

Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette

Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)

Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman

Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak

Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Barrett
Blagojevich
Davis (IL)
Eshoo

NOT VOTING—11

Fattah
Fletcher
Hinojosa
Kilpatrick

Murtha
Rush
Traficant

□ 1812

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from “yea” to “nay”.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District, I was unavoidably detained on Wednesday, March 13. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows on the amendments to H.R. 2341, the Class Action Fairness Act: “aye” on the Waters Amendment (Roll-call No. 56); “aye” on the Conyers Amendment (Roll-call No. 58); “aye” on the Jackson-Lee Amendment (Roll-call No. 59) and “aye” on the Frank Amendment (Roll-call No. 60).

Finally, I would have voted “aye” on the motion to recommit offered by Mr. SANDLIN (Roll-call No. 61) and “nay” on final passage of H.R. 2341 (Roll-call No. 61).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. 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 H.R. 2341, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 I had to return to

my district on official business. On Rollcall No. 51, if I had been present, I would have voted no.

On Rollcall No. 52, H.R. 3090, the economic stimulus package to increase the unemployment benefits for laid-off workers, I would have voted aye.

On March 12, 2002, Rollcall No. 53, H.R. 1885, Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002, I was unavoidably detained in my district. If I had been present, I would have voted aye.

Mr. Speaker, my final one, today, March 13, 2002, on Rollcall No. 54, the Journal vote, I was delayed because of air travel. I was coming from my district. If I had been present, I would have voted aye.

CUBANS SEEKING POLITICAL
CHANGE

(Mr. FLAKE 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. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a remarkable event that occurred last Thursday on the island of Cuba. According to Reuters, “In an apparently unprecedented move during Fidel Castro’s 43-year rule, a group of dissidents says it has gathered 10,000 signatures to ask the Cuban parliament for a referendum on political reforms.”

“We are proposing a consultation with the people so that they can decide about change,” a leading moderate dissident, Oswaldo Paya, who is the main promoter of the so-called Varela Project, told Reuters late on Wednesday.

The project, named for the pro-independence Catholic Priest Felix Varela, is based on Article 88 of the Cuban constitution, which says new legislation may be proposed by citizens if more than 10,000 voters support them.

The proposed referendum, Paya says, would be on the need to guarantee rights of freedom of expression and association and amnesty for political prisoners; more opportunities for private businesses; and new electoral law and a general election.

Unfortunately, it is virtually certain that the National Assembly will reject the referendum.

Mr. Speaker, I include these two articles and state for the RECORD that these dissidents from Cuba deserve to be seen and heard.

[From the Associated Press, Mar. 8, 2002]

CUBANS SEEKING POLITICAL CHANGE

(By Anita Snow)

HAVANA.—Cuban dissidents said Friday they have collected 10,000 signatures needed to force a referendum on overhauling the government, a move unprecedented in communist Cuba.

Miguel Saludes of Cuba’s Christian Liberation Movement said activists were checking the signatures to verify their authenticity. The petition will then be delivered to Cuba’s National Assembly, he said.

NAYS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch

Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)

Klecza
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markley
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar

He would not say when activists expected to have the document ready. The proposed referendum, known as the Varela Project, appears to be the first signature-gathering effort to get this far under the government of Fidel Castro (news—web sites), in power for 43 years.

The referendum would ask voters whether they think guarantees are needed to assure the rights of free speech and association and whether they support an amnesty for political prisoners. It would also call for new electoral laws and more opportunities for Cubans to run their own private businesses.

Castro's government has not commented publicly on the effort. Previous petition efforts have stalled in part because people were afraid to sign, but in the decade since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the government has shown slightly more tolerance for opposition groups.

The project is named for Father Felix Varela, a Roman Catholic priest who fought for the emancipation of slaves on the Caribbean island. The referendum was first mentioned by the Christian Liberation Movement shortly after Pope John Paul (news—web sites) II's visit here in January 1998.

The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and Reconciliation and the Democratic Solidarity Party later joined the Christian Liberation Movement in helping coordinate the signature-gathering drive. The groups have been gathering signatures across the island since early last year.

All three groups operate here without the approval of the government, which regularly characterizes its opponents as "counter-revolutionaries" and "mercenaries" for the U.S. government and Cuban exiles.

CUBA DISSIDENTS SAY 10,000 SIGN REFERENDUM APPEAL

(By Isabel Garcia-Zarza)

HAVANA (Reuters)—In an apparently unprecedented move during President Fidel Castro's 43-year rule, a group of dissidents says it has gathered 10,000 signatures to ask the Cuban parliament for a referendum on political reforms.

"We are proposing a consultation with the people so they decide about change," a leading moderate dissident, Oswaldo Paya, who is the main promoter of the so-called Varela Project, told Reuters late on Wednesday.

