

Ose	Sanchez	Tauzin
Otter	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Owens	Sandlin	Taylor (NC)
Oxley	Sawyer	Terry
Pallone	Saxton	Thomas
Pascarell	Schaffer	Thompson (CA)
Pastor	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Schiff	Thornberry
Pelosi	Schrock	Thune
Pence	Scott	Thurman
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt
Peterson (PA)	Serrano	Tiberi
Petri	Sessions	Tierney
Phelps	Shadegg	Toomey
Pickering	Shaw	Towns
Pitts	Shays	Turner
Platts	Sherman	Udall (CO)
Pombo	Sherwood	Udall (NM)
Pomeroy	Shinkus	Upton
Portman	Shows	Velazquez
Price (NC)	Shuster	Visclosky
Putnam	Simmons	Vitter
Quinn	Simpson	Walden
Radanovich	Skeen	Walsh
Rahall	Skelton	Wamp
Ramstad	Slaughter	Waters
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Watkins (OK)
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Watson (CA)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Watt (NC)
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Watts (OK)
Reynolds	Snyder	Waxman
Riley	Solis	Weiner
Rivers	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rodriguez	Spratt	Weldon (PA)
Roemer	Stark	Weller
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Wexler
Rogers (MI)	Stenholm	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Wicker
Ross	Stump	Wilson (NM)
Rothman	Stupak	Wilson (SC)
Roukema	Sullivan	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Woolsey
Royce	Sweeney	Wu
Rush	Tancredo	Wynn
Ryun (KS)	Tanner	Young (AK)
Sabo	Tauscher	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake	Paul	Rohrabacher
-------	------	-------------

NOT VOTING—7

Blagojevich	Levin	Trafficant
Fattah	Pryce (OH)	
Gordon	Ryan (WI)	

□ 1444

Mr. FLAKE and Mr. PAUL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3694

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3694.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 10, 2002.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, District of Columbia.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I designate the following Members to be available for service in

accordance with the provisions of Clause 5(a)(4)(A) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

Mr. Lewis of Georgia.
Ms. Meek of Florida.
Mr. Tanner of Tennessee.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
Democratic Leader.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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.)

□ 1445

ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we were warned, and in the earlier years of our Republic, we heeded that warning. Today, though, we are entangled in everyone's affairs throughout the world and we are less safe as a result. The current Middle East crisis is one that we helped create, and it is typical of how foreign intervention fails to serve our interests. Now we find ourselves smack-dab in the middle of a fight that will not soon end. No matter what the outcome, we lose.

By trying to support both sides we, in the end, will alienate both sides. We are forced, by domestic politics here at home, to support Israel at all costs, with billions of dollars of aid, sophisticated weapons, and a guarantee that America will do whatever is necessary for Israel's security.

Political pressure compels us to support Israel, but it is oil that prompts us to guarantee security for the western puppet governments of the oil-rich Arab nations. Since the Israeli-Arab fight will not soon be resolved, our policy of involving ourselves in a conflict unrelated to our security guarantees that we will suffer the consequences. What a choice. We must choose between the character of Arafat versus that of Sharon.

The information the average American gets from the major media outlets, with their obvious bias, only makes the problem worse. Who would ever guess that the side that loses seven people to every one on the other side is portrayed as a sole aggressor and condemned as terrorists? We should remember that the Palestinian deaths are seen by most Arabs as being American-inspired, since our weapons are being used against them and they

are the ones whose land has been continuously taken from them. Yet there are still some in this country who cannot understand why many in the Arab Muslim world hate America.

Is it any wonder that the grass-roots people in the Arab nations, even in Kuwait, threaten their own government that is totally dominated by American power and money?

The arguments against foreign intervention are many. The chaos in the current Middle East crisis should be evidence enough for all Americans to reconsider our extensive role overseas and reaffirm the foreign policy of our early leaders, a policy that kept us out of the affairs of others.

But here we are in the middle of a war that has no end and serves only to divide us here at home, while the unbalanced slaughter continues with tanks and aircraft, tearing up a country that does not even have an army. It is amazing that the clamor for support for Israel here at home comes from men of deep religious conviction in the Christian faith, who are convinced they are doing the Lord's work. That, quite frankly, is difficult for me as a Christian to comprehend.

And, we need to remember the young people who will be on the front lines when the big war starts, which is something so many in this body seems intent on provoking.

Ironically, the biggest frustration in Washington, for those who eagerly resort to war to resolve differences, is that the violence in the Middle East has delayed plans for starting another war against Iraq. Current policy prompts our government on one day to give the go-ahead to Sharon to do what he needs to do to combat terrorism, a term that now has little meaning. On the next day, however, our government tells him to quit, for fear that we may overly aggravate our oil pals in the Arab nations and jeopardize our oil supplies. This is an impossible policy that will inevitably lead to chaos.

Foreign interventionism is bad for America. Special interests control our policies, while true national security is ignored. Real defense needs, the defense of our borders, are ignored and the financial interests of corporations, bankers, and the military-industrial complex gain control, and the American people lose. It is costly, to say to least. Already, our military budget has sapped domestic spending and caused the deficit to explode. But the greatest danger is that one of these days, these contained conflicts will get out of control.

