withdraw awarding a ''Constructive Dissent'' award to U.S. Armenian Ambassador John Evans.

Ambassador Evans was due to receive the Christian A. Heter Award for intellectual courage, initiative, and integrity later this week. The award was as a result of courageous statements he made regarding the recognition of the Armenian genocide.

In a series of public statements, Ambassador Evans, who has studied Russian history at Yale and Columbia and Ottoman history at the Kennan Institute stated, ''I will today call it the Armenian genocide.''

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans has studied history of Armenia, and based on his substantial studies of the issue, he is willing to go on the record and define the actions taken Armenians as genocide. The Armenian genocide was the systematic extermination, the murder, of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children. To this day, the Republic of Turkey refuses to acknowledge the fact that this massive crime against humanity took place on soil under its control, and in the name of Turkish nationalism.

Unfortunately, some 90 years later, the U.S. State Department continues to support Turkey's demands and denials despite all evidence to the contrary. It is not likely that the State Department was happy that their Ambassador to Armenia acknowledged the Armenian genocide. And, therefore, Ambassador Evans retracted his remarks after receiving substantial pressure from the State Department.

Well, now the selection committee at the American Foreign Service Association has decided to withdraw the award with no reason for its actions. I find the timing of the decision peculiar. The sharp turnaround came right before Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan arrived in Washington for a meeting with President Bush. Based on past history, it is clear that the State Department, the Bush administration, and the pro-Turkish lobby pressured AFSA to withdraw Ambassador Evans' award.

It is simply unacceptable for this administration to continue to penalize the ambassador for his comments. Ambassador Evans did a courageous thing. His statements did not contradict U.S. policy, but rather articulated the same message that this administration has sent to the public. The only difference in this case is that Ambassador Evans assigned a word to define the actions taken against the Armenians.

□ 1930

This was a refreshing break, I must add, from a pattern on the part of the State Department of using evasive and euphemistic terminology to obscure the full reality of the Armenian genocide. Ambassador Evans pointed out, and I quote, that no American official has ever denied it, and went on to say, and I quote, I think we, the U.S. Government, owe you, our fellow citizens, a more frank and honest way of discussing this problem.

Ambassador Evans was merely recounting the historical record, which has been attested to by over 120 Holocaust and genocide scholars from around the world. By doing this, he earned a prestigious award that was taken from him because of politics and denial.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to all those who, in Ambassador Evans' own words, and again I am quoting, think it is unbecoming of us as Americans to play word games here. I believe in calling things by their name. Evans was right, and the American Foreign Service Association was correct in awarding him the Christian A. Herter Award. We should encourage our Ambassadors to speak the truth, and, more broadly, end, once and for all, our complicity in Turkey's campaign of genocide denial.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans has been penalized for simply telling the truth. The American Foreign Service Association has set a terrible example by retracting Ambassador Evans' award. I guess, even in America, the Turkish Government is able to stifle debate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–122) on the resolution (H. Res. 314) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

CAFTA: A LOSE-LOSE PROPOSITION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight during the 5-minute time in opposition to the flawed free trade agreement the administration signed with the Dominican Republic and Central American countries. My colleague from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has an hour later, but I wanted to do a 5-minute on the Central American Free Trade Agreement and the Dominican Republic.

Over the past year we have continued to learn about this agreement. During this time the opposition to CAFTA, as it is called, has only grown stronger. The more we learn, the more we realize that CAFTA is a lose-lose proposition. It is no secret that CAFTA is modeled after the NAFTA agreement that was supposed to create new markets for U.S. products and lift up the low-income people in Mexico. The unfortunate result of NAFTA was the loss of 50,000 jobs and a widening of the income gap in Mexico.

Make no mistake, wealth in Mexico has increased since NAFTA, but it has not been evenly distributed. Since NAFTA, an additional 19 million Mexicans are impoverished, and President Vicente Fox has stated that 54 million Mexicans are too poor to meet their basic needs. With 10 percent of the Mexican population controlling half of the nation's wealth, it is easy to see that the average Mexican worker has not benefited from NAFTA. One would think our country would learn from the many failures of NAFTA instead of applying the nearly identical trade provisions to the Central American and Dominican Republic.

I have long opposed free trade agreements with countries with substantially lower standards of living than we have here in the United States. I am proud to represent the third most blue-collar district in our country. The workers in our district benefit from the labor laws on the books of our country. While our labor laws could certainly be strengthened, they ensure that our blue-collar workers receive a living wage and make up a thriving middle class in our country, although a shrinking middle class in our country, might I add.

I have no doubts whatsoever about the skills and productivity of our American workers, but they cannot compete against similar workers in Nicaragua, for example, where wages average about $200 a month. This salary differential puts the American worker and American products at a disadvantage, one that this country should not allow to be exploited through a free trade agreement.

The labor laws of the CAFTA countries do not come close to meeting international standards. Each of the DR–CAFTA countries has been cited by the International Labor Organization for policies which provide inadequate protection against antiunion discrimination. Four of the five countries have laws on the books that significantly impede workers' ability to strike, and each of the countries has laws that restrict union formation or union leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise includes not only me as a businessperson, but also me as a person to be able to collectively bargain for my wages and my working conditions. What is worse, the CAFTA agreement has no real enforcement mechanism to force a change in these labor laws. True, the agreement

technically requires the enforcement of all labor laws, and as a penalty for failing to enforce its labor laws, a CAFTA country must pay a fine to improve the labor conditions. However, the agreement contains no guarantee that the fine will be used for that purpose. In fact, as a party to the CAFTA agreement, the U.S. has the ability to withdraw trade benefits only based on whether that fine is paid, not on how that money is used.

