradicating the Falun Gong has not been confined to China. The FBI is investigating possible links between the Chinese government and attacks upon Falun Gong practitioners here in the United States.

The Chinese government has continued its brutal repression of Tibet. The whereabouts of the boy identified by the Dalai Lama as the 11th Panchen Lama are unknown. Tibetans caught displaying photos of this child or of the Dalai Lama face fines or imprisonment. Tibetan prisoners have been executed without due process and others remain on death row. Beijing continues to move ethnic Chinese citizens into Tibet in order to dilute and gradually extinguish the cultural and social identity of the Tibetan people.

During the December 2002 session of the United States-China Bilateral Human Rights Dialogue, Beijing agreed to invite, without conditions, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the United Nations Special Rapporteurs on Religious Intolerance and Torture, and the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to visit China. None of these visits have taken place and, in the case of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, two agreed upon trips were canceled because of unacceptable conditions placed on the visit by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including refusing the Commission entry into Hong Kong.

China's refusal to live up to its promises to cooperate with American and United Nations human rights representatives is especially troubling as the United States decision not to introduce a resolution calling upon the People's Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China at last year's session of United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva was based, in part, on the belief that the aforementioned agreements signaled a good faith commitment on the part of Chinese officials to improve human rights practice in China.

In fact, since the last session of the United States-China Bilateral Human Rights Dialogue, a number of very troubling incidents have occurred, including: arrests of democracy advocates; the detention and torture of 18 Tibetans who were forcibly repatriated from Nepal with the cooperation of Chinese officials, in contravention of international law; ongoing forced repatriation of North Korean nationals, who upon return to North Korea will face almost certain arrest, torture, or even death; arrest and sentencing of Internet essayists and labor protesters; and the continued refusal to allow access by United States diplomats and family members of the accused to the trials of those detained for political or religious activities.

China's continued abysmal human rights record has convinced me that Beijing will not take the necessary steps to improve its human rights record absent the external pressure and exposure of a U.S.-sponsored resolution in Geneva. The late Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis famously said, ''Sunlight is the best disinfectant.'' The Chinese leadership will doubtless resist our efforts to open the shutters to allow that light to illuminate its repression, but I believe that China will be better for it in the end. The Chinese government would do well to remember that the eyes of the world will be focused on China in four years' time when Beijing hosts the 2008 Olympic Games. For China, readying itself to host the world must mean more than building an Olympic Village and sporting venues. China must also rise to meet the aspirations of the Olympic movement by dismantling the systems of repression that stifle dissent, free expression, and religious observance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the Members of this House to support this important Resolution.

As I remarked in a speech on trade relations nearly four years ago, the most powerful nation on earth cannot ignore the most populous nation of earth. The United States, in my view, must use its best efforts to move the People's Republic of China toward democratic reform, market economics and the rule of law.

However, even as we seek to engage the People's Republic on issues of mutual interest and concern, we have a continuing obligation, in my view, to hold the communist regime in Beijing accountable for its unjustified and indefensible human rights violations.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reported that China has detained a group of Hong Kong residents—including at least three British citizens—and has begun to prosecute them on espionage charges.

One of the British citizens charged is accused of, among other things, discussing he 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre with a British agent.

And it remains unclear how these British citizens are being prosecuted under Chinese law for activities that allegedly took place in Hong Kong before China resumed control of that territory.

And just last week, the State Department's 2003 Human Rights Report Scored Beijing on this issue. The report stated:

''We began 2003 with hopes that the incremental but unprecedented progress in China seen in 2002 would be continued and expanded; however, throughout the year, we saw backsliding on key human rights issues. Arrests of democracy activists, individuals discussing subjects deemed sensitive by the Government on the Internet, HIV/AIDS activists, protesting workers, defense lawyers advocating on behalf of dissidents or the dispossessed, house church members and others seeking to take advantage of the space created by Chinese reforms increased.''

In short, this Resolution urges the United States to introduce a resolution at the 60th Session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission that calls on China to end its human rights violations and to meet internationally recognized standards for human rights.

Furthermore, it states that the United States should take the lead in organizing support for the passage of such a resolution, and that American officials continue to speak out against religious and political persecution in China, as well as coercive family planning practices, forced labor camps, the forced repatriation of North Korean nationals and other abuses.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for introducing this Resolution. And I urge all my Members to support it.

The People's Republic has made great economic progress over the last half century. But its persistent pattern of human rights abuses is a dark stain on its record. As a beacon of liberty and democracy, we have an obligation to ensure that it is held accountable for such abuses.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. I rise in support of H. Res. 530, and I'd like to commend my colleague, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for sponsoring this important and timely resolution. This bill urges the U.S. Representative to the 60th Session of a the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce a resolution calling upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its human rights abuses. H. Res. 530 also urges the People's Republic of China to safeguard fundamental human rights.

Last year at the 59th Session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, the United States did not sponsor a resolution on the People's Republic of China. The United States refrained from doing so in part because of commitments which the Government of China made to the United States during bilateral talks in December of 2002 that it would improve its human rights record and would allow greater access of international monitors into the country. However, these commitments were not fulfilled.

In fact, during the past year we witnessed continued disturbing trends in the human rights situation in China. Indeed, in last week's release of the State Department's annual Country Reports of Human Rights Practices, referring to China, it notes that, ''We saw backsliding on key human rights issues.''

Unfortunately, there are far too many examples of their ''backsliding.'' In January, Tibetan activist Lobsang Dhondup (Lob-sang Dun-op) was executed without due process. Arrests and harsh sentencing of democracy activists, critics on the Internet, and labor organizers continued throughout the year. And other than the lone release of Tibetan prisoner of conscience, Phuntsog Nyidrol (Putt-sok Nee-droo), last week—the day after the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices was released—there have been no recent releases of political prisoners. Further, religious adherents continue to be persecuted, and Falun Gong followers remain targeted by the government. Another area of grave concern is Beijing's forced repatriation of North Korean refugees in China and other human rights abuses directed against these refugees, including the trafficking of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, the People's Republic of China must understand that increased bilateral cooperation in other areas, including security, does not in any way negate or lessen obligations to uphold basic human rights. I encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 530.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). 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. 530, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. 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 H. Res. 530, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY OF HOUSE FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN IRAN

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 526) expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the victims of the devastating earthquake that occurred on December 26, 2003, in Bam, Iran.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 526

Whereas approximately 40,000 men, women, and children, including a United States citizen, perished in an earthquake that occurred on December 26, 2003, in Bam, Iran;

Whereas the people of the United States immediately expressed their sincerest sympathy by sending aid to the victims of the earthquake in Iran;

Whereas 90 percent of the 2,000 year-old city of Bam was destroyed;

Whereas the magnificent buildings in Bam belonged not only to the people of Iran, but to our common world heritage;

Whereas President George W. Bush lifted sanctions on Iran temporarily in order to enable United States relief organizations to swiftly send aid to Bam;

Whereas United States aid channeled through United States-based relief organizations and charities has been warmly welcomed by the people of Iran;

Whereas United States aid workers have been received with generosity and great appreciation in Iran;

Whereas the United States generosity has confirmed that the United States holds no ill will toward the people of Iran; and

Whereas the spirit and compassionate conduct of the United States has won it tremendous goodwill among the people of Iran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the earthquake that occurred on December 26, 2003, in Bam, Iran, and their loved ones;

(2) expresses its heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for the courageous work of the United States and international aid personnel saving lives in Iran; and

(3) welcomes the President's decision to issue a general license for donations to nongovernmental entities engaged in humanitarian relief activities in response to the earthquake in Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise in support of House Resolution 526, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) on February 11, 2004, expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the victims of the devastating earthquake that occurred on December 26, 2003, in Bam, Iran. This resolution is a reflection of the goodwill that emanates from the people of the United States to the people of Iran during their time of great need and profound sorrow.

On that tragic day, an earthquake measuring 6.6 on the Richter scale struck the southeastern area of Iran. During the days that followed, the American people and the rest of the world watched in sympathy as helpless Iranian families tried to put the pieces of their lives back together. With approximately 40,000 people dead, 30,000 people injured, and up to 75,000 people made homeless, the U.S. Government reacted in solidarity with the Iranian people by implementing necessary measures so that millions of dollars in emergency earthquake assistance could be distributed through United States relief organizations.

Immediately, the President directed that a general license be issued to temporarily permit U.S. individuals or nongovernmental organizations to transfer funds to organizations operating in Iran to assist humanitarian aid activities. I commend the administration's handling of this tragic situation and President Bush's message that ''We stand ready to help the people of Iran.''

Many factors characterize the perceived power and greatness of America throughout the world. However, it is the spirit of our unconditional compassion in times like these that truly resonates in the hearts and minds of the Iranian people and communicates our real hopes and desires for them.

Currently, the people of Iran need their courage and strength to help parallel the efforts by international aid personnel in rebuilding their lives. Children who are orphaned and homeless will need guidance and direction from their elders. Elders who are grieving the loss of their loved ones will need the inspiration of their youth to go on. Through their trials and tribulations, the Iranian people have proved to be a resilient force while never losing hope for the blessings of a new day. I am convinced that through exercising their faith and reconstructing their lives a stronger and empowered community will be unearthed.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for introducing this meaningful resolution and thank him for his understanding of Iran's needs and challenges. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for this important resolution.

The suffering of the Iranian people from the Bam earthquake in December is incalculable. As many as 50,000 dead, countless injured. Tragic as well is the destruction of 90 percent of an historic 2,000-year-old city. This is truly a loss to all the world. The resolution appropriately expresses the heartfelt sympathy of the House for the victims of

the earthquake and for their loved ones. It also expresses gratitude for the courageous work of U.S. and international aid personnel and relief workers. It was right for the administration to temporarily lift the sanctions that otherwise would have prevented such humanitarian activities in Iran.

Relief workers in Iran came from the United States and around the world. They were ordinary people like Jim Ricci of St. Paul, Minnesota serving in the Air National Guard. Mr. Ricci, who was on his third tour of duty in the Persian Gulf, was on the last of the military's 11 humanitarian flights to Iran. Relief also came from groups like the American Refugee Committee International, headquartered in Minnesota. The American Refugee Committee helped coordinate several significant relief efforts, while donating medical supplies and nonfood items. This coordinated assistance was critical in providing the most effective aid programs possible.

Everyone in Congress is concerned by the conduct of the Islamic Republic of Iran, particularly by the hardliners who dominate the regime, support for terrorism, threats against Israel's existence, deceitful pursuit of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction, and notorious human rights abuse. This recent stacked-deck election are cases in point. We all share the concerns about the Iranian regime, but we also know it is wrong to blame the Iranian people. I believe the vast majority of Iranian people would yearn for the freedom and the friendship with the U.S. and the world at large.

This resolution recognizes the common humanity of Americans and Iranians. Our common bond of humanity was also acknowledged by the Iranians, who held a spontaneous candlelight vigil on behalf of the victims of September 11, 2001.

The Iranian people should know they have our deepest sympathies for their terrible tragedy. I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for an excellent statement, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and also the gentlewoman for supporting this resolution. I want to particularly thank the chairman for always responding when it comes to international affairs and making our Congress proud.

Mr. Speaker, we have the support of many great colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), just to mention a few of the cosponsors of this resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for being the prime sponsor and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for all his support, again.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 526, which expresses the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the victims of the devastating earthquake that occurred on December 26, 2003, in Bam, Iran.

□ 1515

More than 40,000 men, women and children, including an American, were killed when the ancient city of Bam was struck by a massive earthquake. While the final toll is still being tallied, the loss of life ranks this as one of the worst human tragedies in recent memory. Aside from the unspeakable humanitarian disaster, which has been pointed out on the floor today, more than 90 percent of the 2,000-year-old city was destroyed. Indeed, in this destruction was the magnificent citadel of Bam.

Located in southeastern Iran, 200 kilometers south of Kerman, Bam was made mostly of mud bricks, clay, straw, and the trunks of palm trees. The more modern part of the city was originally founded during the Sassanian Period, around the third century A.D.

During this time of suffering, the American people immediately showed their sympathy and offered their help. Rescue teams and aid personnel from all over our Nation jumped into action as though this tragedy hit their own next-door neighbors.

President Bush was among those who acted with great speed. He temporarily lifted sanctions on Iran only 5 days after the earthquake. The President's actions enabled American relief organizations to swiftly send aid to the people of Bam. It is not inconsequential that American help was warmly received and welcomed by the Iranian people. Our workers were received with generosity and great appreciation by the Iranian people.

Teams from the Mercy Corps were among the first to arrive and worked hand in hand with local aid organizations. American and Iranian personnel rescued people from the rubble and brought much-needed supplies to very weary survivors.

Our brave aid workers dispelled misconceptions about America that pervade the Middle East. They showed the real essence of our great Nation and of our people, one of generosity and one of compassion.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership that President Bush has shown in exempting humanitarian aid from U.S. sanctions on Iran will go a long way towards improving understanding by the people of Iran, the Mideast and America towards each other. The President's actions have shown that two societies can work with each other in a time of great need and in a time of great trauma and strife.

I ask that the Congress join me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy for the victims of the Bam earthquake and our gratitude and appreciation for the courageous work of the American aid personnel.

By passing this important resolution, we will commend President Bush's decision and this Congress' support to temporarily make aid organizations exempt from the sanctions on Iran, and we will continue to show that the compassion and generosity that has kept America the world's leader in humanitarian missions still continue to this day.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to express my sincere support for this resolution. I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for bringing this forward, and our distinguished chairman on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for making sure for the people of Iran that we stand with them during this terrible loss of life.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a heartfelt supporter of H. Res. 526 which expresses the sympathy of the House of Representatives for the victims of the devastating earthquake that occurred in Bam, Iran on December 26, 2003. It is important that we as a body stand united on issues that may not directly affect us but that are nonetheless very important. I am proud to say that members of this body and this nation as a whole stood up to support our brothers and sisters in Iran when this great tragedy occurred.

The numbers attributed to this earthquake are staggering. In a city with 100,000 residents at the time of the earthquake approximately 40,000 men, women, and children lost their lives due to this disaster. I have heard from many constituents in my district who told me they lost family members in Iran. I was told of some families who even lost as many as thirty-three members of their family. I'm sure this kind of heartbreak was felt throughout the entire Iranian American community.

While the human toll was immense, the sheer destruction of the city of Bam was truly tragic. It is estimated that a full ninety percent of the city was completely destroyed. Unfortunately the historical value of a 2,000 year old city is lost to us forever.

We must take more than sadness away from this tragedy; we must now focus our efforts on how to prevent the deadly effects of future disasters. The amount of casualties in this disaster were far too high. To demonstrate the effect of the quake on this region—as compared to other regions, an earthquake of 6.2 magnitude in Los Angeles on December 23 left a casualty of only two persons as compared to approximately 40,000 in Iran. The number of casualties was so high particularly because of the quality of the local building material consisting of mudbricks, and construction techniques using little reinforcements. We must study ways to protect people throughout the world from being involved in a tragedy like the one in Bam. This is why I have joined the Iran Earthquake Task Force initiated by the Iranian Medical Relief Foundation (IMRF). I

urge all Members of this body to follow suit and pursue actions that will facilitate greater protection from the effects of natural disasters.

We must show the world that we stand with them when tragic natural disasters occur. I was proud to see that so many U.S. based charities and organizations joined the world community to care for those affected by the earthquake. I commend the efforts of so many who took their time and effort to search through the rubble. Their heroic efforts may not have been able to reverse the tragic disaster, but the world realized that we as a nation stand by our humanitarian obligations. I hope we will continue this proud practice whenever events such as this occur.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 526.

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. HYDE. 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.

DESIGNATION OF AND TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES AS BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108–166)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 502(f) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the ''Act''), I am writing to inform you of my intent to designate Algeria as a beneficiary developing country and to terminate the designation of Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Bahrain, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia as beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP).

I have considered the criteria set forth in sections 501 and 502 of the Act. In light of these criteria, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to Algeria. I have also determined that Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, and Bahrain have become ''high income'' countries, and I therefore terminate their designation as beneficiary developing countries effective January 1, 2006. Furthermore, consistent with the Act's prohibition on designation of European Union member states as beneficiary developing countries, I am terminating such designation for the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia when they become European Union member states.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 2004.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3752, COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2004

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–430) on the resolution (H. Res. 546) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3752) to promote the development of the emerging commercial human space flight industry, to extend the liability indemnification regime for the commercial space transportation industry, to authorize appropriations for the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on two motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3769, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 526, by the yeas and nays.

House Resolution 530 will be voted on tomorrow.

Each electronic vote today will be conducted as a 15-minute vote.

BEN ATCHLEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3769.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3769, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
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
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—50

Aderholt
Baca
Bell
Berry
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Castle
Chocola
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeMint
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Filner
Gilchrest
Gutierrez
Harman
Herger
Hinojosa
Hooley (OR)
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kucinich
Lantos
Markey
McCotter
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Mollohan
Napolitano
Ortiz
Ose
Pelosi
Pence
Reyes
Rodriguez
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schiff
Smith (MI)
Toomey
Towns
Waters
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1856

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 32, due to urgent constituent support commitments in my Congressional District, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY OF HOUSE FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 526.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 526, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—381

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
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
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—52

Aderholt
Baca
Bell
Berry
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Castle
Chocola
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeMint
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Evans
Filner
Gilchrest
Gutierrez
Harman
Herger
Hinojosa
Hooley (OR)
Jones (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kucinich
Lantos
Markey
Marshall
McCotter
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Mollohan
Murtha
Napolitano
Ortiz
Ose
Pelosi
Pence
Reyes
Rodriguez
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schiff
Smith (MI)
Toomey
Towns
Waters
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN)(during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1913

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.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 33, due to urgent constituent support commitments in my Congressional District, I missed

the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes 32 and 33. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on each of those votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 32 and 33, for personal reasons, I was unable to be in the chamber when the time elapsed on the vote.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted ''yea'' for both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from leading a Congressional delegation trip to Iraq and due to an unavoidable delay, I was unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 32 and 33. Had I been here I would have voted ''yea'' for rollcall vote 32, and ''yea'' for rollcall vote 33.

INVESTIGATE HAITI CLAIMS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, needless to say, all of our eyes have been focused on a small little nation just south of this great Nation. Small though it may be, Haiti stood alongside Americans in their fight for independence, and Haiti stands this 200th year as an independent democratic nation.

As we read the Nation's headlines, we see Haitians struggle to pull their nation out of chaos, and then the most tragic statement came this weekend when words were stated by President Aristide that someone, this Nation, allegedly forced him to leave his beloved nation, forced him to leave his position as the duly elected president of Haiti.

I believe this Congress cannot sit in silence. So I am asking the Speaker and the leader of the House to convene major congressional investigations that will include a number of committees, and, in particular, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

We must know the truth of the CIA's involvement, who directed the military, and what occurred on that fateful night. America has the responsibility to take the high moral standard. And even though Haiti is not Iraq, Haiti is still a country that we should feel for. Haiti asked us to come in peace, but it seems as if we came in war. An investigation is necessary and we must do it now.