Certainly, the stage is set for that to happen in the Middle East and in south central Asia. A world war is a possibility that should not be ignored. Our policy of subsidizing both sides is ludicrous. We support Arabs and Jews, Pakistanis and Indians, Chinese and Russians. We have troops in 140 countries around the world just looking for trouble. Our policies have led us to support the al Qaeda in Kosovo and bomb

their Serb adversaries. We have, in the past, allied ourselves with bin Laden as well as Saddam Hussein, only to find out later the seriousness of our mistake. Will this foolishness ever end?

A noninterventionist foreign policy has a lot to say for itself, especially when one looks at the danger and inconsistency of our current policy in the Middle East.

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

(Ms. NORTON 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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. DEUTSCH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GLOBALIZATION

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee, the Levi Strauss Company announced that a plant was closing and 900 jobs would be moved out of this country. This follows on the heels over the past year of many other plants closing in east Tennessee and throughout this Nation.

We have entered into some trade deals over the past several years that have not been good for American companies and American workers. They may have been good for big multinational companies, but they have resulted in millions of jobs going to other countries. I think that many, many people, in fact I think a great majority of the people in this Nation, are sick and tired of all of these jobs going to other nations.

Our trade deficits have been running at almost unbelievable levels over the last couple of years, usually \$25 billion to \$30 billion a month, or even higher. Many economists say that we lose 20,000 jobs per billion, but even if the job loss is much smaller than that, it still means that we have been losing millions and millions of jobs over the last several years, and I just do not believe that we can sustain that kind of job loss indefinitely on into the future.

In the short run, we do benefit from being able to buy cheaper goods from overseas. In the long run, however, we have lost and continue to lose millions of jobs to other countries. These jobs will not be easy to replace.

Michael Kelly, a columnist for the Washington Post, wrote recently that "Globalization ultimately depends on driving manufacturing jobs out of the U.S. and results in the loss of real jobs for real people in, say, Akron, Ohio. More than that," Mr. Kelly continues, "it results in real costs to the Nation as a whole, and these costs are massive. When, as has happened all across the country, a factory shuts its doors and shatters a town, turning what had been a productive community into a ward of the State, what does that cost America? Over time, many, many millions, a price that globalists ignore. Finally, globalization results in the loss of a way of life," what was quaintly known as the American way of life.

This columnist, Michael Kelly for The Washington Post, continues by saying, "In the long run, global free trade may be, as its boosters say, to the greater good of all, but in the short and even medium run in any developed country, it is to the greater pain of many for the greater gain of a few. Those who do not understand this may be well-intentioned, but the people who live in globalism's growing number of ghost towns must consider them shockingly ill-informed."

Then, Mr. Speaker, just yesterday Paul Craig Roberts, writing in the Washington Times, wrote this. He said, "Today, free trade has come to mean opening U.S. markets to those who do not open their markets to us. To meet this competition, U.S. firms locate factories in low-wage countries in order to be able to compete in the American consumer market. Free-traders think this is fine so long as the American consumer is benefiting from a lower price. But, of course, if specialization and division of labor means shifting production to low-wage countries, the U.S. population will find itself specialized in selling and servicing imported goods."

He continues on, and he says, "Free-traders are out to lunch when they say things like 'Oh, let the Chinese have the low-wage textile jobs,' implying that the United States retains the high-tech jobs. The reality is that the United States has had a trade deficit with China even in advanced technology goods since 1995."

And then he ends his column by saying, "The United States already has the export profile of a Third World country. The massive influx of poor immigrants from the Third World and the outflow of advanced technology will complete the transformation of the United States from a superpower into a colony."

Mr. Speaker, this greatly concerns me. Already we have environmental extremists who protest any time anyone tries to cut any trees or dig for any

coal or drill for any oil or produce any natural gas. They destroy jobs and drive up prices in the process and they hurt the poor and the lower income and the working people of this country. They always say, well, let us turn to tourism. But we cannot base the whole economy of this Nation on tourism.

Mr. Speaker, we need a trade policy, we need economic policies that put America first, once again, and that put American companies and American workers first, once again. The obligation of this Congress is not to foreign companies and foreign countries; it should be to the American people. If we do not wake up, this country is going to be in bad, bad trouble, because I am not sure that this economy is bouncing back as some of the experts say. I hope it is. But after what happened yesterday in Knoxville and what has happened over the last year or so, I have my doubts. I think we need to take another look at some of these trade deals and put our own people first, once again, in this country.

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

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

DEFENSE BUDGET RESTORATION ACT

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced the Defense Budget Restoration Act. At a time when the United States is at war, I am sorry to say that this bill is necessary. To use a common phrase in relation to pressing military needs—"The Emperor has no clothes." Let me explain:

In the wake of the ruthless terrorist attacks that killed thousands of innocent civilians on September 11, the United States has undertaken a global war on terrorism.

This war requires the use of U.S. military capabilities on a major scale in multiple theaters of operation simultaneously. President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld have repeatedly told the American people that this war will not be resolved quickly and will likely continue for a period of years. Already military operational tempo has increased, creating greater military spending and straining the ability of U.S. forces to meet all the demands placed on them.

Because of this situation, the Armed Services Committee has been questioning the service chiefs and the commanders-in-chief of the combatant commands about their current and future military needs. Several of them have testified that they need more manpower and other military capabilities to do the jobs they've been asked to do—including winning the war on terrorism. Our warfighters need more weapons systems, support equipment, facilities and other resources to fight the battles of this war now and in the future.