The project, named for pro-independence Catholic priest Felix Varela (1788-1853), is based on article 88 of the Cuban constitution, which says new legislation may be proposed by citizens if more than 10,000 voters support them.

The proposed referendum, Paya said, would be on the need to guarantee the rights of free expression and association; an amnesty for political prisoners; more opportunities for private business; a new electoral law; and a general election.

Havana, which scorns dissidents as "counter-revolutionary" pawns of a hostile U.S. government and anti-Castro Cuban American groups, has publicly ignored the project. But Paya and others behind the campaign accused the government of mounting a strong campaign of "threats and persecution" to impede the gathering of signatures and delivery of letters to authorities.

"Authorities are acting like gangsters," said Paya, who has a long list of alleged verbal and physical abuse against Varela Project activists in the last year.

'GOVERNMENT AFRAID'—PAYA

"The government is afraid of this liberating gesture, where a social vanguard is showing it has no fear. The government is afraid when the people are not afraid," he added. Castro frequently says his one-party communist system is more democratic than

the Western model and denies the existence of political prisoners or repression of freedom of expression.

The signatures, gathered by activists across the Caribbean island of 11 million inhabitants over the last year, will be presented to the National Assembly in a few weeks, once all 10,000 signatures have been checked and ratified, Paya said.

"This has never been done before, it has no precedent," he added. "It shows Cubans not only want changes, but also are ready to face the risks to show they want changes." According to Paya, more than 100 small opposition groups have backed the initiative. However, some prominent dissidents, such as Martha Beatriz Roque, do not support it, arguing it is unrealistic to seek change within a constitution designed by the Castro government.

Paya did not say what Varela Project backers will do if the initiative is rejected by the National Assembly, something analysts and diplomats think is virtually certain. "We are ready to keep demanding our rights," he said.

Over the four decades since the 1959 revolution, Cuba's scattered and marginalized internal dissident movement has made little headway against Castro's grip on power. Castro again scathingly lambasted dissidents this week, in a three-hour TV speech, as non-representative of the Cuban people and intent on helping Washington bring Cuba into the U.S. "empire."

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.)

STEEL PROTECTIONISM

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened by the administration's recent decision to impose a 30 percent tariff on steel imports. This measure will hurt far more Americans than it will help, and it takes a step backward toward the protectionist thinking that dominated Washington in decades past. Make no mistake about it, these tariffs represent naked protectionism at its worst, a blatant disregard of any remaining free market principles to gain the short-term favor of certain special interests.

□ 1815

These steel tariffs also make it quite clear that the rhetoric about free trade in Washington is abandoned and replaced with talk of "fair trade" when special interests make demands. What most Washington politicians really believe in is government-managed trade,

not free trade. True free trade, by definition, takes place only in the absence of government interference of any kind, including tariffs. Government-managed trade means government, rather than competence in the marketplace, determines what industries and companies succeed or fail.

We have all heard about how these tariffs are needed to protect the jobs of American steelworkers, but we never hear about the jobs that will be lost or never created when the cost of steel rises 30 percent. We forget that tariffs are taxes and that imposing tariffs means raising taxes. Why is the administration raising taxes on American steel consumers? Apparently no one in the administration has read Henry Hazlitt's classic book "Economics in One Lesson." Professor Hazlitt's fundamental lesson was simple: we must examine economic policy by considering the long-term effects of any proposal on all groups.

The administration, instead, chose to focus on the immediate effects of steel tariffs on one group, the domestic steel industry. In doing so, it chose to ignore basic economics for the sake of political expediency. Now, I grant you that this is hardly anything new in this town, but it is important that we see these tariffs as the political favors that they are. This has nothing to do with fairness. The free market is fair. It alone justly rewards the worthiest competitors. Tariffs reward the strongest Washington lobbies.

We should recognize that the cost of these tariffs will not only be borne by American companies that import steel, such as those in the auto industry and building trades. The cost of these import taxes will be borne by nearly all Americans, because steel is widely used in the cars we drive and in the buildings in which we live and work. We will all pay, but the cost will be spread out and hidden, so no one complains. The domestic steel industry, however, has complained; and it has the corporate and union power that scares politicians in Washington. So the administration moved to protect domestic steel interests, with an eye towards upcoming elections. It moved to help members who represent steel-producing States.

We hear a great deal of criticism of special interests and their stranglehold on Washington, but somehow when we prop up an entire industry that has failed to stay competitive, "we are protecting American workers." What we are really doing is taxing all Americans to keep some politically favored corporations afloat. Some rank-and-file jobs may also be saved, but at what cost? Do steelworkers really have a right to demand Americans pay higher taxes to save an industry that should be required to compete on its own?

If we are going to protect the steel industry with tariffs, why not other industries? Does every industry that competes with imported goods have the same claim for protection? We have propped up the auto industry in the