IN HONOR OF TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Texas' Independence Day, March 2, 1836, the day that Texas declared its independence from Mexico.

On that fateful day, the Texas Declaration of Independence from Mexico was signed by State delegates and began Texans' journey to joining the United States in 1845. As all Texans know, this was not a calm time or serene event. Indeed, as the delegates prepared the very document itself, the Alamo, the famous mission in San Antonio, and our ancestors were literally under siege by the Mexican army. And as all Americans know, the battle of the Alamo was one of the greatest in American history where 189 brave Texans gave their lives, pushing back around 1,600 opposing soldiers in what became the strategic turning point in the ultimate and successful push for Texas independence.

Mr. Speaker, as we pause again to commemorate Texas on its most important anniversary, I also rise to recognize the countless important contributions that Texans have given to our great Nation since those tumultuous times. Thousands of brave Texas men and women, including many from the Ninth District, bravely serve in our armed forces, and Texas continually produces great civic and business leaders, strongly promotes the arts, and proudly serves as an international hub of commerce and culture.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the great State of Texas on this momentous occasion, to honor all the heroes who gave their lives so that Texas eventually won its hard-fought independence, and to salute Texans who defend our Nation and promote peace and America's interests worldwide.

MARK MCCLELLAN: THE WRONG MAN FOR THE JOB

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, Members of this body should be alarmed that Secretary Tommy Thompson, Secretary of Health and Human Services, named Food and Drug Commissioner Dr. Mark McClellan, a vocal opponent of importing drugs from Canada, to lead a government study of reimportation. This decision is a bad one and is a slap in the face of 243 Members of Congress who voted in support of the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act.

As head of the FDA, Dr. McClellan has vehemently opposed the importation of drugs from Canada. Despite the assurance of Secretary Thompson that the study will be balanced and fair, with Dr. McClellan at the helm there is no way this study will be seen as objective. With the proper effort and technology, it is clearly possible for pharmaceuticals to be safely reimported from Canada and from other countries. American consumers are now asked to subsidize the consumers in the rest of the world by the prices we are charged. This is an issue that will not go away.

Madam Speaker, in closing, no matter what barriers they erect and excuses the FDA or drug companies offer, Americans will continue to search for the much lower drug prices found everywhere else in the world.

[From the Omaha World Herald, Mar. 1, 2004]

CHOOSE SOMEONE ELSE

The Bush administration on Wednesday took a step toward establishing a commonsense policy on importing prescription drugs from Canada. Then it took two steps back. That's no way to reach a reasonable policy on a highly significant issue.

Good: Officials announced a year-long study of how drugs could be safely imported from Canada, where the prices can be 60 percent or more lower than U.S. citizens pay. Importation is technically against the law, but many senior citizens, some encouraged and even aided by their local or state governments, do it anyway. The saving is significant for those on fixed incomes and the risks appear minimal.

Bad: U.S. officials appointed Dr. Mark B. McClellan, recently nominated to head the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, to lead the study. McClellan has been a vocal and vehement opponent of any change in the rules that prohibit drug imports, and his agency has threatened legal action against local and state governments that help seniors.

In the Senate, Democrats and some Republicans have objected. ''Putting the fox in charge of the chicken house,'' observed Sen. Byron Dorgan, D–N.D. McClellan has already shown ''a personal bias'' against drug importation, said a spokeswoman for Sen. John McCain, R–Ariz.

Health and Human Services Department leaders promised a balanced commission and a thorough study of the issue. But Director Tommy Thompson has launched a leaky ship with serious holes in its credibility merely by appointing McClellan to captain it.

Drug importation distresses the pharmaceutical industry for obvious reasons. The Canadian government regulates prescription prices. In the recent Medicare reform bill that would give senior citizens a prescription drug benefit in 2006, Congress forbade the federal government from negotiating for lower drug prices for Americans. That is industry-friendly to the extreme.

So is the appointment of McClellan to such a sensitive post. The administration shouldn't squander the opportunity to settle this contentious issue in a rational manner. And it shouldn't squander its credibility by so blatantly stacking the deck. A more objective professional should be chosen.

□ 1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). 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.

EXTENSION OF ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today over in the Senate, our colleagues are having a debate on basically assault weapons to certainly make sure that we renew that by September 13 and also making sure that we close the loopholes in the gun shows.

Mr. Speaker, the NRA today, once again, reached into their bag of tricks to kill a bill it actually supported. Earlier the Senate had voted to add two commonsense gun safety measures to the gun industry liability bill. One would extend the ban on assault weapons. The other would close the gun show loophole bill. Because of this, the NRA said, Jump, and its supporters in the Senate said, How high?

It marked a triumph of special interests in this country. Our Nation's police officers have worked hard to keep assault weapons off our streets. That is why Congress must revisit the assault weapons ban without attaching special interest handouts. Otherwise, assault weapons will go back onto America's streets in 195 days. That is the good news for terrorists and cop-killing criminals. That is the good news for drug dealers. That is the good news for the gangs that are across our country. Unfortunately, it is bad news for America's families and communities and police officers.

Since I took the floor in the House 1 week ago, 400 more Americans have died from gun violence; but instead of a sense of urgency, the House has stood idly by. Some seem content to let the assault weapons ban expire on September 13, the ban that has kept us safer for the last 10 years.

It has also respected the rights of gun owners, protecting the hunting rifles, shotguns, and pistols favored by law-abiding citizens. We do not have problems with people owning guns, but gun owners need to take responsibility on making sure certain guns do not get onto the street.

Only criminals have been kept from their gun of choice. This explains why 66 percent of gun owners support renewing the ban. The American people support it by even more overwhelming margins. Once again, our Nation's law enforcement officers are leading the fight to keep assault weapons, making sure that they are not back on our streets.

But today, I want to highlight one notable flaw in the assault weapons ban. A loophole in the law has allowed gun makers to create hundreds of copycat weapons. The MAC–10, this gun right here, has become the MPA–10. The AK–47 has clones, so many of them, they are too numerous to count. Cosmetically altering the TEC–9, for example, has resulted in the fully legal AB–10. Cosmetically. This is what the gun manufacturers are allowed to do. The A-B, by the way, stands for ''after ban,'' but one can see they almost look identical.

Another weapon advertised for its ability to circumvent the law is the Bushmaster XM–15. People might remember this gun. This was the gun used by the D.C. snipers. Residents of D.C. and across this country know what that weapon was able to do. During October 2002, the snipers used the gun to kill 10 people and wound three others. Bushmaster's slogan for the gun, ''The Best—by a long shot,'' provided deadly accuracy for those in its cross-hairs.

I came to Congress to fight for gun safety. I have fought for commonsense, effective measures, which is why I have introduced H.R. 2038, which would renew the ban, while closing these particular gaping holes.

Let us face it, you cannot tell me that the American people want to see these particular guns back on the streets. You cannot tell me that you want to have our police officers coming across the drug dealer, the terrorists that possibly might be in this country, to come across these.

Another fact, by the way: our police officers have to wear special armor. These guns can go through that armor.

I came here 10 years ago when I was not in Congress to make sure that this bill went through, and now it is time for the American people to realize the power that they have. People always say they have no voice in government. Well, you can have a voice; but you have to call your representative here in Congress. You have to start calling the Senate again. You have to call the Speaker of the House and allow the bill to come up for a vote. We are told that it is not going to be able to come up for a vote. That is wrong, when the American people want to make sure this does not happen again.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Members are reminded not to refer to actions in the other body.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK FEE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–431) on the resolution (H. Res. 547) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patent fees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HEROIN GROWTH IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of our Nation's most difficult narcotics problems: Afghanistan.

Afghanistan has historically produced significant quantities of opium which is refined into heroin. Afghanistan's opium crops accounted for over 70 percent of the world's supply in the year 2000. According to the DEA, about 50 percent of the heroin in the American market originated in the Afghanistan-Pakistani border area in 1984.

We must learn from history and diligently work to prevent any Afghan heroin from entering the American market. While Europe is the primary destination for Afghan heroin today, we suspect that 7 to 10 percent of the illegal crop ultimately reaches the streets of our congressional districts.

Opium production in Afghanistan has resumed over the past 2 years. With the fall of the Taliban, Afghan growers resumed cultivation despite the renewal of the ban on poppy growth by the Karzai government. This problem could grow far worse. Only 8 percent of Afghanistan's cultivated land is presently used to grow opium poppies. If we do not prevail over this problem, the remaining cultivated land could easily accommodate more of this illegal crop.

These drugs are of great concern to all of us because they increase the worldwide supply and have the potential to fund terrorists and other destabilizing groups, and they subvert all of our efforts to assist Afghanistan. The new Afghanistan cannot survive on an illegal economy.

Drug proceeds are the source of a growing reservoir of illegal money that funds international crime across the region; that sustains the destabilizing activities of warlords; and that fosters local coercion and terrorism. Just like the challenges faced south of our own borders for decades, I am convinced that drug money and terrorist organizations in Afghanistan and throughout that region are locked together like a daisy chain. Our resolve to restore Afghanistan must include a broad, comprehensive plan to eradicate poppy production, not only to help the people of Afghanistan, but to cut off the funding of the terror organizations that threaten our own security.

I recently returned from a trip to Libya, Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan. We met with President Karzai and he reaffirmed my conviction that he means business. He is serious about tackling the heroin threat to his country. Together, we must prevent the institutionalization of the heroin cartels. We must support democracy's early days in post-Taliban Afghanistan. We must help them confront those that still threaten to destabilize their society through both the narcotics trade and terrorism. If we are to win the war in Afghanistan, we must recognize that narcotics play a large part in funding the radical anti-democratic elements.

We are pressing for increased coordination with the British on counternarcotics; with the Germans on policing and police training; and with the Italians on justice sector reform. In addition to the traditional smuggling routes through Iran and Turkey, reports indicate a continued movement of heroin shipments north from Afghanistan through the central Asian states, Pakistan and India en route to international markets.

Our strongest partners in these efforts must be those consumer nations where the drugs are destined. The financial, resource, and intelligence requirements to defeat the scourge are not our sole responsibility. The administration must seek commitments from Europe and elsewhere to share this burden, where they get 90 percent of the heroin.

Let me give my colleagues an example of a successful international operation. Operation Containment is an ongoing effort by the DEA. They recently arrested 15 members of a heroin trafficking organization and seized 7.4 tons of morphine base in Turkey. Morphine base can be converted to heroin at a ratio of one to one with a chemical. This is the largest seizure of morphine base ever made. To put the magnitude of this seizure in perspective, the amount seized was more than four times the total worldwide morphine base seizures made in 2000.

There are legitimate uses of the chemical acetic anhydride in industry. Countries that produce this chemical must do their part by restricting or controlling its sale and transportation to legitimate consumers.

The Department of Defense has seen the magnitude of the transshipment problem with three separate seizures by the U.S. Navy operating in the Gulf region. The first seizure was made on December 15 when a motorized dhow was apprehended in the Arabian Gulf. Two tons of narcotics were seized, and three of the 15-man crew were identified as having possible ties to al Qaeda. On December 18, two more dhows were intercepted. Those seizures yielded drugs worth more than $10 million.

I am passionate about this subject. I have chaired a hearing on Afghanistan just last week. Many of the members of my subcommittee have visited the region. The administration must extract commitments from the Europeans to pull their own weight. As leaders of the coalition of Afghanistan and Iraq, the Department of Defense must be compelled to address the growth, storage, processing, and transshipment of drugs in the region. The bullets and bombs used against our own troops are purchased with illicit funds. The Department of State and the DEA must be resourced adequately to address and to assist Afghanistan in reestablishing a viable criminal justice system so that their own poppy ban can be effectively enforced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

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.)

□ 1930

LONGEST MAJOR STRIKE IN UFCW ENDS

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to discuss the end of a long strike; in fact, the longest major strike in the history of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union, and the largest and longest strike in the history of the supermarket industry, a strike that saw the United Food and Commercial Workers hold the line in southern California.

The dispute, which involved some 60,000 UFCW members employed at 852 Safeway-owned Vons and Pavillions stores, Kroger-owned Ralphs and Albertsons stores, began back in October 11, 2003. Officials for the grocery store chain said their workers had a Cadillac health plan that the stores could not maintain in a market with nonunion competitors such as Wal-Mart. I am not sure I would call the plan in question a Cadillac plan, but the proposal to replace it was clearly a Yugo.

Supermarket workers in southern California average about $12 to $14 an hour, and most work less than 40 hours a week, not by choice. Under the employer's proposal, after 3 years an average worker would earn about $12.30 an hour, that is $369 a week before taxes are taken out, or about $19,000 a year. That is a salary that can keep a single mom and her children just above the poverty line; but cut her health care benefits or shift several thousand dollars worth of health care costs from the company on to her and a self-supporting working family can be reduced to near poverty.

In fact, many workers will drop coverage because it will be too expensive and move over to Medi-Cal, which is California's Medicaid program for the elderly, poor, and disabled, as well as to other State and Federal programs for low-income workers. In my mind, this is safety net exploitation by employers. This marks a shift from the employer's books to the ledgers of the American taxpayer.

Thankfully, for 5 months the picket line remained strong, members remained united, and customers honored the workers' picket lines. This is a testament to the rank-and-file UFCW workers and to the leadership of UFCW local leaders. To people like Rick Icaza, President, and Rod Diamond, Secretary-Treasurer of UFCW Local 770; to Connie Leyva, President of UFCW Local 1428; Michael Straeter, President of UFCW Local 1442; to George Hartwell, President of Local 1036, Greg Conger, President of Local 324; Bill Lathrop, President of Local 1167; and Mickey Kasparian, President of Local 135 of the UFCW, we say thank you to you, and we hope that you will express our sincerest congratulations and thanks to all of your men and women in your locals who fought and stood tall throughout this entire 5-month long process.

Every day support for the fight for affordable health care grew stronger. Community and religious leaders joined the cause. The southern California supermarket strike became a national cause as well. There were rallies, picket lines, and hand billing across America.

The men and women on the picket lines are genuine heroes. Their sacrifice for affordable family health care has motivated and activated workers across the Nation. To the Webb family in Los Angeles I send a special message of esteem and pride. Andre and Dee, you, like many of your brothers and sisters, persevered. Christmas was tough this past December, but you weathered these difficult times in a way that makes all of us who are parents so very, very proud. And Andre, your daughter A.J. wrote you a letter for Valentine's Day, which many of us had a chance to read during the father-daughter dance at school, which you will never forget. She understood your fight and offered the best reason to stand firm. At 8 years of age, A.J. is already giving us a glimpse of the next generation of leaders for America.

The labor struggle in southern California is one manifestation of a very large national debate on health care. Lack of access to quality health care and escalating health care costs are issues of concern to all Americans, particularly to communities that are minority and very poor, that suffer the highest rates of uninsured Americans, and are also among those that are least well covered because of disproportionate and disparate health care received by these communities.

The lack of insurance is devastating to millions of families across America. We must make every effort to find ways to extend coverage and to work to end the erosion of employment-based health care coverage due to rising out-of-pocket health care costs that make insurance unaffordable for many workers. If the supermarket giants, profitable, growing corporations, can launch an attack on health care benefits, then every employer is sure to follow. They have sounded the alarm that the American health care system is under siege.

I say to all Americans who are working: Take note of what the United Food and Commercial Workers did over the last 5 months. They stood tall. Let us defend health care coverage for all Americans and we will fight to make sure our next generation also has it.

TRIBUTE TO COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR ERIC COOKE

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, there have been over 500 soldiers now killed in action in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and I rise this evening to share with the Members of this body a letter that my office received today in tribute to one of these great American heroes, Command Sergeant Major Eric Cooke.

''There seem to be so few heroes today. I wanted to tell you about one: Command Sergeant Major Eric Cooke of the First Armored Division. Command Sergeant Major Cooke died on Christmas Eve when a roadside bomb ripped into his Humvee north of Baghdad on a convoy to Samara. He was 43 years old.

''Just before his death, Command Sergeant Major Cooke had written my uncle, David Hunter, that he had not signed up for the 2-week Christmas leave available to soldiers who were deployed to Iraq because he could not take the leave knowing that one of his men would not be receiving theirs. CSM Cooke said he was lucky to have a loving wife who would understand why he was not coming home for Christmas. He was career United States Army, and she understood his commitment.

''On the day he died, Command Sergeant Major Cooke heard of an injured soldier who was in urgent need of O-positive blood, so he rushed to a nearby field hospital to donate his own. He almost missed that convoy going to Samara. Command Sergeant Major Cooke had the opportunity to have an armored Humvee, but he chose to give it to his men so they would be protected during armed escort duty, patrols and raid operations. His selfless service knew no limits.

''If you or I knew the day we would die, we might change the way we were living as that day approached. Command Sergeant Major Cooke did not need to change a thing. He lived each of his days in a selfless and noble manner. Every soldier's death is a tragedy, but this one seemed especially sad.

''Command Sergeant Major Cooke was buried at Arlington National Cemetery on January 5, 2004 at 3 p.m. with full military honors befitting an American hero.

''Written by Lucy Everett Edmondson of Rocky Mount, North Carolina.''

Mr. Speaker, I knew Command Sergeant Major Cooke. I met him on the tarmac at the Baghdad International Airport on December 22, 2 days before his death. It was my only opportunity to ever be in a theater of combat operations, and it seemed relatively safe there on the tarmac. But as I looked into his crystal clear blue eyes, he told me about his 26 years of service to this country in Kosovo, Desert Storm, Operation Enduring Freedom, and now Operation Iraqi Freedom as well. He was looking forward to his retirement in 4 years, but very proud of his service to his country.

Indeed, Ms. Edmondson, Sergeant Major Eric Cooke was a true American hero.

TRADE AGREEMENTS, THE U.S. ECONOMY, AND JOBS

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, 2 weeks ago, President Bush sent to Congress this Central American Free Trade Agreement, an agreement that would expand NAFTA to six countries in Central America. He plans later to send to Congress an agreement called the Free Trade Area of the Americas, which would expand NAFTA, except for Cuba, to all the rest of Latin America.

These two agreements will double the size of the North American Free Trade Agreement in population, will quadruple the number of low-income workers in what is now the North American Free Trade Agreement, so that in the Free Trade Area of the Americas it would have that many countries, that many people, that many low-income workers.

Now, you would think that the President of the United States would understand, with the economy the way it is, that this is not the right response. Ohio, my home State and that of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who is here, also from Toledo, our State has lost 166,000 manufacturing jobs. One out of six Ohio manufacturing jobs is gone, likely will not return, mostly gone overseas. Companies have shut down, companies have outsourced production, companies have moved their facilities overseas, south of the border, or elsewhere.

Ohio literally has lost, in fact the country has lost manufacturing jobs every single month since George Bush took office. This country has lost some 3 million jobs since President Bush took office. And to every bit of bad economic news, every time the unemployment rate goes up, every time there is a report on lost jobs, every time there is bad economic news, the President has two answers: Tax cuts for the people who need them least. Tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our society. Half these tax cuts go to the richest 1 percent. Tax cuts for the wealthy, hoping they trickle down and provide a few jobs maybe, or give some economic prosperity to the country. That is one of his answers. The other answer is more trade agreements, like NAFTA, like MFN/PNTR for China, like the World Trade Organization, more trade agreements that ship jobs overseas; that hemorrhage jobs overseas.

