

Danner	Johnson, Sam
Davis (FL)	Jones (NC)
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)
Deal	Kanjorski
DeFazio	Kaptur
Delahunt	Kelly
DeLauro	Kennedy
DeLay	Kildee
DeMint	Kilpatrick
Deutsch	Kind (WI)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)
Dickey	Kingston
Dicks	Kleczka
Dingell	Klink
Dixon	Knollenberg
Doggett	Kolbe
Doyle	Kucinich
Dreier	LaFalce
Duncan	LaHood
Dunn	Lampson
Edwards	Lantos
Ehlers	Largent
Emerson	Larson
Engel	Latham
English	LaTourette
Eshoo	Lazio
Etheridge	Leach
Evans	Lee
Ewing	Levin
Farr	Lewis (CA)
Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Filner	Lewis (KY)
Fletcher	Linder
Foley	LoBiondo
Forbes	Lofgren
Ford	Lowey
Fossella	Lucas (KY)
Fowler	Luther
Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)
Frost	Manzullo
Galleghy	Markey
Ganske	Mascara
Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)
Gephardt	McCrery
Gibbons	Gilchrest
Gillmor	McDermott
Gilman	McGovern
Gonzalez	McHugh
Goode	McInnis
Goodlatte	McIntyre
Goodling	McKeon
Gordon	McKinney
Goss	McNulty
Graham	Meehan
Granger	Meek (FL)
Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Green (WI)	Menendez
Greenwood	Metcalf
Gutierrez	Mica
Gutknecht	Millender-McDonald
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Hastings (WA)	Minge
Hayes	Mink
Hayworth	Moore
Hefley	Moran (KS)
Hill (MT)	Moran (VA)
Hilleary	Murtha
Hilliard	Nadler
Hinchey	Napolitano
Hinojosa	Neal
Hobson	Nethercutt
Hoefel	Thomas
Hoekstra	Ney
Holden	Northup
Holt	Norwood
Hooley	Nussle
Hostettler	Oberstar
Houghton	Obey
Hoyer	Olver
Hulshof	Ortiz
Hunter	Ose
Hutchinson	Oxley
Hyde	Packard
Inslee	Pallone
Isakson	Pascrell
Istook	Pastor
Jackson (IL)	Paul
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pease
Jefferson	Pelosi
Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
John	Peterson (PA)
Johnson (CT)	Petri
Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
	Pickett
	Pitts

Pombo	Watt (NC)
Pomeroy	Watts (OK)
Porter	Waxman
Portman	Weiner
Price (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Quinn	Weldon (PA)
Radanovich	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—45

Rahall	Andrews
Ramstad	Boucher
Rangel	Buyer
Regula	Campbell
Reyes	Chambliss
Kingston	Riley
Dicks	Rivers
Kleczka	Rodriguez
Reynolds	Roemer
Klink	Rogan
Knollenberg	Rogers
Doggett	Rohrabacher
LaFauche	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Rothman
Dunn	Roukema
Edwards	Royal-Ballard
Ehlers	Royce
Emerson	Rush
Engel	Ryan (WI)
English	Ryan (KS)
Eshoo	Levin
Etheridge	Sabo
Evans	Salmon
Ewing	Sanchez
Farr	Lewis (CA)
Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Filner	Lewis (KY)
Fletcher	Linder
Foley	LoBiondo
Forbes	Lofgren
Ford	Lowey
Fossella	Lucas (KY)
Fowler	Luther
Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)
Frost	Manzullo
Galleghy	Markey
Ganske	Mascara
Gejdenson	McCarthy (MO)
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)
Gephardt	McCrery
Gibbons	Gilchrest
Gillmor	McDermott
Gilman	McGovern
Gonzalez	McHugh
Goode	McInnis
Goodlatte	McIntyre
Goodling	McKeon
Gordon	McKinney
Goss	McNulty
Graham	Meehan
Granger	Meek (FL)
Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Green (WI)	Menendez
Greenwood	Metcalf
Gutierrez	Mica
Gutknecht	Millender-McDonald
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Hastings (WA)	Minge
Hayes	Mink
Hayworth	Moore
Hefley	Moran (KS)
Hill (MT)	Moran (VA)
Hilleary	Murtha
Hilliard	Nadler
Hinchey	Napolitano
Hinojosa	Neal
Hobson	Nethercutt
Hoefel	Thomas
Hoekstra	Ney
Holden	Northup
Holt	Norwood
Hooley	Nussle
Hostettler	Oberstar
Houghton	Obey
Hoyer	Olver
Hulshof	Ortiz
Hunter	Ose
Hutchinson	Oxley
Hyde	Packard
Inslee	Pallone
Isakson	Pascrell
Istook	Pastor
Jackson (IL)	Paul
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pease
Jefferson	Pelosi
Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
John	Peterson (PA)
Johnson (CT)	Petri
Johnson, E. B.	Phelps

