

were the better for his presence and we are the lesser for his passing.

□ 1330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DISAPPOINTMENT IN FORMER LEBANESE OFFICIAL'S REMARKS

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to express deep disappointment in an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times with regard to Lebanon.

We lost American men and women at the American Embassy in 1983. We lost 241 Marines who went there to help the Lebanese people and to help the Lebanese Government.

There was an article whereby the former Prime Minister, Selim al-Hoss, said the following: "The United States is consequently a terrorist partner, which makes the U.S. unfit to lead the world."

Mr. Speaker, we need in this region reconciliation; we need peace. We do not need inflammatory statements like this from the leadership and former leadership of the Lebanese Government. We should be bringing people together, not dividing people.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article I referred to.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 6, 2001]

LEBANON TO RESIST U.S. SANCTIONS ON HEZBOLLAH

(By John Kifner)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The Lebanese government is indignant over American pressure to freeze the assets of Hezbollah, the Shiite Muslim organization bitterly opposed to Israel.

It is a request the Lebanese are likely to reject, according to officials and accounts in newspapers here including the daily owned by Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri, which is presumed to reflect his views.

"The government is headed for a refusal to freeze Hezbollah money or to interfere with the resistance," that newspaper, *Al Mustaqbal*, reported today.

The apparent impasse once again spotlights the difficulties the Bush administration has in cobbling together its international coalition against terrorism in the face of overriding, passionately held views on local issues, particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Hezbollah, whose name is Arabic for Party of God, was listed by the State Department on Friday, along with 21 other groups—a number of them Palestinian supporters opposed to the faltering Middle East peace efforts—as a terrorist organization whose financial resources should be cut off.

Those groups join the list that already includes groups under the control of or with

ties to Osama bin Laden, who is suspected of being behind the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The American action on Friday imposed stringent financial sanctions on the 22 groups. The government seized any assets of Hezbollah in the United States long ago, but the latest move is seen as putting pressure on Arab governments to crack down on the fund-raising activities of Hezbollah and other groups on the list.

The widespread Lebanese outrage over the American demand reflects the distance Hezbollah has traveled since it rose from the Shiite Muslim slums on the southern fringe of Beirut in the early 1980's as a shadowy, brutal band of kidnappers, suicide bombers and airplane hijackers.

Now it is a part of the Lebanese establishment, with members in Parliament, an important social service network and a television station whose news programs are avidly watched by many Lebanese.

Hezbollah has enjoyed the support of Syria and Iran. Syria dominates Lebanon's political affairs.

Indeed, Hezbollah members are officially regarded as national heroes—"the resistance"—for their role as guerrillas who opposed the 22-year-long Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon.

The American ambassador here, Vincent Battle, presented the American position at an emergency meeting he requested on Friday with the Lebanese foreign minister, Mahmud Hammud.

The foreign minister was apparently unimpressed.

"The Lebanese resistance has expelled Israel's occupation army from south Lebanon last year," Mr. Hammud said. "We are proud of it."

"We view the resistance as a legitimate means to liberate our land from Israeli occupation, and we hold fast to it, with the support of Syria and the rest of the Arab world."

Perhaps the most striking reaction came from an unexpected quarter, the elder statesman Selim al-Hoss, a soft-spoken academic and a Sunni Muslim who was the long-suffering prime minister through many years of civil war. He is widely respected for his personal integrity, though as a leader he was rendered powerless by religious militia factions in a land then corrupt beyond imagination.

"America supports the world's most brutal terrorist state and the deadliest ever terrorist who leads it," Mr. Hoss said, referring to Israel and its prime minister, Ariel Sharon. "The United States is consequently a terrorist partner, which makes the U.S. unfit to lead the world."

Indeed, it was widely assumed here that Israel was behind the new list, particularly after the influential Israeli lobby in Washington, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, applauded it.

To Hezbollah the condemnation was a badge of honor.

"We feel proud we have been taken as an enemy that should be blacklisted as terrorist by the Great Satan who heads the greatest pyramid of tyranny, repression and arrogance of modern times," Sheik Hassan Nasrullah, the group's leader, said at a rally. "It is natural for the American administration to blacklist Hezbollah and the other struggling Palestinian factions."

Sheik Nasrullah issued a prohibition against any form of assistance to the American operation in Afghanistan, calling it, "a war against every Muslim who refuses to bow or kneel to the United States."

In southern Lebanon, Sheik Nabil Qaook, the strategist of the guerrilla campaign against Israel, said in a speech during the weekend: "The U.S. lists don't bother us the slightest. When America accuses Hezbollah, we take it as proof of the credibility of our goals.

"In the past, America didn't shout so loud. When it is in a dominating position and when the rules of the international game are in its favor, we don't hear accusations of terrorism. But when the balance of power leans the other way, we hear them scream."

REINSTATEMENT OF MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the service in the Armed Forces for all American men has been an experience that has I think unified us in this country. It has been a common experience of getting up early in the morning, eating mediocre food, but mostly understanding how the military works and understanding the importance of patriotism in this country.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to realize that within a few years there will be nobody in this Chamber that has served in the military. In a few years, there will be nobody in State legislatures that has served in the military except, possibly, for maybe a few heroes that have come back and had the name ID that allows them to run for political office.

I think that is a great danger in terms of the understanding of legislative bodies here in the U.S. House of Representatives, over in the U.S. Senate and certainly in all our legislative bodies, the State legislatures, as well as municipal jurisdictions. That experience of serving in the military has unified us.