Now, in this economic report of the President, which came out last week, signed by President Bush, on page 4, issued by the President's Chief Economic Adviser Gregory Mankiw, also signed by him, he is the President's top economic adviser, it says that Mr. Mankiw predicted on behalf of the President that we would create 2.6 million jobs this year. Even the President's people, after that report came out, said, no, no, no, we cannot create that many, and they immediately disavowed parts of this report.

But it is the same old thing. When the President first took office, he said, give me the tax breaks and we will create millions of jobs. He got the tax cuts, but no jobs were created. Jobs were lost. Then after September 11, clearly a tragedy for our country, clearly a blow to our economy, but after September 11, the President said, give me more tax cuts for the wealthiest, aimed at the most wealthy people, the most privileged, the ones who needs it least in society, and we will create 2.5 million jobs. Again he said that, and again we had job loss in this country.

In this report now it says 2.6 million jobs will be created, but it is simply not happening. And again the President's response to every problem with our economy, as this economic report of the President says, more tax cuts for the wealthy and more trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs, that ship jobs overseas.

Now, as we continue, the President wants to see us do more tax cuts this year. Those tax cuts will go again overwhelmingly to the most privileged people in society. But Alan Greenspan came to this Congress last week and he said because we do not have any money, we are going to have to cut Social Security. So not only do the President's tax cuts not create jobs in this country, not only do the President's tax cuts, who overwhelmingly go to the wealthiest people in society, not only do they not simulate the economy and create jobs, but they also mean that the President and his economic advisers are making a choice; it is either tax cuts or funding Social Security.

They have made their choice. Alan Greenspan, the President's man at the Federal Reserve, has said we cannot afford to fully fund Social Security, and later he will talk the same about Medicare because we have this huge budget deficit. We have this huge budget deficit because of the these tax cuts going overwhelmingly to the wealthiest people. And Alan Greenspan and the President are saying we need this year to do additional tax cuts, again for the wealthiest people in society.

You see how this adds up? Tax cuts for the wealthiest people in society, trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs

and that ship jobs overseas. We do not have much in economic recovery and we have to cut Social Security. It simply does not add up.

The President needs to redirect his efforts against these trade agreements. Stop the trade agreements. No more tax cuts. Let us concentrate on job creation, creating manufacturing jobs and restoring Social Security.

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

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

□ 1945

THE CRISIS IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to joining my colleagues just a short while from now to lay out for the Members of the House, and in many instances the American people, just where we are as it relates to a small nation by the name of Haiti.

First, I applaud the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus not just for its involvement with Haiti over the last trying and tumultuous days, but I think it should be noted the constant meetings and engagement with this administration on providing the necessary resources so Haiti might understand. President Aristide has a longstanding relationship with this Nation inasmuch as he left the country some years ago in the 1990s so that Haiti might regain its strength and that there might be a democratic process. President Clinton restored Aristide to power around 1994 with a number of U.S. military troops as requested by the then-president. President Aristide did not attempt to be a dictator. He left office in 2 years and a new president was duly elected and he maintained his position for 5 years. At that time the people of Haiti decided to reelect President Aristide, and he came back to power.

During the course of that time, the world's economy collapsed. Money due to Haiti to ensure their economic survival were denied by this administration. There were constant negotiations and engagement of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and others to release their funds and work with Haiti to ensure that they followed all of the necessary rules, which fell on deaf ears.

Even as late as last summer, the economy of Haiti was crumbling because the world did not come to its aid. Some might say, here we go again, another nation to give sustenance to. But I say we need to look at this country, which is a mere 600 to 700 miles away from our shore, a country which stood alongside us during our Revolutionary War, and a nation which has maintained its independence for 200 years.

The Haitians look to the United States, the United States looks to the Haitians. Haitians are vibrant contributors to our economy. Many Haitians are living in south Florida in the district of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who has worked so tirelessly, along with his mother before him, to work on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are shamefaced today because President Aristide begged for our involvement to protect a democracy. He asked that this Nation not come in war, but it come to restore democracy and peace and the end of violence to a nation that was struggling. The cause of his demise or the conflict was based a lot on the lack of international resources, first from France and other allies, and certainly the United States participated in that.

Even the Congressional Black Caucus saw the writing on the wall but gave to this administration three easy accomplishments that would have thwarted the violence that we have seen over the last couple of days: (1) establish a humanitarian corps that would provide water and food and safety for those in Haiti; (2) devise an international peace effort bringing in allies from around the world who were willing; and (3) establish a political resolution which President Aristide was willing to engage in. President Aristide even accepted the cosharing of government with the opposition, and yet they refused.

I am fearful that what our Nation did was engage with the rebels, the insurgents and those who would undermine the government. What a conflict of position to go into Iraq with a unilateral preemptive strike to in essence undermine a despot like Saddam Hussein and to find weapons of mass destruction; but yet when a peaceful democracy led by a duly elected democratic president of that country asked for our involvement, we refuse to get involved. And yet when the question was posed, who are the insurgents, who do they represent, no one can identify whether these are simply thugs or drug dealers.

Even now as there is complete chaos in Haiti, we cannot understand why we would want to engage in negotiations with individuals who have a very shady background. I beg of this Congress to fully investigate the scenario of the last 48 hours and the unfortunate departure of President Aristide. Was he or was he not kidnapped? Mr. Speaker, this Congress must answer that question, and this Nation must be told the truth.

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

(Mr. DELAHUNT 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOEFFEL 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 Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE 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 Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE 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 California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER 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. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT 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. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 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.)

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

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

COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 30 months, 2½ years, since the attack of September 11, 2001, on the World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Virginia, and the loss of the plane in Pennsylvania and the loss of all of those lives, more than 3,000 lives lost on that particular day, all the result of the attack of a group of organized criminals known as al Qaeda, the base, or the al Qaeda network.

It is a very important thing for us to examine that attack and to understand it in its full dimensions and implications. It is very important for at least two reasons. First of all, there are the families and the friends, associates of all of those Americans who were killed that day. They have a right to expect that we will provide them with every detail, that we will look into this event, this catastrophe, this disaster meticulously, and we will understand it in every aspect, and all of that will be done publicly and they will have access to all of that information. We owe them, the families of the victims, nothing less, not a scintilla less than that.

Secondly, it is important because the al Qaeda network still exists, and they have others that are operating with them, perhaps in many countries around the world, and some people suggest as many as 60. To the extent that is true, we can expect that they are contemplating additional attacks on our country. In fact, our intelligence agencies inform us that they believe that is the case; and they are working diligently to try to prevent that from happening.

But nevertheless, these plans are being laid and in order for our intelligence agencies and our government to prevent another attack from occurring, we need to know everything possible about the attack of September 11, 2001: precisely who was behind it, how they formulated it, why they did it, what were their motivations, what information and evidence did we have prior to the attack, when did we have it, who had the information, to whom was that information communicated, how was it communicated, under what circumstances, how was it not communicated, and what did we do as a government before, during, and immediately after that attack. All of that information is essential knowledge if we have any chance of preventing another attack from occurring in the future.

So the commission that has been set up to examine these questions is obviously crucially important, and we should be working with them in a fully cooperative way. We should be providing them with all of the resources and all of the time they need to complete this very essential work. To the extent that we are not doing so, either this Congress or the administration, we are failing in our responsibilities to the American people and failing in a very serious way.

The commission is in existence now, but there was a question initially as to whether or not it would actually exist. After initially opposing the creation of an independent commission to investigate the September 11 attacks, the Bush administration has consistently hampered the commission's investigation. They have done so by failing to fully cooperate and to share with the commission information that is necessary for it to be able to conduct its work. This is inexplicable. Why would the administration fail to cooperate with this commission? Why did the administration initially not want the commission to come into existence?

Should we infer from that that the administration had something to hide, has something to hide, does not want information to come out? It is hard to come to a different conclusion based upon the way in which the administration opposed the creation of the commission and the way in which the administration has hampered the work of the commission by failing to fully cooperate with it and to share with it necessary information. This has forced the commission, this failure to cooperate and to provide necessary information, has forced the commission to request an initial 2 months of time in order to fully complete the investigation that it is mandated to complete.

Now, while such a request would seem to be routine, President Bush and the Speaker of the House of Representatives opposed it. Both eventually relented, but they have not done so sincerely. The Speaker now refuses to allow the commission the original 60 days it was originally given after publishing its report to formally wrap up its work and communicate and work with the Congress on its recommendations. This extra time is crucial and should not be eliminated.

We are having the pretense of cooperation and the pretense of extending time but not the fact. The commission is given the same amount of time; it is just being told to do different things within the limited context of that time. The commission should have all the time it needs. Why does the administration and the leadership of this House not want to give it the time that it needs?

The Senate, on the other hand, has passed this legislation. Legislation passed in the Senate would extend the commission's report deadline and its eventual termination for an additional 2 months. The House must follow suit, and it must do so quickly or the commission will be forced to curtail its work and begin preparing its final report before the original deadline. This work is too important to rush. Why is the administration and the leadership of this House forcing this commission to work under a very tight, restricted deadline when its work is complex and complicated and it should have all of the time it needs to complete it because the information that it is going to provide is so essential to the safety and security of every American citizen?

□ 2000

Already the commission has produced findings. They have made great strides in uncovering the events that allowed the September 11 attack to occur. Let me give my colleagues just a few examples. The commission has exposed some of the immigration screening flaws that allowed the hijackers to enter the United States, including the dismal lack of cooperation among Federal agencies with security watch lists. In other words, our Federal agencies had watch lists, individuals that they were watching, that they were alerted to and watching for; but the information was not shared, and as a consequence, these people were able to slip through.

The commission has also highlighted the air security flaws that allowed the terrorists to board the planes and carry on with them makeshift weapons. The commission has uncovered evidence that United States intelligence agencies were given information that they did not use properly and information that they did not share with other elements of intelligence, other intelligence organizations within the context of our government. For example, they were given the first name and phone number of one of the hijackers. This information was provided by German intelligence. But no action was taken on it. The first name and the telephone number of one of the hijackers. Nothing was done about it. Why?

These questions must be answered, and the commission must be given enough time to develop the information which will enable these kinds of answers to be forthcoming. If given sufficient time, the commission will no doubt compile the most comprehensive and extensive report about the September 11 attack and provide Congress and the White House with concrete recommendations for improving the security of the American people. It is essential that we do that.

Throughout the commission's existence, cooperation from the administration has been grudging and delayed. The commission had to issue a subpoena to the Federal Aviation Administration in order to obtain detailed transcripts and other information about communications that took place on September 11. That subpoena had to be issued because the agency refused to cooperate. The Federal Aviation Administration would not give the 9/11 commission transcripts and information about communications that took place on the date of September 11, the date of the attack. It is just incomprehensible.

In October 2003, the commission had to threaten the White House with subpoena because the commission believed it was not being provided all the necessary materials for its investigation by the White House. While interviews have been scheduled with former President Clinton and Vice President Gore, similar cooperation has not been forthcoming either from President Bush or other members of his administration. President Bush and Vice President CHENEY refused to meet with the entire commission. Instead, they have decided that they will only agree to separate, limited meetings with the chairman and the vice chairman. They will meet separately for 1 hour and only 1 hour, and only with the chairman and the vice chairman of the commission. National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice continues to refuse to testify publicly. The commission is now considering whether to issue her a subpoena. Obviously, because of this lack of cooperation, the commission needs more time and the deadline needs to be extended.

In addition to studying the causes of September 11, there are other things about this circumstance that the Congress ought to be looking into. Congress should be conducting a vigorous examination of the administration's actions in Iraq prior to, during, and currently with regard to the war. With the exception of limited inquiries by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the House has failed to exercise its oversight responsibilities with respect to our operations in Iraq. The Constitution of the United States provides the responsibility to the House of Representatives to oversee the operations of the executive branch and to perform oversight functions and to carry out oversight responsibilities. What could be more important than the war in Iraq, which has now cost 550 American lives, American servicemen and -women killed, nearly 3,000 others seriously wounded, many of them lost limbs, wounds that they will carry for the rest of their lives, not to mention thousands of other lives that have been lost? What could be more important than that?

House committees should be thoroughly investigating, not just our intelligence community's massive failures but how the President and members of his administration used the intelligence that they were given to support their case for making war in Iraq. We should also examine all the other reasons that President Bush and other members of the administration cited to support his war. All of this should be examined carefully and in detail.

House committees should be thoroughly investigating the Pentagon's postwar plans. The guerilla war is continuing despite Saddam Hussein's capture. Civil strife is at an all-time high after today's synchronized bombings of Shiite religious gatherings despite the apparent adoption of an interim constitution. Why did the civilian leadership in the Pentagon ignore Army recommendations for a more comprehensive occupation? Why? House committees should be thoroughly investigating how the administration secretly awarded billions of dollars in no-bid contracts to companies like Halliburton. It is only thanks to the work of Members of the Congress, like the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), that we have begun to uncover the scope of some of these massive contracts and that the U.S. taxpayer is actually being overcharged, in fact grossly overcharged, for much of the work that is going on in Iraq by these companies.

House committees should be thoroughly investigating the administration's plan to hand over power in Iraq. How was this hand-over date chosen? It seems conveniently selected to take the upcoming Presidential election into consideration. Why did it take months to get the United Nations involved?

And then there is the whole matter of the case for the war itself. How did we come to go to war in Iraq? How was it that this resolution was presented to the Congress and passed in a very controversial and divisive way? Now that several months of searching have passed without finding any weapons of mass destruction and there remains no evidence whatsoever of a connection between Saddam Hussein, the leader of Iraq, and September 11, one thing is inarguably clear: President Bush and his surrogates intentionally misled the Congress, the American public, and the world about the evidence that such weapons existed in Iraq.

Some may say that this is a premature accusation because it remains possible that some weapons of mass destruction will be found. But such a discovery would not change the indisputable fact that the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, particularly the Secretary of Defense, and other White House advisers were not truthful about the certainty of that evidence. The President would like us to believe that the discrepancies between what the White House said before the war and what we now know to be the truth resulted from failures in our intelligence. He has disingenuously appointed another commission to supposedly study these failures, but he has carefully bounded the commission's scope to prevent scrutiny of his own actions as well as those close to him who were involved in this decision-making process.

Gaps in our intelligence-gathering represent a gravely serious matter that needs to be examined fully. But it is even more important that we scrutinize the discrepancies between what the intelligence agencies told the White House and what the White House told the Congress and the world. If we cannot trust the President to tell us the truth about the need to send our troops into harm's way, then we have lost an essential component of our system of government. Whatever power our leaders have derives from the informed consent of the governed. This President failed to properly inform those we govern.

There are numerous documented examples of the White House's deception in this matter. Part of the administration's method of operation was to take the intelligence community's assessment that a threat may exist and transform that possibility into a certainty in its public statements. For example, United Nations inspectors found that Iraq had failed to account for a quantity of bacterial-growth media. Had this been used, the United Nations inspectors reported, it, and I quote, ''could have produced about three times as much'' anthrax as Iraq admitted to having.

This report was fed into the White House propaganda machine and came out somewhat differently in President Bush's October 7 address. It came out in the following form, and I quote: ''The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced already two to four times that amount. This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for and is capable of killing millions.'' The added rhetoric there did not come about by accident. Those words, used the way they are in that sentence, are designed to frighten people. And people who are frightened are more likely to bend to your will, even if your will is warped and taking them in the wrong direction. If you frighten people, they are more likely to follow you. That was the intention of those words and the misleading elements that are inherent in them.

A recent report by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace described this particular act of trickery this way: ''In two sentences, possibility becomes likelihood, likelihood then subtly becomes fact, and a huge stockpile is created. Finally, biological agent is transformed into weapons, and not just any weapons but extremely sophisticated delivery systems, the only way such weapons could kill 'millions.' Small changes like these can easily transform a threat from minor to dire.''

The Carnegie report has identified 40 distinct caveats or conditions included in the October 2002 national intelligence estimate that White House officials usually left out of their public statements. The Bush administration regularly omitted terms like ''probably'' or ''we suspect'' or ''we cannot exclude'' when telling the world what our intelligence agencies had reported. Sometimes the White House was less subtle. Secretary of State Colin Powell told the United Nations, and I quote, ''Every statement I make today is backed up by sources, solid sources. These are not assertions. What we are giving you are facts and conclusions based on solid evidence.'' That is the end of Mr. Powell's quote. We now

know that what the Bush administration gave us was indeed nothing more than speculation, speculation presented as if it were fact.

Another trick the administration and its advisers employed was the lumping of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons under the single rubric ''weapons of mass destruction.'' In so doing, the White House could combine the likelihood that Saddam Hussein had chemical weapons, a relatively minor threat, with the potentially catastrophic scenario of an Iraqi nuclear program for which there was never any evidence whatsoever.

□ 2015

The administration further inflated the threat to the United States by insisting, with absolutely no supporting evidence, that Saddam would give weapons of mass destruction to terrorists. The October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate concluded that this was unlikely. It was unlikely, said our National Intelligence Estimate, except under imminent threat of United States attack. Establishing this nightmare scenario was essential to securing public as well as congressional support for war. Only through terrorists did Saddam pose a threat on American soil. Without that threat, enthusiasm for an attack on Iraq would have been, no doubt, greatly diminished.

Using those methods, the White House presented us with the image of a ''mushroom cloud,'' without which they could not wage the war they had been wanting to wage for years.

Today's synchronized bombing of Shiite Muslim religious ceremonies in Baghdad and in Karbala are tragic reminders that Iraq remains an extremely dangerous place. At least 143 people were killed and thousands more were likely injured just today.

These bombings are just the latest in a series of attacks against Iraqi civilians and against United States soldiers. Five hundred and fifty United States soldiers have died in Iraq, and over 2,700 have been wounded, seriously injured. While there is no accurate figure available for Iraqi casualties, it is reasonable to assume that that number is in the thousands. The vast majority of these deaths occurred after the end of major combat, after the end of those major combat operations was announced by President Bush on May 1 of last year.

It is now conventional wisdom that the President and his administration failed abysmally to plan for the conditions in postwar Iraq. Vice President CHENEY's predictions of a rosy welcome were shattered long ago. Our troops remain engaged in a guerilla war, and Iraq's civilian population lives under constant threat by the same adversary.

Why is the House, this House, ignoring this reality? The CIA, the State Department, the Army, the Marine Corps, the Army War College, and various nongovernmental organizations have produced thousands of pages of recommendations that were ignored. These predictions have proved extremely accurate after the fall of Baghdad. Outside experts are saying that the ongoing financial, diplomatic and human costs of the Iraq occupation are far worse than expected because the administration did not take its own agencies' suggestions.

This is an extremely serious charge, yet no House committee is currently investigating what went wrong with our postwar plans. We are in this House ignoring our responsibilities to oversee the operations of the administration on matters of great and grave seriousness.