1945

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1945

DONALD YOUMANS' INTERNATIONAL CUSTODY BATTLE

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of Donald Youmans, a father whose son was abducted to Germany in 1993. Donald filed a missing persons report with police, and a United States court granted him temporary sole custody and ordered immediate return of his son.

A German court issued an ex parte order granting the mother sole custody of the son, stating that the child would suffer severe psychological damage to be taken away from his new environment of 3 months. In 1994, a German lower court denied return of the child, and 4 months later granted sole custody to the mother. In 1996, a court confirmed sole final custody and gave Donald restrictive access rights to be exercised only in Germany.

Despite the court order for these restrictive access rights, Donald's ex-wife continues to deny him access to his son. He has not seen his son since 1994. His son was abducted when he was two, and he is now eight.

Madam Speaker, these daily 1 minutes are about families and reuniting children with their parents. We must show respect and concern for the most sacred of bonds, the bond between a parent and a child. The House must do all that it can to bring our children home.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CORPORATE INVESTMENT IN AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

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. Madam Speaker, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War opened up a 10-year flood of new trade investment and economic growth in the world. But underneath this trend lies an unsettling pattern.

When it comes to competing for U.S. trade and private investment dollars, democratic countries in the developing world, countries like India and Taiwan and Bangladesh and South Korea, are losing ground to more authoritarian countries, like Indonesia, and especially the People's Republic of China.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic nations fell from 53 percent in 1989 to 34 percent in 1998, a decrease of 18 percentage points. Nondemocratic nations increased their share commensurately.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 21 percentage points, from 56 percent to 35 percent.

Regarding U.S. foreign investment in manufacturing, developing democratic countries gained 1 percent over the last 10 years. Nations that do not support democracy gained 5 percent of U.S. foreign investment over the last 10 years. China was responsible for 5 percent of foreign investment gained for nondemocratic countries.

Not only have the U.S. export market shares decreased for developing countries that have always been democracies, countries that have recently become democracies have also lost market share.

Understanding that basis for the vote that is coming in the next couple of weeks about giving permanent trade, Most Favored Nations status trading privileges to China should make the difference in this vote.

Western corporations want to invest in countries, like China, that have below-poverty wages, that have unenforced environmental laws or non-existent environmental standards, and

have no opportunities to unionize. As a result, they are turning to the authoritarian countries that can suppress labor rights and guarantee high profits for American companies.

China, for instance, is much more attractive to an American investigator than is India; China, a country which has a docile hierachal workforce where workers cannot join unions, where workers cannot talk back, where workers often cannot switch jobs and go to a competing factory.

United States pretends to promote democratic ideals worldwide through foreign aid and through the rhetoric in this chamber. But as developing countries make progress towards democracy, the American business community rewards them by pulling its trade and investment and depositing their investments in money in other totalitarian countries.

Understand, where corporate CEOs walk the halls of Congress asking Members of Congress to support permanent trade advantages for China, understand where they say that we need to engage with China so China improves its human rights record, where China will quit persecuting Christians and China will quit allowing forced abortions in their country, understand that the three major economic players in China are the Communist party of China, the People's Liberation Army of China, which runs many of the factories there, and Western investors.

Those Western investors, the Communist party, the People's Liberation Army, none of them want to change the rules. The rules work just fine for them. They like an authoritarian government structure that does not reward an ability to organize and bargain collectively, that does not tolerate any kind of dissent, that does not allow for any kind of worker rights.

That is why American investment is more and more likely to go to China instead of India, instead of Taiwan, instead of South Korea, instead of a country that really is a democracy. That is why China's permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges are such a bad idea.

Shame on this country, shame on this Congress if we give permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges to a country that violates every human rights standard, every value that we in this country hold dear.

SUPPORT \$500 TAX CREDIT FOR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN ON FOOD STAMPS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, for several weeks, I have been coming down to the floor talking about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps. Quite frankly, it has been a couple of weeks.