I have been working on legislation for the past 5 years that would reinstate military conscription in a process that is both voluntary and mandatory. It would direct the Secretary of the Army and the President to reinstate a conscription between 6 months and 1 year where those individuals would go through a kind of orientation of boot camp, but also the learning of international relations, the learning of terrorism and how terrorists work and where they come from, a better understanding of the different goals of the countries around the world, and then after, but also the military discipline of that kind of basic boot camp orientation.

After that there would be a discretion. If they do not want to continue to serve in that kind of military combat training role for the rest of that 6-month period or for the rest of that year period discretionarily, they would have the option of working in community service or going into AmeriCorps

or going into some other service for the government. They would receive modest pay but exceptional training to bring back that kind of unity of experience that is so important, I think, as we conduct business that involves, more and more, the rest of the world.

An understanding of international relations has been so obvious since the September 11 attack on this country. I would encourage my colleagues to call me or my office to get a copy of this draft legislation, to look into the possibility of renewing military conscription in both a mandatory and a voluntary way that they could earn credits with the GI Bill of Rights provisions for the time that they serve their country.

It would give those individuals the kind of experience, but more than that, it would be a binding force of common experience that would hold this country together.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEETING IN QATAR

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to yesterday's New York Times, the front page. There are some stories there that bear an interrelationship that is important.

There was a major story about the World Trade Organization's upcoming meeting in Qatar in the Middle East, the first meeting that the WTO will be holding since Seattle; and the story talks about the World Trade Organization and some of the difficulties that it has been having in gaining broad-based public support for its activities and deliberations; and in fact, the story implies that if these meetings in Qatar are not successful, it might spell the demise of the WTO and the type of globalization initiatives that have ensued since this Congress passed GATT just a few years ago when the WTO was set up.

One of the reasons it says that these talks are having difficulty is because of the fact that the world trade system has resulted in widening disparities between the very rich and the very poor, and it is very interesting that the meeting is being held in a part of the world which demonstrates the wide disparity in incomes between the very rich and the very poor.

On the same front page there was a story about the rumblings in South Africa that have come since independence was granted, and what does it talk about? It talks about the growing disparity in South Africa between the very rich and the very poor and the fact that thousands and thousands of people are having their electricity shut off, are not able to earn a living, rising

unemployment levels and that globalization without a social contract, and those are my words, not the words of the New York Times, creates a rising poverty and rising wealth for only the few, and that our globe is being affected by these forces, these powerful economic forces in all regions.

Recently, this week, Secretary Powell has met with the top leaders of Bangladesh, Bangladesh, one of the poorest nations in the world, which has a \$2 billion trade deficit with the United States.

How do these stories connect? These stories connect because in Bangladesh over 3,500 contract shops operate, producing over a billion garments for the world, half of which come here to the United States.

Women in that country make caps that are worn by athletic teams at all of our major universities, for example. They are forced to sew 320 caps per hour if they want to keep their job, and their bosses want them to increase it to 370 caps per hour. For each cap, they are paid a penny and a half. Those caps arrive in our country for a total of \$1 for total costs of production and shipment, material, labor and transportation. And then they are sold, on average, inside this economy for \$17 to \$19 a cap.

Now, the foreign minister of Bangladesh wants us to remove further tariffs on these items coming to our country. And what I am thinking is, even if we remove the tariffs, what guarantees are there that the women of that country would get a living wage? There is absolutely no guarantee.

The trading system that this globalization regimen has put in place has put a downward pressure on workers across this world; and they are rising up in South Africa, in the Middle East, in South America. We saw their faces in Seattle. Somebody had better pay attention to what is wrong with this global trading system. It works to the benefit of the few at the cost of the many.

I am for trade. I have a trading district, but I am for the dignity of the working person whether they work on the farm or whether they work in the factory, wherever in the world they exist. This world trading system must have a social contract, and without that we are going to have political tremors across this world, the likes of which the free nations have never experienced before.

I would say that you must have free trade among free people. And that trade regimen that is put in place by the laws we pass and by the institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank, if they do not give credence to democratic rights and freedoms then, my goodness, what are we doing?

So I would commend to my colleagues, take a look at the New York

Times. Think about the connection between WTO and Qatar this week and what is going on in South Africa, and what is going on in Mexico where wages have been cut in half, and what went on in Seattle when people did not earn enough for the work they do.

What kind of system is this country promoting?

CREATING SAFER AIRLINE TRAVEL

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I do not come often to the well of the House, but today I feel it is essential that I address both my fellow colleagues here today and the American people because we are now in the process of considering airport security. And the debate, in my opinion, has degenerated to do we, in fact, hire Federal workers or do we hire non-Federal workers when, in fact, the House of Representatives and the Senate clearly agree on two things that are existing today.

One is that we need to up and improve the standards; secondly, that the existing contractors who are doing the job today, that is supposed to result in our safety in the air, are not doing their job properly.

Only yesterday when Chicago was proven to be a hopeless sieve, and other cities when it was shown that these workers, many of them, most of them not citizens, operated by a foreign corporation that does not even ensure that the background checks are done, even after paying a huge fine, they continue to not do the background checks. They continue to not meet the requirements that will lead to America's safety.

I get on an airplane virtually every week. I have over 100,000 miles this year alone going back and forth to my district. I as much as any other member of this great Nation have a vested interest in airline safety, as do all of my colleagues here today and on the other side of the House.

There is no question that we must act and act immediately. From this body we do not call on the administration to specific action, but I call on all of us in government to immediately fire these contractors who have failed to protect us, those contractors who continue to violate the laws. Do not fine them; fire them. I believe that while we are deciding who can protect us better, I would feel much safer having my county sheriff standing there, having my California National Guard and every other State's National Guard. And I know that those men and women with minimal supervision on Day One will be U.S. citizens, will speak, read, write English, will understand better what behavior that is not