Tonight is an opportunity to outline some of the advice that has been ignored by the administration, first with regard to U.S. military recommendations. War games run by the Army and the Pentagon's Joint Staff in preparation for war with Iraq led to very high troop levels. The Army's recommendation for an invasion force was 400,000 troops. Secretary Rumsfeld envisioned the force level of 75,000.

The Army's recommendation took into account the invasion and subsequent occupation. It argued a larger force would actually be more useful after Baghdad fell as opposed to the initial invasion. A large force would allow the Army to restore order quickly and perhaps allow for a much smaller occupation force 6 months or so later.

In Bosnia the Army stationed 200,000 troops to watch over 5 million people. In Iraq, with a population of 25 million, the Army dispatched fewer than 200,000 troops for postwar action. The heart of the Army's argument was that the U.S. would win the war and do so quickly but could be trapped in an untenable occupation if there were too few soldiers.

Marine General Anthony Zinni, who preceded Tommy Franks as CENTCOM Commander, agreed with the Army's recommendation for higher troop levels. The Army had also worked out cost projections prior to the war, despite claims by Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz that it was impossible to produce such numbers.

The State Department's Future of Iraq Project is also important for us to look at. Starting in late 2001, the State Department began contemplating postwar plans and created the Future of Iraq Project. It brought in outside experts and teams of exiles and created 17 working groups designed to systematically cover what would be needed to rebuild Iraq's political and economic infrastructure. Congress authorized $5 million to fund the project's studies in May of 2002. The final report consisted of 13 volumes of recommendations on specific topics. Among the list of recommendations were these:

First, restore electricity and water supplies as soon as possible after regime change by employing Iraqis, thereby creating jobs and engendering goodwill toward the coalition by the indigenous population.

Secondly, they recommended do not disband the entire Iraqi army. The project suggested purging the Iraqi army of its Baathist elements but retaining most members to help restore public order and provide for the country's defense when the U.S. departs. It also stressed, however, that ''all combatants who are included in the demobilization process must be assured by their leaders and the new government of their legal rights and that new prospects for work and education will be provided by the new system.'' The report later detailed steps on how this could be accomplished.

The project went on to stress how disorderly Iraq would be soon after liberation, despite Vice President CHENEY's rosy predictions. The report predicted the power vacuum and the crime and looting that followed Saddam's removal would be extensive, and, of course, they were entirely accurate.

The report also suggested that despite the need for a long United States postwar commitment, instituting a long-term military government would alienate the Iraqi people.

The report also warned against the ill will that would result from Iraqis being seen as working for foreign contractors instead of having foreign contractors be seen as assisting the Iraqi people. We have seen all of that come to pass because the recommendations of that report were ignored.

There were other suggestions that came from the Central Intelligence Agency that were forwarded to the administration. The common theme among all CIA predictions was that disorder would follow the fall of Baghdad. The CIA believed that rivalries in Iraq were so deep that quick transfer of sovereignty would invite chaos. The CIA began running war games to plan for the postwar Iraq. These included representatives from the Defense Department. But when the Secretary of Defense's office heard of this kind of cooperation between Defense and the CIA in the early summer of 2002, the Office of the Secretary of Defense reprimanded the Department of Defense employees who participated and ordered them to stop cooperating with the Central Intelligence Agency. It is astonishing.

These war games were intended to make cost predictions and simulate potential problems. Because of that they were seen as weakening the case for launching this ''war of choice.''

There were also numerous recommendations from nongovernment organizations and the relationship of NGOs and USAID. In the fall of 2002, USAID began planning for postwar Iraq. Since it was the natural contact for nongovernmental organizations, these NGOs were concerned with relief operations in Iraq. At the time most high-ranking officials in the Bush administration were comparing the eventual fall of Iraq to the fall of Germany and Japan. The NGOs strongly disagreed with this assumption and made those views known to USAID.

The NGOs believed Iraq would likely fall into chaos following regime change and requested that sanction restrictions be lifted from them so that they could prepare for postwar Iraq. The NGOs should be allowed to go there and make the arrangements so that postwar Iraq could be organized and people would see that there were organizations that they could relate to and that chaos would not ensue. This request was denied. The NGOs continued to stress the disorder that would follow war, but all they received back from USAID representatives were broad assurances that everything was taken care of.

There was a report from the War College. In January, 2003, the Army War College produced a report that addressed Iraq reconstruction challenges. It predicted long-term gratitude towards the United States was unlikely and that if the United States had to supply the bulk of the occupation force this would lead to many more problems in postwar Iraq. The Army War College report strongly recommended that a large international force would be ideal for postwar occupation. It also provided a 135-item checklist of what tasks would have to be done right after the war and by whom those tasks would have to be accomplished.

According to those involved with this report, the Pentagon paid little attention to any of its postwar recommendations.

There were, of course, unrealistic assumptions. Exaggerations during the buildup for war were not limited to weapons of mass destruction. Administration officials often made widely ridiculed assumptions about postwar Iraq. Here are just a few: Both President Bush and Vice President CHENEY claimed we would be greeted as liberators. USAID Administrator Natsios claimed rebuilding would cost U.S. taxpayers $1.7 billion. Secretary Rumsfeld and Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz repeatedly claimed it was impossible to guess any costs for the war. Secretary Rumsfeld called former Economic Adviser Lawrence Lindsey's claim that the war would cost $200 billion way off. He thought that was a gross exaggeration. Wolfowitz claimed reconstruction would cost U.S. taxpayers very little. What is the record? To date, the United States Government has spent approximately $150 billion in Iraq, and we know that the President has an additional bill of at least $50 billion which he will present to the Congress sometime after the November election. Lawrence Lindsey's recommendation seems quite good now based upon the experience. It is too bad he was not listened to at the time.

The House of Representatives must investigate. These examples are just the tip of the iceberg. There are literally thousands of pages of postwar planning that were prepared and then ignored.

Why was the Defense Department and not the State Department initially put in charge of postwar Iraq? Why were we not more prepared? Why did the administration not take its own recommendations? Why were we told there were no cost estimates when of course there were?

Postwar plans were available and they were ignored. The House of Representatives must investigate this to ensure that legislative remedies are examined and to put in place mechanisms that will prevent another failure of this magnitude.

Just for a moment let us take a look at the no bid contracts. Halliburton and Bechtel already have contracts in Iraq worth $3.14 billion. Those contracts result from the conflict in Iraq and the reconstruction efforts. Yet the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and his staff at the Committee on Government Reform have found that the cost of many of the reconstruction projects could be reduced by 90 percent if the projects were awarded to local Iraqi companies rather than contractors like Halliburton and Bechtel. The American people, in other words, could be saving 90 cents on the dollar if this reconstruction activity were done in a way that is not designed to benefit the people who benefit the administration.

□ 2030

There is ample evidence of overcharging. We have learned that Kellogg Brown & Root, a Halliburton subsidiary, is overcharging the United States for fuel delivered to Baghdad from Kuwait. They are charging as much as three times the amount for gasoline that can be purchased there on the market, inflating the price three times.

We have also learned that Kellogg Brown & Root employees received kickbacks from a Kuwaiti subcontractor in exchange for awarding that subcontractor a reconstruction contract. But that is all. How much of a kickback was there? Who were these people who received the kickback? Who at Halliburton knew about it? Who at the Defense Department may have known about it? Who else in the administration may have known about it? There is an awful lot of information we do not have, and that is why this investigation needs to go forward.

Members of Congress were informed of these sole-source noncompetitive contracts by media reports, by investigative reporters in the media. Despite repeated requests by Members to Federal agencies, the administration has been slow to respond, or simply has declined to provide details about why these large private contracts were awarded on a non-competitive basis.

Here are two brief examples. USAID awarded several contracts worth hundreds of millions of dollars to a few companies it hand-picked to compete against each other, yet repeated inquiries from the minority on the Committee on Government Reform to USAID have been brushed aside, and now USAID has refused to provide copies of the contracts or information on how it chose which companies would bid on these initial contracts.

This is the taxpayers' money. We are spending enormous amounts of money, and it is being spent secretly, and the Congress is not being allowed to look at the contracts or examine how this bidding process went forward.

The administration has also failed to disclose information about its sole-source oil field contract with Halliburton's Kellogg Brown & Root. Kellogg Brown & Root was awarded a no-bid contract on March 8, 2003, but the Defense Department did not disclose until April 8 that this contract has a potential value of $7 billion. Today, despite a recommendation by the Army Corps of Engineers to open this contract to public scrutiny, the Defense Department continues to keep its content classified for allegedly national security reasons. Whose security is at stake, we have cause to wonder.

House committees must investigate. It is clear that Members of Congress are receiving grudging and delayed cooperation, if they receive any cooperation at all, from the administration regarding reconstruction contracts. Only a formal committee investigation will be able to answer the serious questions and allegations that have arisen from these no-bid contracts and this no-bid process.

Ambassador Bremer has set the deadline for transferring power back to the Iraqi people as June 30, 2004. This date falls conveniently close to the beginning of the summer Presidential campaign. The date was set solely by the United States, despite recent events indicating that Iraq will not be able to make a peaceful transition without the United Nations leading negotiations. This begs the question, Was this date set for political purposes?

The House should be asking these questions and demanding clear proof of the reasoning behind this date. Part of the original reasoning was that elections in Iraq would be held shortly after the transition deadline to ensure the legitimacy of the new government. But that is no longer the case. The United States plan for such an election was roundly rejected, and it was the United Nations that had to step in and negotiate a solution to the election question.

Does this administration still believe the United Nations is a ''worthless debating society''? I wonder.

Under the United Nations plan, national elections will take place in the late fall of 2004. Should this new development not affect the transfer date? The Congress and the American people deserve answers to these questions that at this late date still remain unanswered.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have two issues. One is the 9/11 commission and why that commission is not being allowed the time it needs to complete its work comprehensively and completely and provide answers to questions that beg

answers, answers that we need as Representatives and which the administration should have also, if it does not have them already.

The 9/11 commission should be given more time to carry out its work, and the 2-month extension is not too much to ask. Why are we rushing the completion of the work of that commission? That question ought to be on the mind of every Member of this House, and every Member of this House ought to demand an answer. The extension ought to be granted, and it ought to be granted sincerely and accurately so that they have the full time that they need to complete their work.

There, of course, remains all of the questions that I raised, and many, many more. I have just begun to scratch the surface of the questions that remain with regard to what happened prior to our going into Iraq in that war, what has happened during it, and what is continuing to happen and what we will do subsequently with regard to that country. Many questions remain unanswered.

The responsibility to develop those answers lies with this House of Representatives. The leadership of this House should appoint appropriate bipartisan committees to look into these matters. We are derelict in our duty. We are not fulfilling our responsibilities to the American people on an issue that is of paramount importance, an issue that involves thousands of lives, hundreds of billions of dollars in American treasure and the future safety and security of the American people. Those answers should be forthcoming, and there should be no delay in setting up the mechanisms which will allow them to come forward.

POLL SHOWS ENTHUSIASM FOR FREE TRADE FADES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD this evening a poll done by the University of Maryland that shows that even high-income Americans, those earning over $100,000 a year, now have lost their enthusiasm for free trade and the loss of jobs in this country as they perceive their jobs are now threatened by white collar workers in China, in India and other countries, and rising anxiety exists across all income bands in our country relative to free trade.

So it is as much of a curiosity as anything that the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Greg Mankiw, caused an uproar recently when he said the practice of shipping out our jobs, outsourcing U.S. jobs, is good for our country.

How can shipping out our jobs be a good thing? Not surprisingly, Mr. Mankiw was forced to backtrack and profess his sympathy for anyone who had lost a job. My goodness, that is the least he could have done. Predictably, Mr. Mankiw was defended by free trade fundamentalists like The Washington Post and some of his fellow economists. But something has changed profoundly in America over the past 10 years, and I would say it is reality. Reality has set in coast to coast.

NAFTA is celebrating its 10th anniversary, and we are seeing the impact of failed NAFTA-style trade policy throughout our country and continent.

It is no longer just in Ohio and Michigan, although the Great Lakes States are undoubtedly the epicenter of the job-loss earthquake. It is not just the Carolinas or Massachusetts, where the job losses have been so staggering. And it is not just vehicles, cars and trucks and the massive auto parts industry. It is not just machining businesses, and it is not just machinery in general.

In fact, the damage to our economy from outsourcing and the doctrine of free trade is no longer confined to just the manufacturing sector.

Something has changed in America, and it will undermine and eventually destroy public support for NAFTA-style trade agreements. Suddenly, it is not only manufacturing jobs that are being outsourced to Mexico, to China and other low-wage platforms. Now outsourcing is beginning to bite into whole new sectors of our economy, where the promise of future job growth once lay. Indeed, the loss of jobs in manufacturing has been dramatic over the past several years.

Look at these sectors: apparel, 37 percent of the jobs lost; textile mills, 34 percent; primary metals, down 25 percent; machinery, down 22 percent.

But the decline in what has been called knowledge-based industries has been dramatic too: computer and peripheral equipment, down 28 percent; communications equipment, down 39 percent; semiconductors and electronic components, down 37 percent; electrical equipment and appliances, down 23 percent; telecommunications, down 19 percent; data processing, down 23 percent.

During the NAFTA debate, the free trade fundamentalists promised that high-wage, high-benefit jobs would be replaced by high-wage jobs in the computer sector. In other words, automotive industry jobs would be replaced by computer jobs.

Wrong. As economist Paul Craig Roberts wrote recently in the Washington Times, ''For years, as U.S. multinationals moved manufacturing offshore, Americans were told their future was in 'knowledge jobs.' Today, knowledge jobs are being moved offshore more rapidly than even manufacturing jobs were moved away.''

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers said last week that in 2003, the U.S. jobless rate for computer scientists and systems analysts has reached an all-time high of 5.3 percent. That is roughly in line with the national unemployment rate of 5.6 percent. In Ohio, the unemployment rate is 6.2 percent, in my region of Ohio, over 8.4 percent, and in some counties of Ohio as high as 18.5 percent.

But the burden of proof is now in the proponents of NAFTA-style trade agreements. If outsourcing is sending the jobs of highly trained computer scientists, computer programmers and medical diagnosticians overseas, then where are the new jobs supposed to come from?

It is hard to believe, but Vice President CHENEY said, ''If the Democratic policies had been pursued over the last 2 or 3 years, the kind of tax increases that both Messrs. KERRY and EDWARDS have talked about, we would not have had the kind of job growth we have had.''

I would just ask the Vice President, where is the job growth? I do not see any job growth. And that is what the average real American is asking too, where are the good new jobs going to come from? Where?

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the poll I referred to earlier.

[From USA Today, Feb. 24, 2004]

POLL: ENTHUSIASM FOR FREE TRADE FADES; DIP SHARPEST FOR $100K SET; LOSS OF JOBS CITED

(By Peronet Despeignes)

High-income Americans have lost much of their enthusiasm for free trade as they perceive their own jobs threatened by white-collar workers in China, India and other countries, according to data from a survey of views on trade.

The survey by the University of Maryland's Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is one of the most comprehensive U.S. polls on trade issues. It found that support for free trade fell in most income groups from 1999 to 2004 but dropped most rapidly among high-income respondents—the group that has registered the strongest support for free trade. ''Free trade'' means the removal of barriers such as tariffs that restrict international trade.

The poll shows that among Americans making more than $100,000 a year, support for actively promoting more free trade collapsed from 57 percent to less than half that, 28 percent. There were smaller drops, averaging less than 7 percentage points, in income brackets below $70,000, where support for free trade was already weaker.

The same poll found that the share of Americans making more than $100,000 who want the push toward free trade slowed or stopped altogether nearly doubled from 17 percent to 33 percent.

Rising anxiety about free trade and shipping out of U.S. jobs could intensify an already fierce political battle this election year.

In the fight for the Democratic presidential nomination, Sen. John Edwards, D-N.C., has gained ground on front-runner Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., by hitting Kerry's support for free-trade agreements that critics say have cost American jobs. The two have bitterly accused each other of supporting past agreements.

Whoever the Democratic nominee, he is expected to use the trade issue against President Bush, whose administration has generally been supportive of free trade.

The poll was released last month, but breakdowns by income level were performed at the request of USA TODAY. The results

are based on responses from more than 1,800 U.S. residents. The margin of error is ±2.3 to 4 percentage points.

The findings suggest that anxieties about free trade long held by lower-income Americans and blue-collar workers—who have been losing jobs to cheaper labor markets abroad—have spread up the income ladder.

The findings come as the U.S. job market remains sluggish and accounting, computer programming, radiology and other high-end service jobs are being lost to workers abroad.

''This is huge,'' said Steven Kull, director of the Maryland polling unit. He said the PIPA poll shows most Americans remain supportive, or at least tolerant, of free trade, but with big caveats. ''They're not saying, 'put on the brakes,''' he said. ''But they are saying, 'Don't step on the gas. Don't rush. We need to make adjustments. We need more time to adapt to these changes.'''

IN DEFENSE OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN IRAQ AND TEACHING AN APPRECIATION FOR WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the comments that preceded me in the Special Order that dealt with our involvement in Iraq, certain thoughts came to mind that I think I would like to present this evening prior to getting involved with the issue of primary importance right now, or, I should say, not primary importance, but the issue I had intended to bring forward. I will do that, but I will do it subsequent to the thoughts I have had listening to our loyal opposition.

We have heard for approximately an hour that there were a number of things wrong with the intelligence reports that we received; that there are problems that we now face in trying to pacify Iraq; and that as a result of these things, there should be investigations. And a lot of people's integrity has been called into question, not the least of which the President of the United States.

□ 2045

There are many issues that I disagree with the President on, and I have not been hesitant to express my opinions when I do disagree. But on this issue of Iraq, let me just present a few ideas that may I hope stimulate some thinking about whether or not we were right to do what we did in Iraq.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to think about what pundits and political opponents would have said if in some time between, say, 1933, when Hitler took power in Germany, and 1939, when finally the world decided to go to war against Hitler, or at least a good portion of the world decided to go to war, what if at any point in time between 1933 and 1939 the United States and Great Britain and as many other countries as would join us would have taken a very, very bold action? And that action would have been preemptive. It would have been before any sort of aggressive action had been taken by Germany and by Hitler against the West, against the Allies, before Poland had been invaded, even before Czechoslovakia. Could we imagine what would have happened on this floor and throughout the world, really, in terms of the reaction, if America and a group of nations had taken preemptive action and stopped Hitler, if we had gone into Germany, if we had deposed Hitler and attempted to bring about a different and truly democratic regime?

Well, certainly there would have been an awful lot of second guessing. Certainly there would have been people here on the floor of the House talking about the fact that we really do not know for sure whether V–1 and V–2 rockets were being developed. Maybe the hard evidence would not have been available at the time. And so where were we? Why were we doing such things and was it not against all rules of engagement, was it not something that we should be challenging our administration for and saying you did the wrong thing?

We did not have all of the very specific information that we needed to make this decision. Could it be that we would have been questioning whether or not Hitler's intention would have been to, in fact, bring about the ''final solution'' for the Jews in the world?