I brought tonight, as I have each and every night, the Marine who is getting ready to deploy for Bosnia. On his feet is his little girl named Magan. In his arms, he has a baby named Bridgette.

It so happens, on April 14, as my colleagues know, the Congress had closed for Easter. I was asked, along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), to attend a memorial service at New River Marine Air Station, as four Marines were among 19 Marines that were killed in the V-22 helicopter accident in Arizona a few weeks ago.

Sitting in the sanctuary during the memorial, I started thinking, I was looking around at Marines in attendance and just how many times those of us in this Nation take for granted the men and women in uniform that are willing to be called upon at any time to go defend this country and to give their life for this Nation.

So I am back on the floor tonight because I have introduced H.R. 1055, which is a bill that would give each and every member in the military that qualifies for food stamps, it would give them a \$500 tax credit. Quite frankly, it is not enough. At least it shows that we care, and it is a start.

I am pleased to tell my colleagues tonight, Madam Speaker, that we have 95 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, that are on this bill almost equally divided. Many on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side are in the leadership, and I am pleased they would join me in this effort to say to those who qualify for food stamps in uniform that we do care about them, we are trying to do something about it.

I have figures that are really kind of interesting, that the Defense Department says we have 6,500 men and women in uniform on food stamps, and the GAO says we have 13,000. Well, my point is, Madam Speaker, that one is one too many.

I think about the fact that we have already spent probably \$9 billion or \$10 billion in Bosnia, we have spent probably \$11 billion in Yugoslavia, and yet we cannot find the money to take our men and women in uniform off food stamps. That is unacceptable.

I speak about this quite frequently in my district. I see a lot of people in civic clubs and sometimes at churches, like any Member here that serves the United States House of Representatives. People come up to me afterwards and say, "I cannot believe that. I did not know that."

So I am hoping, by coming to the floor once a week, that I can encourage the leadership both, again, Republican and Democrat, to move this bill. There are other ideas that Members have, and they are good ideas. But I tell my colleagues that we have researched this thing for months going back a year ago, and what we found out, that if one really wants to make sure that those who qualify for food stamps are the ones that receive the assistance and no one drops through the cracks, then it

has to be this bill that we have introduced that would give a \$500 tax credit.

If there should be some movement on this bill, I hope, quite frankly, that, in a bipartisan way, we would raise that figure from \$500 to \$1,000.

So, Madam Speaker, I am going to close now. But, again, I want to remind the Members of the House that not only this Marine, this Marine represents everybody that is in uniform. We are sending our troops around this Nation just like a police force. I think between 1991 and 1999, they have been on 149 operations or deployments. I think about 60 percent of those in uniform are married.

So, again, I hope that we, in a bipartisan way, before we leave in October, will pass legislation that those that are on food stamps will know that we care about them. Because I know truthfully, Madam Speaker, that the American people are just outraged that anyone in uniform is on food stamps.

THIRTEEN JEWS HELD IN SHIRAZ, IRAN ON CHARGES OF ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to address this House on the issue of the 13 Jews being held in the city of Shiraz in Iran and on trial on charges of espionage. Let me first provide a bit of background. The Jewish community of Iran has been there since the Babylonian captivity over 2,500 years ago. It is the oldest Jewish community anywhere in the world except for Israel itself. For 2,500 years, Jews have lived in peace and in loyalty to whichever regime has governed Persia, now Iran.

2000

In 1979, the Iranian revolution created the Islamic Republic. Since then, that Islamic Republic has found it necessary or appropriate for some reason to oppress its religious minorities. Its treatment of those of the Bahai faith is known to many of us and is deplorable. And as to those who practice the Jewish faith, some 17 have been killed in the last 21 years, roughly one a year, always after some sort of show trial, always absurd charges followed by execution.

In February of 1979, the government of Iran, perhaps dissatisfied with the idea of only one trumped-up execution a year of the Jewish community, instead decided to arrest some 13 Jews on absurd charges. They were charged with spying for the United States and spying for Israel.

Now, why can I brand these charges so absurd? Well, Madam Speaker, here in the United States we live in a multi-ethnic, multicultural society. People of all races, religions, and ethnicities are found in the National Security Administration, the CIA, the FBI, and other positions of importance to our national security. And so no matter what a person's ethnic background, every boy and