This provision violates the spirit of the fast track negotiating authority under which Congress will consider CAFTA. Under fast track, all parts of an agreement must be subject to equal remedies. Yet under CAFTA, the penalties for labor violations are much weaker than those involved in commercial disputes, whether it be copyright or some other commercial dispute.

Make no mistake about it, this agreement is not in the interest of the Central American worker or the American worker. This agreement would just open the door for American multinational corporations or other countries' multinational corporations to shift their operations overseas for cheap Central American labor. In the interest of both American workers and the Central American workers, I encourage my colleagues to join me, and a majority of this House, in opposition to DR–CAFTA.

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.)

IRAQ

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, this Congress approved an additional $82 billion for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That is on top of the other $220 billion that we had appropriated, raising the total cost of this war to more than $300 billion. If that was not enough, this week we are about to approve another $45 billion as a bridge loan for the operations in Iraq, bringing the cost up to $350 billion. What have we gotten ourselves and what have we accomplished in the last 2 plus years and after nearly now $350 billion of American taxpayer money?

We defeated Saddam Hussein's regime, but today we find ourselves mired in an endless occupation with the inability to find a way out of our occupation of Iraq. In fact, the generals there say we are years off from ever being able to extricate ourselves from Iraq. Operation Iraqi Freedom was a war of choice. As President Kennedy once said, ''To govern is to choose.'' One can only hope that the war in Iraq was the right choice.

Every President in the middle of a war has thought and laid out a vision of America after that war, how to see of all the sacrifices that America made, how the benefits of the war would come home. President Lincoln thought of the land grant colleges and the transcontinental railroad system in the midst of a civil war. He saw a way of building America when it became clear we were going to win that war. President Roosevelt, the GI bill and universal health care; President Truman, the minimum wage, universal health care; President Eisenhower, on the heels of the beginning days of the Cold War as well as the closing days of the Korean War, the Interstate Highway System today. President Kennedy, in the midst of Vietnam and the early days of his administration of a cold war, envisioned a man on the moon and NASA, where America would dominate space and all the benefits that would come from that. President Johnson saw health care as his vision, Medicare and Medicaid.

While we are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, while Americans have lost 1,700 of their fellow citizens, over 10,000 who have been wounded and cost us $350 billion of taxpayer-funded entities and a taxpayer-funded war, what is our vision? What has this President said? How does he see America down that horizon, that point out there on the horizon as you look forward? What are we going to build? What vision do we lay for the next generation for all the sacrifices Americans have made, not just in blood and in treasure, but for our sense of our country?

As I said, President Lincoln saw an intercontinental railroad system. This President wants to eliminate Amtrak. President Eisenhower built highways. The highway system we have today was laid out by President Eisenhower. President Bush is threatening to veto the highway bill. President Kennedy saw a man on the Moon. The President has walked away from his vision of putting a man on Mars. President Roosevelt saw a GI bill for the troops to come home. Just this last week we cut or eliminated the opportunity for our National Guard and reservists to get health care.

Every President during the midst of a war has had a vision of America after that war that was bigger, grander and worth all the sacrifice that said the benefits of that war, America's prestige, would come home in material benefits to America. That is why we have an intercontinental highway system. That is why we had a railroad system. That is why we had the land grant colleges. That is why we put a man on the Moon. We saw a vision, every President that led this country both through war and then through peace.

It is at this time that this President needs to lay out a vision, and, let me tell you, it needs to be larger than a tax cut. That is not a vision. Somehow, do we have a universal broadband, so America leads again technologically? Would you see in the midst of a war a President who submits a budget that cuts the National Institutes of Health, a President who eliminates from the National Science Foundation $100 million from its budget, yet we placed 16th for the first time in computer sciences? That is not a vision of America that goes forward. That is a smaller, a reduced America, an America that does not see itself in the grand scheme of things.

When President Bush ran for the nomination in 2000, he announced that he was against nation-building. You look sometimes at this budget, you look at what he has done, and who knew it was America he was talking about when it came to nation-building? It is time for this President to lay out a vision that says, with all the sacrifices, his vision for America, what we are going to do. We are going to build in the science, we are going to build in the medical field, we are going to provide universal health care. What is it? It has got to be more than a veto of a highway bill, and it has got to be more than the elimination of 60 vocational programs. It has got to be more than walking away from landing a man on Mars. It has got to be a vision that says the sacrifice was worthy of this country and its great commitment to democracy around the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I also rise to join my colleagues in opposition to the Dominican Republic Central American Free Trade Agreement, known as CAFTA. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and other Members of Congress will shortly be speaking for a special hour to take note of the negative effects that CAFTA will have not only on the American public, but also our relatives and friends that live in Central America.

I have the distinction of being one of the few Members of Congress with family that lives in Central America. I have seen firsthand for myself the conditions that people are currently living in there right now, in a small country known as Nicaragua where the poverty levels are just outrageous. There is no relief that will come through CAFTA, in my opinion.

As I see it right now, what we have learned from the NAFTA trade agreement that was passed some 10 years