All these things would have been speculative, certainly. We could not have perhaps proven that that was his intent. We would have been perhaps without all of the hard evidence to bring in front of the world body to prove that the decision we made to preemptively act was right. But if we had done so, just think about what would have been the outcome of that decision and that action. Fifty million people, 50 million people died as a result of our unwillingness to take action. National treasure, untold national treasure had to be expended; and, of course, hundreds of thousands of American lives were lost to try and stop him and stop the Axis powers after they made their intentions perfectly clear.

Now, I think that there is a lesson to be learned here, and it is that at some point in time it is imperative that the civilized world take action and, in fact, take preemptive action to try to prevent an occurrence similar to World War II. If we could have done that now, knowing what was the outcome of World War II, knowing what it took to actually stop him when we chose to finally get involved, who would suggest that we should not have taken preemptive action?

Does anyone really believe that we should have waited knowing now what we know? Does anybody believe that we should have waited for Hitler and the Japanese empire to strike first? Well, we did. That is history. And we know the outcome. So I will suggest to the body that there was a great deal of evidence presented not just to the United States but to many other countries and many other intelligence networks around the world that would lead us to believe that there was a problem in the making in Iraq. No one, not a single person has ever denied the fact that Iraq was in the process of developing nuclear weaponry and weapons of mass destruction; and, of course, we knew that they had used similar weapons in the past. So that was not a question.

The question is would he have, would Saddam Hussein have actually used those weapons had he gotten ahold of them? How long would it have taken for Iraq to actually obtain those weapons? Those are questions we do not know the answer to right now, but we can be fairly sure by all of the empirical evidence that we have in front of us that they have would have developed the weapons and that either he would have used them or think of this, what if, what if those weapons became disposable to the two sons of Saddam Hussein, Uday and Qusay? Does anybody really believe that they would like to live in a world where those two guys would have the ability to push the button?

Well, now they are gone. Saddam is in custody. Uday and Qusay are history. So now we can stand on the floor of the House and we can get on all of the talk shows and say we really did not have all of that to worry about. It really was not worth the expenditure of our resources, both human and financial. Well, maybe not. But I have to say that from everything we know about history and from everything that we know, absolutely, unequivocally know, not the if's, not the ''I wonder if,'' but what we know about the regime in Iraq would lead us to believe that the action we took eventually would end up saving a lot of lives. Not only that, but we are now engaged in a very difficult process and that is to impose democracy, to plant the seeds of democracy in an area of the world in which, of course, it is a very alien idea. And the task is incredible, it is true, but think of the task we have faced when we chose to rebuild Germany and Japan and to rebuild those countries on democratic models. In Japan, of course, where it had never ever existed before, and in Germany, where it had been bastardized, the concept of democracy. We undertook that huge, monumental task; and people could have said in 1946, 1947, 1948, look at the problems we are facing. How come we have not been able to construct these democratic models over there by now? Why are American troops still occupying Germany and Japan? Why are our people still at risk? Why are we spending hundreds of millions of dollars which would equate in today's terms to hundreds of billions of dollars in the rebuilding of both Japan and Germany? Why are we doing it? They would have been there and they may have been here on the floor saying those things at that time. I know that is true.

I am not saying they are not legitimate questions and that they should not be raised. All I am saying to you is that we have history on our side. We know what happens when you do not undertake the task, and we know what happens when you do in fact persevere, when you say we are going to rebuild these countries, it is going to take a lot of money, a lot of time and a lot of effort because they are not used to this concept; but did it work out to the benefit of humanity that we did what we did? Of course it did.

Who argues that we should not have rebuilt Western Europe and even Japan? They became prosperous. They became willing to accept the ideas and ideals of Western civilization, which will get me into my next area of discussion here. But we faced all of these things. We did it. We persevered.

In terms of the time frame that has expired between the ending of major hostility to today, it is a blink of the eye. Think how long it took for the United States of America to perfect this concept of a republic based on democratic ideals. It did not happen overnight. You may recall at the end of our revolution many people went to George Washington with a council, figuratively speaking, a council and said, We want you to be king. And, of course, Washington refused and said that is not why we fought a war against a king. That is not the kind of government we were going to establish. Even then, of course, we did not warm to this concept of a republic very quickly.

The Articles of Confederation were problematic. There were things in them that did not actually address all of the problems that we had in this country trying to pull it together. Just as today we are watching Iraq in this process, and we are saying, gee, whiz, even their constitution, or the lead up to the constitution, even what we have developed in Iraq today is problematic because we still do not know whether or not exactly what the role of religion will be in Iraq.

Well, you may recall that we did not know exactly what the role of slavery would be in the United States and we refused to address it in the Constitutional Convention because we could not come to an agreement. So we put it off and, admittedly, it led to a lot of violence. But the issue was settled. The republic remained and we now still present to the world the best possible hope for stable government and for peace. But it did not come easily. It did not happen when Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown. Lots of things, even bloodshed followed the surrender of the British.

Peace will not come easily in Iraq. Democracy will not come easily in Iraq. Many trials and tribulations lay ahead, much bloodshed, certainly true. Should we abandon it because there are these obstacles? Shall we walk away because the challenge is very, very difficult? Well, that is the proposition that is put before us. And I suggest to you that planting democracy and the concept of a republic in a part of the world where it had not heretofore existed is a worthy endeavor.

□ 2100

I also suggest to my colleagues that our efforts in Iraq up to this time can be described as noble.

This is an interesting situation that we are in; and this develops into another discussion that I want to have tonight, and that is the value of Western Civilization and what it really means, because tomorrow I am going to introduce a resolution, and I am joined by many of my colleagues, and the resolution is a simple one.

It says that this body, the Congress of the United States, believes that all children graduating from schools in this country should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western Civilization; and it may seem to some at first to be a heavy topic, some amorphous idea, and one might wonder what are its practical implications and why I would be doing that, as I say, and I and my colleagues would be doing this.

I think in a way it is ironic that we are desperately attempting to implant concepts of Western Civilization in a place called Iraq while we, in this country, challenge their relevance in our schools and in our textbooks and certainly in the media in our culture. I believe that we are in a war that can be described as a clash of civilizations. There is a great book by an author by the name of Samuel Huntington called the ''Clash of Civilizations,'' and I remember reading this book, I do not know, maybe 8 years ago and thinking that it was interesting; but I remember going back and reading it again after 9/11 and thinking that it was profound and prophetic.

I believe the United States is in a clash and Western Civilization is in a clash of civilizations. It is a real clash, if you will, a real war. It is bloody. There are times when the clash becomes even more violent and times when it subsides, but the clash is real and it will be here for some time. The clash is with radical Islam. It is with people who have said openly and repeatedly that their desire is to come here and kill you and your children, me and my children, to eradicate us from the planet.

There is an interesting diary, I do not know whether it was on Al Jazeera, but it was published some time ago, and it is a diary of a person who became a suicide bomber. He talks about in this diary why he has to do what he believes he has to do. He says that the ultimate threat to his view of Islam is the West, is the concept of a republic, a democratic republic. He said that this is a threat to the heart; this is a threat to the existence of Islam as he saw it because what the West provided, through democratic principles and free enterprise, was the good life essentially, what it sort of boils down to. It provided the good life. People could achieve more and more; and, yes, they could achieve in monetary ways, but they could also achieve even from the standpoint of advancing oneself and one's self-esteem, and this he said would turn people away from looking to the afterlife as the ultimate goal or as the ultimate glory.

I can tell my colleagues that certainly there are aspects of Judeo-Christian tenets that tell us also that it is what comes next that is important, but Western Civilization has allowed us many things. It has provided a system and a set of ideas and ideals that have served humanity well; and, yes, those ideas and ideals are a threat to other ideas; and, therefore, a clash occurs.

How do we fight this war? How do we deal with this clash? Well, of course, it will require the force of arms at times, and it will require the commitment of resources, and it will require something else. It will require a belief in who we are, which by the way is the title of Samuel Huntington's new book, which I certainly commend to everyone, ''Who We Are.''

We have to know the answer to that question. We have to know who we are. We have to understand that this Nation uniquely was created on the basis of ideas and ideals, all other nations formed for other reasons, but ours started for a brand new reason, ideas. Those ideas were held up to the world, and people came from all over the world to embrace them. Uniquely, we said this old concept that people should be ruled by individuals is not acceptable; it has not worked out well and it does not accrue to the benefit of most human beings. So Western Civilization was based upon a different idea, and it is called the rule of law, not the rule of man, not one person making arbitrary decisions about everything that affects our lives, but the law making those decisions as developed by people who represent all of us, a brand new concept that we put into effect and that I think serves the world well.

Western Civilization was based on other ideals, the ideal of the individual being superior to that of the collective; the idea that humans had inalienable rights. This is a Western concept. No place else does it show its face but in Western Civilization.

Today, in America, however, there is a movement, a philosophy, I call it radical multiculturalism. It has taken hold of our society. It is seeping its way into our public schools and on to our college campuses. This philosophy may be peculiar to most Americans; but it does seem to be taking hold among elites, academics, the media, and certain groups within the political establishment. It is a corrosive movement, and its purveyors are threatening to accomplish in the classrooms what they could not get through elections: one, to erase the notion of citizenship; and, two, to teach young people that there is nothing positive or unique about America and that Western Civilization contributed nothing to

world history but imperialism, slavery, and discord.

Let me emphasize something here. I do not for a moment want to tell the children of America, the citizens of America or the world that we believe that we have never done anything wrong and that Western Civilization is nothing but a set of ideas and principles that have been put into place without problem. Many of those ideals are not yet reached, by the way. So I am totally and completely supportive of the thought that we have to teach our children the truth about who we are, the truth, warts and all; but I have to tell my colleagues I am becoming extremely concerned, as I think many others are, about the fact that we concentrate so much of our effort and time on teaching children and immigrants into this country that there is nothing good about Western Civilization or about the United States as a representation of that civilization.

These are some examples that we have taken, by no means exhaustive. These are just tiny little snippets of some of the things we tell our children in textbooks and some of the things that, in fact, teachers and professors have told our children about America, about the West, all in an attempt to essentially eliminate any concept that there is something good and special about us and who we are, and I will go through them in a minute.

I just want to tell my colleagues about something that happened to me just a short time ago.

I was visiting a high school in my district, and there were probably 150 to 200 students who came into the auditorium to have a discussion with me; and it went on for, as I say, about 60 minutes or so, and at the end, some students were sending up written questions. One of them said, What do you think is the most serious problem facing the country? I said, well, I am going to answer that question with a question, if you do not mind, and that is this, How many people in here believe that we live in the greatest Nation on the Earth or as Michael Medved always says, on God's green Earth? And I looked around. It was fascinating to see what happened out there.

This was a suburban district in Douglas County, Colorado, middle- to higher-income families in the area, predominantly white. If one looked up suburbs in the dictionary, probably a picture of this particular area, and when I asked the question how many of you believe that you live in the best country in the world, about two dozen raised their hands, most of them very sheepishly I should say, and the rest just sat there. Some looked uncomfortable, and I must admit that I thought to myself at the time that some of them looked like they actually wanted to say yes, but they were afraid to. They looked at the teachers who were lined up on the sides of the walls. They were kind of looking at them like, gee, should I actually say this, and more than that I think that they were thinking, if I say yes, if I say yes I believe I live in the best country in the world, someone might challenge me, maybe even he will, and would I be able to defend that principle.

These are high school students; and I said, well, let me ask you about do you realize that we are a product of Western Civilization and that how many of you would agree that this is something again about which you can be proud? Maybe a dozen at that one, and I said, well, this is what I consider to be one of the biggest problems facing America, what is happening to you and what has happened to you as a result of this multiculturalist philosophy that we push in the schools.

□ 2115

This idea that all cultures are at worst the same; at best they are better than ours; and that we cannot make these kinds of statements about what is better or best, about which country is better or best, which civilization is better.

Now, that happened, and I know it is not unique to this little typical suburban school in my district. I could have asked that question in any high school in America and the response would have been similar; tepid, sheepish support, with most people saying, I do not know, I do not care, and what does it matter?

I wonder how this could have happened. How is it that people living here in this country, at this time, can look at the rest of the world and not recognize that every single day millions of people are struggling to get here, if not to America at least to Western Europe; that they are struggling to get to Western civilization? And I have to ask, how many people do you know that are struggling to go the other way? Is that not empirical evidence of some sort that what we have is pretty good; that it is worthy of our allegiance, worthy of continuing?

People ask me why I am so involved with the immigration issue; why I speak on that issue so often. Well, there are a whole bunch of reasons, and they deal with jobs and the environment, and the cost, and all that sort of thing. But after all of that is said and done, I worry about this. I worry about the fact that we are not doing a very good job of creating a society, a cohesive, homogenous society out of all of the disparate parts that make up America. I worry that we are working very hard to divide us, to divide this Nation into camps; into Balkanized areas that are based on linguistic, cultural, or political differences while simultaneously trying to erase anything that smacks of an attempt to bring people together around a set of ideas other than the concept of diversity, which is the only thing that multiculturalists will say is worthy of our allegiance.

I worry about what will happen to us in this clash of civilizations when it is not only the force of arms necessary to win the day but it is the force of ideas. For us to be successful as a people, as a civilization, as a country we have to know who we are, where we came from, and where we are going. We have to believe in who we are, where we came from, and where we are going. And I worry that too few of us know who we are, where we came from or where we are going, and that this in the long run will prove to be our undoing.

So that is why I talk about immigration, and that is why I talk about issues like this. That is why I worry about the fact that in the textbook called Across the Centuries, which is used for 7th grade history, the book defines the word jihad as ''To do one's best to resist temptation and overcome evil.''

Now, maybe that is somebody's interpretation of jihad. But, remember, this was not even suggested as someone's idea, this is presented as the interpretation, the definition of jihad: ''To do one's best to resist temptation and overcome evil.''

I guess we would not want to tell children, would we, that that word implied something quite different? It is a call to arms to those people who believe we should be annihilated, and everything we believe in should be wiped out because it is a threat to fundamentalist Islam. Well, we need to say it, because it is true. We may not like it, we may feel uncomfortable by telling children the truth, but it is imperative that we do so. That is not the only definition of jihad.

In 2002, the New Guidelines for Teaching History in New Jersey's public schools failed to even mention America's Founding Fathers, the pilgrims, or the *Mayflower*. How do you tell the history of the United States, I might ask, without mentioning the Founding Fathers, the pilgrims, or the *Mayflower*?

Maybe it is a good thing that the book did not, because in many textbooks, and certainly out of the mouths of many teachers, the mentioning of these people would be in derogatory terms. The Founding Fathers, all white men, who were slave owners, who came here to pillage and rape and whatever. Columbus came here to destroy paradise. I have seen that.

So maybe it was better that they did not mention it. Do you think at least some reference to the ideas and ideals upon which this Nation was founded should have been made, and the fact that people struggled and died to bring those ideals into fruition? Do you think that was worthy of mentioning?

In a Prentice Hall textbook used by students in Palm Beach County High Schools, titled A World Conflict, the first five pages of the World War II chapter focused almost entirely on topics such as gender roles in the armed forces, racial segregation in the war, internment camps, and women and the war effort.

Do you think I make this stuff up? You can go and look, if you do not believe me, that this is in fact being taught to our children. This is in the textbooks of the schools in this Nation.

By the way, Madam Speaker, if anyone were to be so inclined, they can go to our Web site, www.House.Gov/Tancredo and they can click on a pop-up that says Our Heritage, Our Hope, and they can see what I am talking about here, and they can also sign up to help us in this endeavor to change the situation. And I have some very specific things I would like them to do.

A Washington State teacher substituted the word ''winter'' for the word ''Christmas'' in a carol to be sung at school programs so as not to appear to be favoring one faith over the other. The lyrics in Dale Wood's carol From an Irish Cabin were changed to read ''the harsh wind blows down from the mountains and blows a white winter to me.'' Not ''Christmas.''

I was in a school, again in my district, again a typical public school, and it was right before Christmas. I was talking to a lot of, I think they were in grades 5 and 6 in an elementary school. When I left the room, I said Merry Christmas. Again, there was this kind of an uneasy response, and some kids said okay. And as I was walking out the lady who had invited us to come and speak, who was an aide at the school, said, you know, the principal does not like us using the word ''Christmas'' here. I said what is that, as I pointed to a Christmas tree in the hallway? And she said, that is a seasonal tree. And I said, are you telling me that we cannot use ''Christmas''? And she said, no, the teachers do not.

So I went back and I yelled, as I was leaving and all the kids were coming out, I said, Merry Christmas, and they all said, Merry Christmas. But this is happening, of course, in schools all over the United States. I bet if people go to their own schools and check these things out, they will see what I am saying is not just unique to my little suburban district in Colorado.

In a school district in New Mexico the introduction to a textbook called 500 Years of Chicano History in Pictures states that it was written ''In response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American Revolution and its lies. Its stated purpose is to ''celebrate our resistance to being colonized and absorbed by racist empire builders.'' The book describes defenders of the Alamo as ''slave owners, land speculators, and Indian killers,'' Dave Crockett as a cannibal, and the 1857 ''War on Mexico'' as an unprovoked U.S. invasion. The chapter headings include, Death to the Invader, U.S. Conquest and Betrayal, We Are Now a U.S. Colony, In Occupied America, and They Stole the Land.

Now, again, I certainly do not say that mistakes were not made, that manifest destiny as an idea and an ideal did not have inherent in it problems for other people. I certainly believe that is true, and I believe we should teach our children about those problems. But this is what we call objective history text?

I am going to repeat it. This book, it said, was written ''in response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American Revolution and its lies.'' Its stated purpose is to ''celebrate our resistance to being colonized and absorbed by a racist empire builder.''

Children are often taught only the most negative things about the United States and about Western civilization. And if these efforts go unchecked, children will lose any real connection to the goals and aspirations and ideals of America and the West, the ideals exemplified in the Constitution and articulated by the people who founded the country over 200 years ago. If we fail to instill these values in our children, we risk losing our national identity.

It is not surprising to me that a brand new phenomenon is developing in the United States with regard to the immigrant community. Since about 1947, the United States has allowed people to claim a dual citizenship. Most of this happened in 1947 as a result of the creation of the State of Israel, and to provide Israelis here with the opportunity to travel back and forth and to state their allegiance to Israel by accepting a dual citizenship. But we never had very many people, to tell you the truth, that actually accepted that offer. It numbered in the hundreds of thousands, at the most, at any given time in America.

Today estimates are that there are between, we do not know for sure, 5 and 10 million people in this country who claim a dual citizenship, mostly with Mexico, after Mexico allowed Mexican nationals to keep their citizenship once they came to the United States. This happened a couple of years ago, and the number skyrocketed.

When we tell people that they should keep their political associations, political allegiances to other countries, that they should keep their language of origin, that they should not actually blend into this American mosaic, should we be surprised by the fact that they do not?

□ 2130

McDougal's ''The Americas,'' another textbook, states that the Reagan-Bush conservative agenda limits advances in civil rights for minorities. Again, these are statements of fact by a textbook, not somebody's opinion, and that the conservatives' bid to dismantle the Great Society's social programs could be compared to abandoning the Nation.

It goes on to include a text stating that Communism had potentially totalitarian underpinnings, and contrasts future Taiwan President Chiang Kai-Shek's repressive rule with Communist Chinese Dictator Mao Zedong's benevolence toward peasants in the early 1940s.

Now, if we did not know anything else and read this, why would you not believe it to be true? If the book and your teacher failed to mention the deaths of about 65 million Chinese after Mao came to power in 1949 or Taiwan's peaceful transformation into a thriving, pluralistic multiparty democracy, no one would know this. They would never understand it. They would never truly understand world history. Would we be lying to tell children this was the case? Would it be chauvinistic of us to suggest that it was not just the possibility of some totalitarian underpinnings, but a totalitarian regime, and that Communism could only survive out of terror.

Is it not acceptable for us to tell the truth? That is what I wonder. Why are we so fearful about telling children about who we are really, all of the warts but all of the good things, too.

Here is a study by Philip Sadler, director of science education at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, which shows that students who had taken high school physics classes that used textbooks did substantially worse than high school classrooms that used no textbooks at all. I would suggest that if these other textbooks, these history textbooks are an example of what we are doing, it would be better to not use them at all.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow I am going to ask this Congress to pass a simple resolution, and that resolution will state, as I said, that all children graduating from our schools should be able to articulate an appreciation for Western civilization. That is it. No mandate, no textbook mandates, no curriculum change, just whatever you do, this should be an outcome.

Simultaneously we are going to be joined by State representatives all over the country who will be introducing into their representative legislatures a similar resolution, and we are going to be joined by hundreds of Americans, and this is where other people can get involved because we are going to be joined by I hope eventually hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of American citizens who will go to their school board with a resolution that we have on that Website that I mentioned earlier, www.house.gov/trancredo, and go to Our Heritage, Our Hope, and there you will see a copy of a resolution that a person could take to their school board and ask their school board to adopt.

Now, the NEA, the National Education Association, has already attacked this proposal. And I keep thinking to myself, what is there about this? And not just the NEA. Tomorrow is when we are going to actually drop this resolution and announce it, but we have had all kinds of people responding saying that in fact this is a bad idea. Now, please, let us really think about this for a second. They are saying it is a bad idea to teach children facts so that they could articulate an appreciation for Western civilization. I mean, is that not the definition of what would be a good history education, a good

civics education? Should children not be able to articulate those principles?

We can argue whether they are right or wrong, but we should be able to have children who can articulate them, understand who we are, where we come from and where we are going.

I know that this is a stretch for a lot of people. It is hard for a lot of people to get their hands on this because it is not an issue that you can condense into a bumper sticker, but I encourage people to think through this and think about the possibility that it is important for us and for our civilization to actually transmit these goals and ideas to the next generation. We cannot continue to teach only the negative. Doing so contributes to the balkanization of the United States into subgroups, subcategories, and hyphenated Americans.

In Numbers U.S.A., an organization that does a lot of great work and also has a great Website, Numbers U.S.A. talks about the fact that if we continue as we are in terms of population growth and the source of our population growth in this country, being 90 percent from immigrants, that by the year 2100 two-thirds of the people here in the United States will be descendants of people not yet here at the present time. Think about that. In 96 years, two-thirds of the people living in this country will be descendants of people not yet here. Think about that and then think about what we are teaching them, the folks that are coming in and the folks that are here about who we are. How can we expect this new Nation essentially that will be created by 2100 to be steeped in the same goals and principles and ideas?

Again, Madam Speaker, I hope that we will be joined by hundreds of thousands of Americans all over the country who will be willing to say that it is important for their schools, it is important for our civilization that we teach children to appreciate the value of Western civilization and there is something we all can do about it. I am going to do what I can do here, State legislators will do what they can do in their respective bodies, and then it is up to the people of this country to take this on and move it forward. It will determine whether we are a Nation at all in years to come.

PROTECT HAITIAN LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, this Special Order is taken in a spirit of deep sadness and regret about the events that are going on in the nation of Haiti. We have come here this evening to recommit ourselves to the proposition that the United States has a responsibility to prevent the loss of life and the continued deterioration of the nation of Haiti. The present administration's inaction has undermined democracy and security in Haiti, and it is our responsibility to make sure that this does not get any worse.

So we, Members of Congress, call upon the administration to protect Haitian lives by restoring order, upholding the rule of law and disarmament across the country. The current state of affairs in Haiti is chaos. The rebels who were empowered by our inaction must be held accountable and not allowed to benefit from their violence. Humanitarian aid must flow to Haiti immediately. A humanitarian corridor with supplies of food and water and medical equipment must be established to provide assistance to the beleaguered Haitian people. Humanitarian aid must flow to Haiti immediately. We must support the formulation of a donor conference so the people of Haiti can finally get the kind of assistance that they so desperately need and so properly deserve.

This administration is misinterpreting and failing to honor the spirit of the Haitian constitution. Where is Article 149 in the transitional government talks?

So we as Members of Congress call upon this administration to follow the rule of law and the Haitian constitution. In it, Article 149 of the 1987 Haitian constitution clearly outlines the process by which the interim president is appointed and it includes the ratification of the legislature. Due to the unwillingness on the part of the political opposition party's willingness to participate in elections, there is no legislature to confirm the interim president; and, therefore, the recently sworn in president is, unfortunately, regrettably not ruling pursuant to the Haitian constitution.

On Sunday President Bush said, ''The Haitian constitution is working.'' How does he believe just because he said it that that could make it true? The President forgets that when they fail to respond to the opposition's rejection of the U.S. brokered peace plan that they had in fact repudiated their own plan for peace. It was just on Monday of last week that Secretary of State Powell said ''The United States will not support the overthrow of a democratically elected government by thugs and criminals.''

For the administration to remain mute while the constitutional process was thwarted and then to pressure President Aristide, the one who was compromised to resign, is in no way in line or in accordance with Haiti's constitutional process.

Moreover, now that the administration has created this constitutional quagmire in Haiti, it is reprehensible to claim that the constitution is working.

□ 2145

Our administration is jeopardizing the lives of countless numbers of Haitian asylum seekers by enforcing immediate Coast Guard interdiction without an opportunity for a fair asylum hearing.

Members of Congress call on the Bush administration to extend temporary protected status to Haitian asylum seekers because returning to Haiti will pose a serious threat to their personal safety.

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti under section 244(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so that the nationals of Haiti present in the United States or reaching our shores may be granted temporary protected status. This would mean that both Haitians who are present in the United States and those who may be fortunate enough to make it to shore will not arbitrarily be sent back to Haiti until the country is stable.

This administration's neglect of Haiti and the intentional, systematic dismantling of the Haitian social, economic, and political circumstance which culminated in the current political instability and provided the environment for a coup d'etat.

As Members of the Congress, we call on our leaders in Congress to hold joint public hearings between the House Intelligence Committee and the International Relations Committee on the Bush administration's role in undermining a democratically elected government in, of all places, the western hemisphere. The United States should not have allowed the opposition in Haiti without a legislative popular mandate to veto the possibility for peace in Haiti. Now there is mayhem and on-the-spot executions and other atrocities which are taking place daily.

Why did the United States not send in a force to reinforce the police when a political solution was still possible? Why did the United States only act after that possibility, along with President Aristide, was removed? Why have the rebels not been arrested? Were their actions not illegal? How did the leaders of the insurgence, some of whom are the most notorious torturers and death squad members, return to power? Louis Jodel Chamberlain is a former military leader who led a brutal paramilitary group that backed the most recent of Haiti's coup d'etats in 1991. The other, Guy Philippe, is a charismatic former soldier once loyal to President Jean-Bertrand Aristide who fled Haiti 3 years ago after being accused of drug dealing and of treason.

What are we to say to history? How will we account for this tragic set of circumstances that have now surrounded this poor beleaguered nation? As of today, the United States Coast Guard has repatriated 902 Haitian refugees to Port-au-Prince despite the escalating and continuing violence there. A handful of Haitians only have met the ''credible fear'' standard required for asylum. They remain on Coast Guard vessels and are being assessed by asylum officers from the Department of Homeland Security's Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services.

Officials from the Department of Homeland Security and Coast Guard

have said that Haitians picked up at sea who indicate that they are afraid of returning to Haiti are given interviews with asylum officers on Coast Guard cutters. Haitians are not individually asked if they have a fear of return, nor are they necessarily spoken to individually where they may have a chance to say why they left. Homeland security says that when people are afraid, they find a way to convey that. I do not know whether any of the Coast Guard officials who first encountered the Haitians speak French or Creole. If Haitians do not express fear somehow, then they are given an interview with asylum officers who either speak French or Creole or have interpreters. Thus far, three Haitians have been found to possibly have a credible fear of persecution. Those who are deemed to be economic migrants have been turned over to the Haitian Coast Guard and were disembarked in Port-au-Prince. The last repatriation was today when 21 refugees returned to the Haitian Coast Guard. No new refugees have been picked up by the United States Coast Guard since Friday; and as far as is known, the repatriations will be ongoing despite the terrible insecurity in Port-au-Prince.

I have been unable to get information on the current control of the Haitian Coast Guard now that the government in effect ceases to exist. It seems that the United States Government is still treating the Haitian Coast Guard as an official agency under legitimate command of the Republic of Haiti.

And so, my colleagues in the Congress, we are now called to an immediate task to make right, to correct the terrible wrong that has been visited much by our inaction upon the 8 million inhabitants of this small country. We have a duty to persist. It is not over. We will investigate, we will protest, we will evaluate, we will persuade, until the majority of the American people are convinced that we cannot leave this wrong, which is a wrong for which we must be responsible, to go uncorrected. That is the pledge I leave my colleagues with on this evening.

I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who serves with great effectiveness on the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the full committee for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this has been a tumultuous and trying set of days for the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members of this House who have shown their leadership and concern for the Haitian people. I want to thank, particularly, the gentleman from Michigan for an untiring and unrelenting effort as the chair of the Haiti Task Force, a persistent and informed advocate for Haiti over the years, knowledgeable about issues of democracy. I join him tonight because I believe that not only have we tainted the page of democracy but some might say that we have torn it from its book.

As I look over this last weekend and the last couple of days in the meetings that we held or had with both the Secretary of State and the National Security Adviser and, of course, the President of the United States, the Members who were present were there in good faith and they had good intentions to be able to accept or at least to make real democratic principles, and, that is, our plea was at that time to establish a humanitarian corridor, to have an international force of peacekeeping and peace maintenance, and to restore or to have a diplomatic solution once the violence had ended.

Unfortunately, I believe that the direction that was taken was maybe somewhat parallel to what we saw in Iraq. Interestingly enough, the people of Iraq did not call the United States in for a unilateral, preemptive attack against Iraq. We all acknowledge the despotic and heinous acts of Saddam Hussein, but the people did not call us. But yet the people of Haiti begged for our intervention and they asked us to intervene along with the head of state. Unfortunately, they decided to ignore them. And what we have today are the following words, in an article dated March 2, 2004, in the Houston Chronicle. U.S. officials have called for the rebels to lay down their weapons now that Aristide has surrendered power. But the rebels make it clear that disarming is not in their playbook. Philippe, 37, and we know Guy Philippe, a former police chief, has said he has no intention of becoming Haiti's next president; but in the vacuum left by Aristide's departure, Philippe and the other armed rebels have become a force that cannot be ignored.

Tippenhauer, another one of the opposition party leaders, said he and other opposition politicians were not formally cooperating with the rebels before Aristide's resignation, but they would have to deal with them now. Rebels, insurgents, individuals who have criminal records, I happen to believe that all are innocent until proven guilty; but there is a long history of their involvement in violence. And so the question is to the American people and to this government, how could you depose of and remove a duly elected democratic President in the name of Jean-Bertrand Aristide and now place as leaders of the Haitian nation those who have been called many names, rebels and thugs, opposition leaders who are in fear of their lives, and rebels who suggest that they are not about to lay their arms down.

And so, Madam Speaker, I am joining with my colleagues to ask now for full congressional hearings, not next week, not next month or next year, but immediately. President Aristide, who I believe has no reason to misrepresent how he was led away from his nation, his presidency, has indicated now in fear and apprehension that he was swished away from his home against his will. The question is who and why and who directed it. The question is whether or not the United States will abide by the governance of international law and whether or not we will tell the American people the truth.

We now have as my colleague here on the floor of the House has so eloquently put in his statement and joined by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) those Haitians who are now in the United States who are in fear of their lives, there needs to be an immediate addressing of the question of temporary protection status. I join with my colleagues in pressing that opportunity and that emergency need. I further press the need for a complete overhaul of the treatment of Haitians in this country and will be pressing for, again, legislation to equate Haitians to Cubans, that when they touch the soil, their status will be able to be adjusted.

I join the gentleman from Michigan in asking the question, how can you interrogate a boatload of Haitians by a global question, looking at them, asking either the leader or whoever is the senior person on board and then determining whether or not there is a credible claim of fear? I believe that the Homeland Security Department has to immediately revise its policies to retrain inspectors and immediately send out a directive that says each individual Haitian and family member must be questioned separately as to whether or not their life has been threatened and that they are in jeopardy upon returning. I have joined my colleagues in sending letters to the Speaker of the House and the leader of the House to ensure that we have these immediate investigations. It is imperative that they be the International Relations Committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I would offer to say the Select Committee on Homeland Security and the Judiciary Committee. Questions of the violation of law have been raised.

Allow me just to read these words as I come to a close. In 1825, France forced Haiti to assume a debt of $90 million to compensate French plantation slave owners for their financial losses in exchange for France's recognition of Haiti's independence.

My friends, Haiti paid back that debt. It took them 100 years, to 1925, to pay back $90 million. President Aristide, duly restored to power in the 1990s and then stepping down from power, having a duly democratic election for a new president who served 5 years, and then the people of Haiti reelected him, came back and asked France, one of the nations who early on had asked for him to leave or to be deposed, if you will, or to step down and resign, a few years later President Aristide asked for that debt to be repaid to the Haitian people, totaling about $21.7 billion in today's currency.

□ 2200

That amount of money would have restored Haiti to its prominence, would

have provided them with the ability to rebuild its crumbling economy. Restitution, reparations, fair reparations, that this should have occurred. Is it not interesting that as President Aristide tried to hold his nation together, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the leadership of this Nation refused to release funds that would have helped the agrieconomy and other aspects of its economy be rebuilt, and yet we blame President Aristide in totality for the condition of this nation?

I join the gentleman in asking and demanding an immediate response by this administration that international forces be maintained in Haiti to keep the peace and to hold the peace, that immediate infusion of funds come into that Nation in order to provide a safety net for the people who are now starving without water and good food, and as well that the constitutional premise be adhered to and that is that the transition of government be adhered to under Article 149 where it speaks to the transfer of government. The present leader now admits he is not a politician. I do not even know if he will have the wherewithal to lead Haiti in this time, but what I will say is that the hand of the United States is very much involved in this process. Thugs have said that they are not going to lay their weapons down. What I actually say tonight is that we have a crisis, and I believe, along with the United Nations, this government has a responsibility to stand up and be counted. I am asking the administration now to be counted in this effort to rebuild Haiti. I am also asking for this administration to be accountable for what has happened to President Aristide, a duly-elected President, and I am asking for this Congress to abide by the Constitution for the fact that this Congress is an oversight body and ask the hard questions as to why freedom has seemingly been jeopardized and seemingly been undermined in the last 48 hours.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for allowing us to have an opportunity to be able to challenge both our government and the international arena for what has occurred to an independent people who have sought nothing but freedom in this 200th year of their independence. I will continue to join with the voices of those who will join and stand up with them and be reminded of words heard earlier this evening: Someone said how does one change this government? They said by agitation, agitation, agitation. And I hope tonight will be the beginning of our agitation of change.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to once again ask the Administration to take leadership and responsibility to bring peace and stability to Haiti. We read and hear in all media sources information that suggests that the CIA may have been involved with or had knowledge of the alleged kidnapping of Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. I have reached out to our leadership to request that they schedule congressional hearings immediately to investigate this matter. One government was supposed to be in Haiti for the specific purpose of helping restore peace, give humanitarian aid, and to uphold the principles of democracy and the rule of law. Apparently, the Administration had another agenda in mind. If the allegations are true, it will be an atrocity, an embarrassment, and a hypocrisy for this Administration to facilitate the commission of a crime against international law and an act that is completely adverse to the principles of democracy.

His Excellency, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, P.J. Patterson, chairman of the Caribbean regional group, CARICOM, has verbally supported the allegations that Aristide had been removed illegally. I question the authority that guided the CIA and the military's involvement in the removal of President Aristide—especially since he has been duly elected under a recognized democracy.

Because there is uncertainty as to what caused President Aristide to depart from or to be removed from Haiti, it is imperative that we hold immediate Congressional hearings to ensure that there has not been a violation of international law. Allowing or facilitating the removal of a democratically elected president in a manner that violates international law sets a dangerous precedent for other established democracies and tarnishes our reputation in the international community.

I rise this evening to once again revisit the escalating political crisis in Haiti. I, along with Members of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) met with President George Bush, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and National Security Advisor Dr. Condoleezza Rice to discuss the immediate need for the establishment of a humanitarian zone with foresight in Haiti.

When I, along with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Bush concerning this situation, we stressed that the United States must support democracy and that the rule of law is paramount. Instead of political ideologies, we need to preserve the innocent lives in the region where over 70 have been killed and dozens wounded to date. Violence, chaos, and anarchy cannot be allowed to oust the democratic government.

The deadly uprisings in this war-torn nation come at the hands of the same factions that ravaged Haiti several years ago. Reports show that two of the rebel leaders are the most notorious torturers of the death squads, having already earned a reputation of infamy in a massacre that took place before Jean-Bertrand Aristide returned to power.

Louis-Jodel Chamblain is a former military leader who once orchestrated the most recent coup d'etat in Haiti in 1991 with a brutal paramilitary group. Guy Phillipe, a charismatic former soldier and loyalist to President Aristide, fled Haiti three years ago in exile to the Dominican Republic to escape charges of drug-dealing and treason. Phillipe and Chamblain crossed the Dominican border back into Haiti a week ago to join their gang of former police and soldiers.

We cannot allow innocent Haitians to die at the hands of thugs who want to thwart the establishment of democracy. We hope that, after our meeting, the President will call for an affirmative plan to respond to the Opposition Party's rejection of peace proposals offered by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Organization of American States (OAS). Our acquiescence and inaction will soon suggest support of the opposition; therefore, it is time that we acted to demonstrate our strong commitment to democracy, constitutional government, peace, and the rule of law.

Humanitarian aid and military assistance are critical needs for the Haitians given the threat that demonstrators may thwart the delivery of food and other relief items. There has already been a cry for assistance by President Aristide. Haiti, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, with only 4,000 police officers for 8 million citizens has formally requested humanitarian aid and security forces.

As we work with the government of Haiti to explore the role of the international community in averting civil war, we must also begin to look beyond the current crisis. For example, Haiti continues to be in dire need of food aid and medical assistance. The current unrest could set off an exodus of refugees. Furthermore, there is an uncertainty as to the timing and fairness of the next elections is promoting suspicions and instability. We must anticipate the work that will have to be done in order to effectively and humanely process the imminent influx of refugees by improving our immigration screening and detention processes.

I do not believe that Haitian refugees receive a fair chance to satisfy the requirements for entitlement to an asylum hearing. Also, I am disturbed by the lack of parity between the Haitian refugees and the Cuban refugees. While Haitian refugees are detained and then removed from the United States, Cuban refugees who reach American soil are welcomed. They are admitted or paroled into the United States, and a year later they are eligible for adjustment of status to that of lawful permanent residents. This difference in treatment is unfair and unjustifiable.

I will support a bill sponsored by our colleague Mr. MEEK of Florida to designate Haiti under Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow Haitian refugees to obtain Temporary Protective Status (TPS). I have signed on to join my brother today in fact to take leadership in this crisis.

Furthermore, I will introduce a piece of legislation, the ''Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2003.'' Section 502 of this bill responds to Attorney General Ashcroft's decision in Matter of D–J–, 23 I&N Dec. 572 (AG 2003), in which he denied bond release to a Haitian on the ground that giving bond to undocumented refugees who come to the United States by sea would cause adverse consequences for national security and sound immigration policy.

This legislation would permit the adjustment of status for Haitians who meet the following categories:

(1) The individual would have to be a native or citizen of Haiti;

(2) The individual would have to have been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States; and

(3) The individual would have to have been physically present in the United States for at least one year.

The Caucus advocates positive action by the U.S. Government to support peaceful and democratic efforts to alleviate the violent and unsanitary conditions to prevent the spread of diseases such as HIV/AIDS. Collaboration by and assistance from the United Nations will be key in the effort to stimulate the participation

of the international community. The Haitian people must implement the organic constitutional and democratic principles to indicate its contrition and willingness to effect change. With the plan to institute a democratic form of governance must accompany maintenance of the rule of law so as to ensure the development of a framework of fundamental rights. Violence will not bring about peace, but fair and transparent electoral processes will.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our words are heard and that this nation will move to end this problem before a full-scale civil war results. Action today will translate into an investment that will benefit innocent Haitian lives and the immigration challenges that do not diminish. I urge this Administration to do the right thing and to provide the humanitarian aid and security provisions necessary to save these lives.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas for her analysis and her contributions to this discussion.

I yield to, if he desires, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for holding this special order on Haiti tonight. I believe all through the week and next week and the week after that and the month after that that we will continue to raise the issue of the policy decision that the Bush administration has put forth as it relates to Haiti. I must say that it is sad today in this democracy that we celebrate that we are now in the position and seen by the world community as being a country to decide who will lead in a democracy and who will leave a democracy.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to come down here for a minute. This is the front page of the Washington Post. Mr. Guy Philippe, the rebel leader who went through Haiti, taking cities over and left about 70 people dead in the path of that. Here is the cover of the New York Times. This is Mr. Philippe again, with two armed individuals with AK–47 fully automatic weapons, going through the streets of Port-au-Prince. Mr. Philippe called a meeting today and he said if police chiefs throughout Haiti and also the prime minister, if they did not show up, that he would place them under arrest. He has declared himself as the leader of the Haitian army. He said that he respects democracy and that he would respect the wishes of the now president, who was the supreme court justice, if he asked him to lay his weapons down.

Madam Speaker, I am no great cheerleader, I must add, of President Aristide or the opposition forces, but I am a cheerleader for democracy, and I will tell the Members, regardless of what anyone may say or what they feel, representing south Florida where we have several Haitian Americans, I must add that it is a disappointing day on behalf of democracy. The fact that the President of the United States, along with the Secretary of State, along with Mr. Noriega, who is Assistant Secretary of State, made the singular decision to go visit President Aristide on a Saturday night to give him two options: One, board a plane to save his life or, two, die. I do not consider that an easy and nonpersuasive discussion. I will take that as a very persuasive discussion if someone, just any American, just think about it, if military forces came to one's house representing the United States of America and said they have two options, one, leave with us and live, two, die, we will not stop them from killing them.

Madam Speaker, we have a lot of distinguished Members that are ready to address the House here tonight, but I want to say regardless of how one may feel toward Haiti, the administration, as far as I am concerned, the Bush administration had something personally against President Aristide. It was personal. This was not, well, he is not a great guy, he is not this, that, and the other. Guy Philippe is a murderer. He is a murderer and a thug and still carrying out thuggery on the streets of Haiti. He is willing to arrest the prime minister? He is going to arrest any police chief who did not show up at a meeting, and he is parading around the streets with armed individuals? This does not look like security for Haiti. What this looks like is more difficulty for Haiti. And he says he is interested in politics; so, Madam Speaker, I will say to the other Members the next leader of Haiti is going to be the person with the biggest guns and the most guns and who are willing to do what they have to do. I will tell the Members also as it relates to U.S. forces on the ground, what the Bush administration did on that Saturday night, Sunday morning have endangered the lives of American troops that are there that are trying to restore peace and security there, and international force troops, the President himself has placed their lives in jeopardy. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am very upset about that. We do not go and do this kind of Saturday night visit giving people an ultimatum.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the hearings that will be hopefully held in the coming days here in this Congress because if we allow this to happen as a U.S. Congress, we are in for a rude awakening from the international community about our integrity as it relates to democracy. I thank the chairman so very much.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, may I just thank the gentleman for his leadership. He has just heightened the drama and the fear and the crisis that we are in. Coming from south Florida, does it make any sense for this administration not to immediately grant, as the gentleman has requested, temporary protective status to present to those who may be in fear of their lives? When we have just read that we have Guy Philippe who is not laying down his arms, he indicated that he is going to arrest leadership of government if we even have a government, is there any reason for this not to be granted in the next 24 hours to protect the people that the gentleman represents and others around the Nation?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, that answer is yes. I just want to say that the President and the Department of Homeland Security can grant temporary protective status as they have done in similar situations in Nicaragua and other places where they had disruption and danger on the streets. But, Madam Speaker, I must say the repatriating of 900-plus individuals seeking safety and refuge and to get a true asylum hearing of being returned back to Haiti, 12 executions, 12, took place on Monday. These are pro-Aristide supporters. Twelve individuals died execution style. So I am going to tell the Members right now that our country, and I will not even say our country, I would say our leadership has placed us in that position. So, once again, we have other Members here. We will be hitting the floor in the coming days and coming hours. It is important that we have leadership in this House that is willing to schedule congressional hearings immediately based on the actions of the executive branch on a Saturday evening to go to a democratically elected president's home and tell him either he gets on a plane or he loses his life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) that as usual his perception about this problem is remarkable. I know that he has not an awful lot of seniority, but he worked on this problem for many years before he became a Member of Congress. He worked in his State legislature as a State senator. He worked alongside with his mother, Ms. Carrie Meek, who held a seat before he did. So it is very important that we seriously analyze the contribution that he has made tonight, and I thank him for it.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman so much in this late hour.

The die has been cast. Our country's leap year contribution to Haiti's bicentennial celebration is another example of the support of violence over democracy when it suits our national political interests.

There is no doubt that this administration empowered the so-called opposition which consisted of no more than a coterie of wealthy Haitians, CIA operatives, neo-Duvalierists, and drug merchants to inflame a struggling populace. We did this by denying a democratically elected president the support and the resources needed and promised for his people's development.

This rebel opposition is no more than a retread of the same elements traditionally militating against the people's interest ever since the African slaves soundly thrashed the finest of the French and other European legions to reclaim their freedom 200 years ago.

The United States State Department, which ''never negotiates with terrorists,'' had sufficient cozy contact with the Haitian rebels to convince them to delay their onslaught on Port-au-Prince. Even after the rebels rejected terms of settlement acceptable to President Aristide, in a matter of hours the State Department acceded to the rebels' demand, the removal of President Aristide.

There is a distressing school of thought that subscribes to the new official spin that President Aristide has no one but himself to blame for this sordid state of affairs. Maybe Aristide is to blame for not realizing that there was no way that the Haitian elite and their U.S. conservative supporters would allow a government of black ex-slaves to succeed in this hemisphere.

□ 2215

Maybe the priest-turned-politician was too naive in committing his faith and the fate of his people to the tender mercies of the U.S. State Department.

Maybe Father Aristide was so consumed in doing good that he could not recognize the need to play ball with the powers that be, making himself a conduit through which the millions of international aid funds would flow into the greedy hands of the elite who would keep Haiti impoverished while they pranced on the ritzy edges of society.

But whatever the cause, the deed has been done. Regime change has again trumped sovereignty. The first democratically elected president of the first black nation in this hemisphere has, on the last day of Black History Month, 2004, been removed from office and escorted into exile.

Whether Aristide's removal was voluntary, that is, by free will, or voluntary, as in eagerly handing over your wallet to a gunman in the alley, will be resolved, I hope, in time. The question is, where do we go from here?

As legislators, we have a duty to attempt, wherever possible, to snatch victory from the jaws of defeat. So far, the United States has spearheaded the drive to commit peacekeepers on the Haitian scene, to bring back stability to the political environment and to set the stage for prosperity and development. Keeping the peace is the simplest of these missions. You can keep the peace by totally suppressing disorder with overwhelming force, or you can rely on the natural establishment of peace emanating from the application of social justice and economic prosperity.

In Haiti's case, building a solid social and economic structure is more important than building our concept of democratic institutions, and military forces and police law and other actions are only applicable if required in the pursuit of social and economic goals.

Therefore, the size and national composition and duration of deployment of the peacekeeping force should be determined by the extent and the progress of the nation-building force, and not by proposed election schedules. Rather, the question of political elections in Haiti from now on should be determined by the stability and the economic progress achieved and sustained by an interim government replacing the deposed Aristide regime.

This situation proposes that the international community, possibly through the United Nations Development Program, deploy a Haitian Reconstruction Commission, a nation-building force charged with the responsibility for reconstructing the economic and social fabric of Haitian society, and with the employment of the peacekeeping force, constitute the interim government of Haiti.

Any intervention that fails to establish an interim regime strong enough to assert a humane face on the Haitian nation and that lacks the sustained commitment of the U.S. and the international community to Haiti's future well-being can only condemn the millions of that country to the future of neo-slavery from which Dr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide tried to save them.

Madam Speaker, we have much work to do to right an egregious wrong that has been committed by our so-called democratic administration. We must act.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California, for the work and steadfast commitment she has had to make democracy work in a tiny, impoverished nation, now celebrating its 200th anniversary. I thank the gentlewoman deeply.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who has worked in this as long as anyone I know.

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

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for having this Special Order at this critical moment in the history of Haiti and world relations.

First, I would like to salute Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the Father of Democracy in Haiti. In all the years Haiti has existed, it has never had a democracy. Jean-Bertrand Aristide was elected democratically in 1991. He was deposed by a coup d'etat by the army. He was here in this capital for 3 years.

He went back after the Congressional Black Caucus urged President Clinton and worked very closely with President Clinton to restore democracy to Haiti. He went back, and he gave up the fact that he had missed 3 years. He did not insist on serving 5 years, he just completed the term, 2 years. Like George Washington, he stepped down in order to guarantee there would be a constitutional process going on, just as George Washington stepped down. He stepped down and there was another president for 5 years, and then Aristide came back. He was reelected later on for another 5-year term.

It is important for people to know that Jean-Bertrand Aristide was not in charge of Haiti for all these years that you hear talked about, especially the year that the parliamentary elections were questioned. The parliamentary elections that were questioned were held and the irregularities that were charged, which involved six out of 100-some people elected, those irregularities were charged during a period when Jean-Bertrand Aristide was not in power. It is important to get the chronology straight.

There are many people who say that Jean-Bertrand Aristide has only one fault, and some of us might have a tendency to want to agree with that, and the fault is he is not a seasoned politician. He came out of the priesthood. He was a priest. He was almost murdered three times before he was elected president.

This priest, who some say is an inept politician, also was able to maintain influence, to maintain a following for all the years that have gone on since he was first elected. While he was out of office, he had influence and had a following. Does that sound like somebody who is inept and not a person who knows how to organize people?

He has been accused of being a ruthless dictator. I have been trying to find out what the basis of that charge is. What ruthless dictator do we know who would disband his army? What ruthless dictator would not want an army?

One of the most important things that Jean-Bertrand Aristide did when he went back after being deposed by the army was to abolish the army. The army of Haiti has been in charge ever since the United States created the army.

Most people do not know the United States Marines created the army of Haiti. In their long occupation of more than 30 years, they built the Haitian army. After they left, whenever there was somebody not liked by the rich governing families, the oligarchy of Haiti, whenever there was somebody not liked by the United States, the army was used to remove them. He got rid of the army. What ruthless dictator would get rid of the army?

I just want to say that this democratically elected president, this very unusual person of a magnitude you do not see in politics usually, who is accused of so many crimes in general, but when you start asking people specifically what he did, nobody ever has an answer.

Did he go all over the world shopping, like Baby Doc Duvalier and his wife, spending $1 million on a weekend? Did he have palaces built like Saddam Hussein while the population starved? Where is the personal use of government funds to be seen? Nobody can tell me specifically any of that.

But what I do know is because of his antipathy toward violence, because he understood the long history of Haiti and did not have an army, he has been taken advantage of by terrorists. Terrorists. If you look at the fact, this is

a group of terrorists that has taken over Haiti. Terrorists.

Now, we have varying degrees of suspicion about to what degree our own government was involved. We do know certain individuals well known to our government who have cooperated with the CIA in the past have shown up among these terrorists. We do know that they had modern weapons, United States weapons, machine guns, grenade launchers and so forth, that are not made in Haiti.

We do know that our government said to Aristide, we will not accept your agreement. Aristide agreed to the CARICOM agreement, and our government would not support the legitimate government of Haiti, and say, well, you agreed, therefore we will step in and protect you from the violence until there is some kind of settlement. No. They said to Aristide as long as the opposition, as they called it, do not agree, we will not get involved in trying to guarantee the safety of your government.

They empowered the terrorists. Whatever else they did not do, whatever other lack of complicity there is, there is the open complicity of the United States Government in empowering the terrorists, making them equal to Aristide, saying unless they agree, you have a doomed government.

Beyond our own United States of America, the international community went along with all that, unfortunately.

There is a lesson, unfortunately, here, for all the Caribbean nations of this hemisphere and for small nations throughout the world. There is no more gunboat diplomacy. There will not be any obvious takeover that the United Nations can object to, but look forward to a new kind of takeover process; and that is the process with the use of terrorists.

Evidently, some people think there are good terrorists and bad terrorists; there are terrorists you can use and terrorists you have to worry about. But I say that Haiti is a victim of terrorism, and we should bear that in mind as we start sifting out the facts. As we go to our hearings, as we call into account our own elected officials and our appointed officials connected with this, let us remember to ask the question, have we acted in complicity with terrorists?

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me, and again congratulate him on this Special Order.

Mr. CONYERS. How profoundly we are in the debt of the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for his contribution tonight and from across the years around the people and the country and the idea of a democratic process.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), a strong and dedicated leader and fighter in seeking justice for Haiti.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me just say that I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.

I think everything goes back for me to the 2000 election when we had our own form of coup d'etat; when in my district alone, over 27,000 votes were stolen, 27,000 votes. So when we think about the domestic issues, I go back and blame that election. But what happened this weekend and last week is just unacceptable.

This administration, the Bush administration, it is clear, if you do not go along with them lockstep, then they will take you out.

□ 2230

Look at Venezuela, look at Iraq, and now Haiti. For the past 3 years, this administration, the Bush administration, along with its leadership have blocked humanitarian assistance to Haiti. And, yes, the Haitian people are suffering. And the words ''corrupt government,'' what do you have to be corrupt with? We block any funds from the international community. The majority of the money that the Haitian people receive is for those people that are working abroad in the United States and sending it back.

I am on the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure. I understand something about infrastructure, roads, bridges. They do not have food, water. The people are suffering. But we are responsible for the crumbling of that poor island. And I want to thank the chairman because I have been there on numerous occasions with him. And, of course, he and I and others in the Congressional Black Caucus attended their election. And I can tell you that the people were excited about voting. And I can also tell you that 27,000 votes were not thrown out in Haiti like it was thrown out in Duvall County.

But I have four questions that I would like to just ask the chairman and other Members. The first one, to what extent do you think the role of the United States played in a Haitian coup d'etat? What part did we play?

Mr. CONYERS. Well, apparently there was an American role. The details have not been forthcoming because what actually happened has been covered up with a series of misrepresentations that are clearly not accurate, and that is a challenge that remains for us to uncover. That is our job as legislators. And I think that the gentlewoman's fierce determination to get to the bottom of this will lead this country, this Congress, to an honest evaluation of what has gone down.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, in talking to other international leaders and, of course, we have to be careful not to call any names because then they will also be put on the hit list, but they were very disappointed with the leadership of the Bush administration. They were willing to act but not only would this Bush administration and its leadership not act; they blocked other nations from acting. So do you think that the State Department has been honest to the American people in regard to Haiti?

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, it is very clear that what has happened and what has been explained as what has happened are both totally inconsistent and have yet to be reconciled and that this is another responsibility that has added to our duties.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, do you believe that if the United States had acted earlier in a more humane way that this crisis could have been averted?

Mr. CONYERS. Now, on that I firmly believe that had we not taken the incredible diplomatic position that we had to resolve a political dispute before security could be brought to the people, that we would not be in the position that we are in.

Just consider, how can you tell people that when the rebels do not want to compromise, do not want to negotiate, do not want to resolve the violence, that unless President Aristide can reach a conclusion with them, they did not even listen to representatives of the United States, much less their own government, because they were determined not to reach a political accord, something that was patently obvious from the very beginning?

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank our troops for preventing further chaos and killing in Haiti. But I would like to know what in the world does the future hold for the Haitian people.

Mr. CONYERS. That is precisely what we are in the process of determining. And I would like to say that my optimism is still on the side of justice, that my conviction that there are enough people in this Federal legislature and in this country to right the terrible wrong that has been visited upon the poor beleaguered citizens of that little tiny nation only miles away from our shore. We can make Haiti better. We can still create a humanitarian corridor to bring in the life-giving supplies without which they will not only perish but the violence will continue.

I again thank the gentlewoman for her perseverance and commitment across the years on this subject.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I once again want to thank the chairman for his leadership. But my mind goes back to our meeting that we had Wednesday at the White House with the Congressional Black Caucus members, with Colin Powell, Secretary of State, and with Condoleezza Rice and with later the President; and I guess I have a little Haitian or a little African in me because I knew then that our government under the leadership of the Bush administration and those Cabinet members were not going to lift their hands to help the poor people of Haiti. They were not going to do one single thing.

We have spent $200 billion of American dollars in Iraq to build up a democracy there, but we deny people less

than 600 miles from our shore any assistance, any intervention. And not only do we deny them; we are prohibiting, prohibiting other countries from going in and assist them.

Shame on this administration. And hopefully we can have a regime change or a change in our government come November.

Ever since I was elected to office, I have advocated on behalf of the Haitian people, and it simply enrages me that Haiti has been nothing more than a stepchild to policymakers in the State Department. While Cubans gain access to U.S. citizenship by merely stepping on land in Florida, Haitian immigrants are not just detained indefinitely when they try to come to the United States, but they are mercilessly sent back to the island.

These groups that refer to themselves as ''the opposition,'' are in reality nothing more than armed gangs often funded by drug lords, that are on the verge of taking power through undemocratic means. I repeat: these are not legitimate political opposition groups, many of them are the same criminals that were in power before Aristide, the same thugs we removed from office just a decade ago. Ex military, ex death squad members, drug and gang members, and members of the wealthy business elite that dislike representative government are their leaders. It is more than ironic that just as the Bush administration admonishes Haiti and other nations for being ''undemocratic,'' they led the way for these armed gangs (the same gangs they criticize in the press) to usurp power.

They did not like the idea of a government that is trying to redistribute money to the poor and provide Haitians with proper education and health care, because they feel threatened that their previous absolute hold on power will dissolve. And since they can't defeat Aristide in a fair election, they resorted to overthrow him militarily.

I have traveled to Haiti numerous times with Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, met with Haitian government officials, opposition groups, and leaders of NGOs, and served the Nation as an election observer, and I will tell you that Aristide won by a landslide. This cannot be denied by anyone. Yet for whatever reason, the Bush administration has been anything but a friend to the Aristide government, and insists ironically that Haiti does not deserve our monetary assistance because their elections were ''unfair.'' It simply mystifies me how President Bush, a President who was selected by the Supreme Court under more than questionable circumstances (in my district alone 27,000 votes were thrown out), is telling another country that their elections were not fair and that they are therefore undeserving of aid or international recognition.

Haiti is a nation that is still in the incipient stages of democracy and is in desperate need of foreign aid, and the Bush administration's economic stranglehold on the island has exacerbated Haiti's already crippled economy. The economic situation in Haiti is dire, yet the Bush administration's State Department apparently does not lend help to nations for humanitarian reasons, only when a precious natural resource such as oil is at stake.

Moreover, I remain outraged that Attorney General John Ashcroft and the Miami INS office is explicitly going after the Haitian refugees. In December, the INS routinely released refugees who passed credible-fear interviews—unless they were deemed special security risks connected to September 11. That is still the case for asylum seekers from Colombia, Venezuela, Cuba and almost any other country—except Haiti. The Miami INS, under orders from the Department of Justice, imprisons Haitians seeking to prove they deserve asylum, while asylum seekers from other countries roam freely within American borders. This unfair discrimination against Haiti has become a common practice under the current administration, and the Congressional Black Caucus is one of the few voices fighting against this outrageous policy.

To conclude: I reiterate my utter disappointment in the events that occurred in Haiti, and my outrage at the Bush administration's contribution to the fall of a democratically elected government.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank all of the Members that have participated in the Special Order.

HELP HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, first, let me thank Members of Congress tonight, the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for our focus and for leading this effort not only tonight but over the years with regard to Haiti.

Of course, Haiti tonight is on the minds and in the hearts of the international community, of many of us here in Congress and throughout the country. And tonight I want to first ask and raise concern for the safety and for the security of President Aristide and Mrs. Aristide and for their family. Given the circumstances of their departure, I think it is appropriate that we be concerned about their safety and insist that our government ensure that they not be put in harm's way.

For many years now we have consistently attempted to increase the Congress's role, the administration's role with regard to engagement with Haiti. We have asked over and over again for immediate humanitarian assistance, development assistance, infrastructure assistance. Really, all of those efforts to allow the Haitian people to live, to survive, and to move forward. Yet, repeatedly, over and over and over again, this administration has blocked any type of assistance, has embargoed efforts to ensure that the Haitian people receive the funding that they have negotiated, every single time. This administration went to the international community and blocked from the world the type of aid and assistance and economic development that Haiti needs.

It is unbelievable the type of circling of the wagons that we have seen as it relates to Haiti. Now, unfortunately, our country has helped to ensure that democratically elected president of Haiti was overthrown and this is totally unacceptable. What I have seen in the last few years is that really this country was setting up the situation which has occurred over the last few weeks. It really has helped democracy fail in Haiti, and that to me is a shame and it is a disgrace. Over and over again this administration has undermined and undercut President Aristide's attempts at social and economic development and the political challenges that have devastated his country. Over and over again I witnessed President Aristide comply with all of the requirements of the United States. One month it was this. The next month it was that. The next month it was something else. The Haitian government continually complied, continually stepped up to the plate even when it caused some discussions and some turmoil in their own country as a result of, for instance, having to raise the price of gasoline so that the international banks would be satisfied so that they could get the money that then negotiated for their loans. Outrageous kinds of requirements this country put on the Haitian government. Yet, still President Aristide responded and complied.

So what we have witnessed over the last couple of weeks really was the march to a coup d'etat. We witnessed the execution of a plan that I believe was really developed by, of course, those; and we are having hearings tomorrow so we will begin to expose and at least ask the questions, but it was the execution of a plan that we saw, I remember I think during the 1980s around Nicaragua, around some of the attempts to overthrow governments in Latin America, the U.S. ambassador, Negroponte, and Noriega who then was Senator Helm's person. We see many of the same kinds of players in place. And so, unfortunately, I am seeing an updated repeated performance of what we saw in the 1980s in Latin America. And, yes, this country has said that central to its foreign policy is regime change. That is a public kind of policy. And regime change manifests itself in many, many ways.

If I were Venezuela or Brazil, not to mention Cuba, I would be a bit concerned with what we know now and what we see taking place in terms of how the execution of a regime change, foreign policy takes place.

Finally, let me just say, when Secretary Powell says, it is nonsense and we are engaged in conspiracy theories, I would ask people to look at the ''U.S. War Against Haiti, Hidden From the Headlines.'' These are the facts. We will begin to expose it tomorrow.

AMERICAN REGIME CHANGE IN NOVEMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, there is a president in the western

hemisphere who was chosen in what many voters believe is a flawed 2000 election. Many people in his country and around the world believe that this president misled his people into a violent conflict in which many lives were lost. Revelations of corruption including falsifying documents, financial mismanagement, gross overcharging by well-connected corporations, kickbacks to politically allied organizations continue to accumulate. What is the proper response of the people of that country who no longer wish to be led by that president? Because it is a democracy, the answer is clear: vote him out at the next election.

I speak of President George W. Bush, not President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti.

□ 2245

Those of us who do not support President Bush will work to remove and replace him in the November 2 election. That is the way we do it in our democracy. In a democracy, one does not take up arms against an elected President. We do not threaten his life nor is he forced out of the country nor are convicted murderers and drug dealers and armed thugs welcomed in to do the dirty work. In a democracy, one goes from elected President to elected President and not coup d'etat to coup d'etat.

So this is a very, very sad time for those of us who believe in democracy. The Bush administration had the choice of defending the democratically-elected government in Haiti or supporting its overthrow. It chose the latter. Jean-Bertrand Aristide was the first democratically-elected President of Haiti, his successor due to be chosen in the next presidential election in 2005.

Over the last several weeks, an armed insurrection was organized by former death squad leaders, convicted murderers and drug dealers. They used terrorist tactics to take over police stations and then cities which were protected by only a very small government police force.

The New York Times describes these so-called rebels: ''The public face of the rebel army is the smile of Mr. Guy Phillipe. He is suspected by both Haitian and United States officials of cocaine trafficking. Mr. Phillipe has few democratic credentials. In 2001 he stood accused of planning a coup. Government said he masterminded a raid on the Presidential palace that left seven dead. He is joined in this rebellion by Louis Jodel Chamblain, the convicted assassin from FRAPH.''

The New York Times described FRAPH as ''an instrument of terror wielded by the military junta that overthrew Haiti's embattled Jean-Bertrand Aristide in 1991. It killed thousands over the next 3 years.''

Rather than coming to the defense of the democratically-elected government of Haiti, the Bush administration joined with the anti-democratic forces in the country to call for the President's ouster.

The administration, our administration, the Bush administration has consistently supported a small, elite group in Haiti whose principal economic interests is working with multinational corporations to exploit Haiti's vast pool of cheap labor. It is not a pretty history.

Last weekend, the United States and the international community met with President Aristide, at which time he agreed to a power-sharing proposal made by CARICOM and supported by the United States and France. He agreed but the opposition refused. Colin Powell extended the deadline, but the opposition stood by its insistence that Aristide step down, essentially dead or alive.

So, in the end, the Bush administration sided with the murderers, with the terrorists. While it is unclear exactly what happened early Sunday morning, the message from the U.S. to President Aristide was crystal clear, the United States will not protect you from being cleared by the assassins that are on your doorstep.

So President Aristide has gone. People are dead. The brutal former dictator Duvalier is on TV saying he wants to come back. Guy Phillipe wants to reinstate the brutal army. Chaos reigns in Haiti.

Where do we go from here? Clearly, we need to be part of this international force to establish security, but it would be shameful if we do not look back and figure out how we got into this mess, that is, to have a full investigation of every taxpayer dollar that was spent in Haiti and find out whether it was involved in the destabilization of Haiti. We have to assure the security of the Aristides so that they can go to a country where they can be safe, and we have to help the refugees. We need that full investigation, and we will be pushing for it, starting tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through March 10 on account of business in the district.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of the California primary.

Mr. CASTLE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and March 3 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CHOCOLA (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and March 3 on account of official travel to Libya.

Mr. KING of Iowa (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. PENCE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and March 3 on account of official travel to Libya.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 3 and 4.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, March 3.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 714. An act to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6879. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 99-09A, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

6880. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard ChalleNGe Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2003, required under section 509(k) of title 32, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6882. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report as of December 31, 2003, entitled, ''Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects and activities; Defense Cooperation Account'' as well as a report on the value of personal property that foreign nations have provided the United States for the Global War on Terrorism, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom for the period October 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6883. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6884. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Section 257 Triennial Report to Congress Indentifying and Eliminating Market Entry Barriers For Entrepreneurs and Other Small Businesses — received February 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6885. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Hart, Pentwater and Coopersville, Michigan) [MB Docket No. 02-335; RM-10545] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6886. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Dos Palos, Chualar, and Big Sur, California) [MM Docket No. 01-248; RM-10241; RM-10342] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6887. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Saluda and Irmo, South Carolina) [MB Docket No. 03-8; RM-10625] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6888. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcst Stations. (Muleshoe, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-251; RM-10315] (Big Lake, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-254; RM-10550] (Turkey, Texas)[MB Docket No. 02-370; RM-10612] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6889. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.2029b0, Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Charlotte Amalie, Frederiksted, and Christiansted, Virgin Islands0 [MM Docket No. 00-102; RM-9888] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6890. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Amherst and Lynchburg, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 96-100; RM-9963] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6891. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Shawnee and Topeka, Kansas) [MB Docket No. 03-26; RM-10638] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6892. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Park City, Montana) [MB Docket No. 02-79; RM-10424] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6893. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations; and Section 73.600(b), Table of Allotment Digital Television Broadcast Stations. (Knoxville, Tennessee) [MB Docket No. 03-224; RM-10801] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6894. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations. (Hobbs, New Mexico) [MB Docket No. 03-193; RM-10768] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6895. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations. (Portland, Maine) [MM Docket No. 00-133; RM-9895] received February 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6896. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States be transmitted to the Congress within a sixty day period after the execution thereof as specified in the Case -Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

6897. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed issuance of export licenses to Australia and Singapore (Transmittal No. DDTC 126-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6898. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6899. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual inventory of U.S. Government-sponsored international exhanges and training programs, as well as the FY 2003 report on the activities of the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training (IAWG), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g); to the Committee on International Relations.

6901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to section 565(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236), certifications and waivers of the prohibtion against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel and of the prohibition against contracting with firms that discriminate in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, and accompanying Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on International Relations.

6902. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: United States Munitions List (RIN: 1400-ZA06) received February 18, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6903. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of the Department's commercial and inherently governmental activities inventory, pursuant to Public Law 105—270; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6904. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting Pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), the Department's Inventory for FY 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6905. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of State Acquisition Regulation (DOSAR) (RIN: 1400-AB06) received February 10, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6906. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6907. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the Calendar Year 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6908. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6909. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report discussing the Congressional Office recycling programs for traditional and electronic equipment waste (E-waste) for the fourth quarter of FY 2003, pursuant to the directions issued in House Report 107-576; to the Committee on House Administration.

6910. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report entitled the ''Northeast Multispecies Harvest Capacity and Impact of Northeast Fishing Capacity Reduction'' covering the period December 1, 2002 through November 30, 2003, as pursuant to Section 308(d)(7) of the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act, as amended; to the Committee on Resources.

6911. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Fiscal Year 2002 Annual Report entitled, ''Promoting Partnerships for Public Safety Partnerships,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3711; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6912. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter concerning grants made under the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act of 2000 (Pub L. 106-561) to improve forensic science services, pursuant to Public Law 106—561, section 2806(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6913. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report on the extent to which the implementation by the United State Coast Guard of regulations issued or enforced, or interpretations or guidelines established, pursuant to Public Law 104—55, Public Law 104—324, section 1130(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6914. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G-V Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-13436; AD 2004-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6915. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-330-AD; Amendment 39-13437; AD 2004-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6916. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-262-AD; Amendment 39-13442; AD 2004-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6917. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 900EX Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-276-AD; Amendment 39-13439; AD 2004-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6918. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109E Helicopters [Docket No. 2003-SW-28-AD; Amendment 39-13438; AD 2004-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6919. 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-152-AD; Amendment 39-13415; AD 2004-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6920. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT9D-7R4 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-13422; AD 2004-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6921. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-144-AD; Amendment 39-13421; AD 2004-01-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6922. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Kidde Aerospace Part Number (P/N) 898052 Hand-held Halon Fire Extinguishers [Docket No. 2003-CE-19-AD; Amendment 39-13413; AD 2003-26-14] (RIN: 1220-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6923. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-13414; AD 2004-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6924. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-252-AD; Amendment 39-13420; AD 2004-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6925. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-13416; AD 2004-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6926. 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. 2001-NM-267-AD; Amendment 39-13417; AD 97-24-02 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6927. A letter from the Program Analsyt, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-87-AD; Amendment 39-13418; AD 2004-01-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6928. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of section 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Public Law 101-576, and the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the Corporation's 2003 Annual Report; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Government Reform.

6929. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting the annual report on the use of the Office of Compliance by covered employees for calendar year 2003, pursuant to section 301(h) of the Congressional Accountability Act; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

6930. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a two-part report to the Congress on various conditions in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Part I responds to the requirements of section 7 of Pub. L. 105-174 (1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act) and outlines the latest developments in our continuing efforts to achieve a sustainable peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Part II responds to the supplementary reporting requirements contained in section 1203(a) of Pub. L. 105-261 (Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999), covering the period from July 1 to December 31, 2003; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Armed Services, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 546. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3752) to promote the development of the emerging

commercial human space flight industry, to extend the liability indemnification regime for the commercial space transportation industry, to authorize appropriations for the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 547. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to amend title 35, United States Code, with respect to patent fees, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–431). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 3869. A bill to provide for the expanded use of technology and information management systems in the administration of the school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to provide grants to States to establish prescription drug monitoring programs, to impose requirements respecting Internet pharmacies, to require manufacturers to implement chain-of-custody procedures, to restrict an exemption respecting the importation of controlled substances for personal use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TURNER of Texas (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3871. A bill to establish the Unites States-Israel Homeland Security Foundation to make grants to joint business ventures between United States and Israeli private corporate entities to develop products and services with applications related to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 3872. A bill to prohibit the misappropriation of databases while ensuring consumer access to factual information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations, to improve children's nutritional health, and to restore the integrity of child nutrition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 3874. A bill to convey for public purposes certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, that have been identified for disposal; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that qualified homeowner downpayment assistance is a charitable purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit the comparative cost adjustment (CCA) program from operating in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OTTER:

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an election by individuals eligible for old-age insurance benefits under such title to waive payment of benefits based on their work record, to provide for income tax deductions based on the actuarial present value of benefits foregone by reason of such an election, and to provide that special Government obligations issued exclusively for purchase by the Social Security Trust Funds shall bear interest at the average market yield then prevailing for comparable obligations issued in the private sector; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3878. A bill to establish the Commission on American Jobs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of Western civilization; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H. Res. 548. A resolution recognizing the contributions of environmental systems and the technicians who install and maintain them to our quality of life; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 549. A resolution encouraging the President of the United States to designate a ''Read Across America Day''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 308: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 339: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 463: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 466A: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 503: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 566: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 677: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 814: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 847: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 871: Mr. ISAKSON and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 891: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 931: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 935: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 970: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 972: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1005: Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 1043: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1051: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 1083: Mr. WAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1098: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1105: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1117: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 1258: Mr. GORDON, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1264: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1345: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1421: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1478: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1519: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1582: Mr. PORTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1608: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1716: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1734: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1811: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1873: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1930: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 2052: Mr. RENZI.
H.R. 2217: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 2239: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2256: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 2262: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2322: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2323: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2569: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2582: Mr. OWENS and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2626: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2627: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2699: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2727: Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2771: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2863: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. WU.
H.R. 2932: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2946: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 2999: Mr. BURR and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 3015: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 3069: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 3158: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3226: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 3243: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3266: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3344: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3397: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3416: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3429: Mr. BURNS and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 3438: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3441: Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3458: Mr. WAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3474: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3480: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3488: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3528: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3543: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 3550: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 3567: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. MAJETTE, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 3574: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. OTTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 3582: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3619: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3643: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3656: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3658: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 3693: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3714: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3717: Mr. OTTER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 3755: Mr. OWENS, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3763: Mr. HOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 3771: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3777: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 3793: Mr. WU, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3801: Mr. HERGER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3804: Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 3815: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3818: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. LEE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3833: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3848: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 3857: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 3860: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 3867: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. SANDLIN.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. WELLER.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BACA, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H. Con. Res. 356: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illionis, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MOORE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. HOLT.
H. Con. Res. 366: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FILNER.
H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. BAKER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. COLE.
H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. CASTLE.
H. Res. 144: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 167: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 402: Mrs. NORTHUP.
H. Res. 481: Mr. POMBO.
H. Res. 482: Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 485: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Res. 501: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 522: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WU, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 530: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 540: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. KING of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3752

OFFERED BY: MR. BOEHLERT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In section 3(c)(5), strike ''by striking'' and all that follows through '', and the item'' and insert ''by striking '**License applications**' and inserting '**Applications**', and the item''.

In section 3(c)(12), strike ''is amended'' and all that follows through ''by adding'' and insert ''is amended by adding''.

In section 3(c)(17)—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) strike ''crew,''; and

(B) strike ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), strike ''employees,'.'' and insert ''employees'; and''; and

(3) add at the end the following new subparagraph:

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''The requirement for space flight participants to make a reciprocal waiver of claims with the licensee or transferee shall expire 3 years after the first licensed launch of a launch vehicle carrying a space flight participant.''.

In section 3(c)(18)(B), strike ''employees,'' and insert ''employees''.

In section 3(c)(19)—

(1) insert ''(1)'' after ''70113(a)''; and

(2) strike '', but not'' and insert ''but not''.