

Washington, in other words, wouldn't stop hedging its bets. The United States backs Mr. Karzai, but it can't relinquish its alliances with the enemies of all he stands for.

But President Karzai bears part of the blame. He, too, has been hedging his bets. His endlessly polite interactions with his predator governors are confusing his constituents. Although Washington thought firing half a dozen governors was too much, it would have supported the dismissal of one or two, and Mr. Karzai wasted a golden opportunity by refusing to do that.

The problem is, no matter what they say, these warlords aren't going to behave. They are not reformable, because it is not in their interest to reform. The warlords' livelihood depends on extremism and lawlessness. That's how they draw their pay; that's what allows them to rule by the gun in an unofficial martial law, looting villages under the pretext of mopping-up operations, extracting taxes and bribes, crushing opponents.

The American alliance with warlords also discourages ordinary Afghans from helping rebuild their country. And without the people, the process is doomed. Afghans I have met and worked with share a fierce desire to live in a normal country. They have demonstrated that desire. In the face of tremendous adversity, they have managed to open schools, clean irrigation ditches, plant trees and dig sewers. But seeing warlords regain power is making people waver. I have found in my work that more and more Afghans are withdrawing to the sidelines, subtracting their life force from the battle to reconstruct Afghanistan.

They are also increasingly wary about the elections next year. At a recent meeting here with representatives from the commission that's drafting a new constitution, a nursing student asked, "How can we freely elect our representatives with warlords controlling the countryside?"

Despite American officials' misgivings, it would not be so difficult to remove the warlord-governors. Their lack of popular support means no one would fly to their defense were they dismissed. The mere display of American backing for a plan to oust them would be enough to cow their paid liegemen. In the interest of offering Afghanistan a chance at a future, and opening the door to a new kind of relationship with the Muslim world, the United States should back any future decision to remove the warlord-governors.

For despite the rocky start to reconstructing postwar Afghanistan, an ember of hope for the country's future is still burning. Several high caliber diplomats are now at the American embassy. American military commanders, who by training focus on battle plans, have begun to realize that their activities can have unintended political consequences if they do not have intimate knowledge of the people they are dealing with. These officers have grown more alert to the ways in which local warlords may be using them. In Kandahar, the base commander has begun meeting with tribal elders to forge links with the population. In other words, the United States is finally positioned to do a good job here.

When President Bush decided to invade Iraq, he promised that Afghanistan would not be forgotten. If that promise is to mean anything, America's accumulated experience in Afghanistan must be acted upon, unequivocally. It's time to stop hedging bets.

H.R. 1828, SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEBANESE SOVEREIGNTY RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 2003

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, today I joined a growing number of my colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 1828, the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act.

I sponsored this legislation because I believe that Syria presents a unique threat to the peace, security and stability in the Middle East. Syria is geographically central in the region, but it is also central to the peaceful evolution of the region.

Continued Syrian sponsorship of terrorism threatens to unravel renewed efforts at peace in the region. President Bush's Road Map is at risk because of this state-sponsored terrorism and we must indicate the serious consequences of Syria's destabilizing activity.

This legislation gives the President the leverage he needs to persuade the Syrian regime to reconsider its role in the region. The fall of Iraq represented only the first in a series of positive changes that will sweep through the Middle East in the coming years, and Syria has an opportunity to be on the right side of history. The possibility of this legislation becoming law should be understood as a clear warning about the position of the House of Representatives.

At the same time, I do not believe that H.R. 1828 is a perfect bill. It needs to be improved before it is sent to the President for his signature. I am cosponsoring the bill out of a desire to move this legislation forward, but believe a number of changes are necessary.

First, the legislation must specifically define the meaning of "food and medicine" in Section 5(a). Specifically, this section should be brought into conformity with the definitions of "agricultural commodity," "medicine" and "medical device" included in the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-387). Enactment of this legislation three years ago signaled Congressional intent to prohibit unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. To ensure there is no confusion by implementing agencies that have historically demonstrated hostility to excepting categories of exports from unilateral sanctions, it is necessary to include very specific definitions.

Second, the legislation must incorporate sunset clauses for both the authorization of sanctions and for any sanctions that are imposed through Section 5(a)2. Congress should not impose sanctions in perpetuity, for while we are often quick to impose sanctions; we are not nearly as effective at repealing dated restrictions. Sanctions, fundamentally, should be an aberration to how the United States approaches other nations. Our bilateral relationship should stress engagement over restrictions, but in certain exceptional cases, sanctions may be necessary. These sanctions should be temporary in nature to encourage future Congressional scrutiny of the continued value of the restrictions. Should sanctions be perceived necessary in the future than future Congresses are likely to extend the prohibitions beyond the sunset period. Sunset peri-

ods also encourage rogue regimes to recognize that there is an opportunity to improve their relations with the United States. Should rogues wish to reengage with the United States, they need only to change their behavior. Regular Congressional review of sanctions ensures that this change in behavior will have a chance to be acknowledged. Conversely, permanent sanctions can backfire by signaling to the rogue state intent to isolate, irrespective of the nation's willingness to respond with reforms. The Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act outlines a two-year sunset for unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions. H.R. 1828 must incorporate a similar sunset provision.

Third, the legislation must provide greater flexibility to the Executive Branch in the imposition of sanctions. Section 5(b) provides a waiver from the imposition of sanctions if the President determines that it is in "the vital national security interest of the United States to do so." Such a waiver sets the bar too high and is potentially restrictive of the exercise of foreign policy by the Executive Branch. The Libertad Act (P.L. 104-114), for example, sets for a "national interest" waiver for Title III sanctions.

Fourth, the legislation must place a greater priority on cooperation with our allies in the imposition of sanctions. Sanctions tend to be effective when they are imposed under a multilateral framework. Unilateral sanctions isolate the United States as much as they isolate the targeted nation. Diplomacy, as in nature, abhors a vacuum and will fill it. A loss of American influence will be replaced by other nations unless sanctions are imposed through a broad, multilateral coalition. The United States must persuade other countries to join us in sanctioning Syria if we are to have significant influence.

I offer these reservations and recommendations out of a desire to improve H.R. 1828. I recognize that peace in the Middle East depends on change in Syria. But I also believe Congress should adhere to the limitations outlined above in the imposition of unilateral sanctions. When unilateral sanctions are imposed, they should be limited in scope and limited in duration and provide significant flexibility to the Executive Branch. H.R. 1828 can be amended to incorporate these recommendations, which must be made before the legislation is sent to the President for signature.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes:

Mrs. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, many of us will spend part of the Independence Day work period at ceremonies marking the heroism of our

service men and women, and the sacrifices of their families. If we were to ask any military commander present at those ceremonies, What is the most important aspect of leadership? The answer would be: First, take care of the troops.

This bill provides an opportunity for the House to exhibit that kind of leadership, the opportunity to take care of our troops. Instead, sadly, it is another missed opportunity.

If military quality of life issues were a priority, we would not be considering a Military Construction Appropriations Bill that is \$1.5 billion below last year's funding level, but we would be passing Mr. OBEY's amendment, which would help nearly 8,000 service members and their families get the housing they deserve.

Instead, we pass resolutions that talk about supporting the military and then refuse to provide that support in the appropriations bills.

Active and retired military personnel and their families have been among the victims of the irresponsible and fiscally unsound budget and tax policies of the Republican majority. If putting the troops and their families first were a Republican priority, they would not have submitted a budget that continues the tax on disabled veterans, that cuts veterans benefits, and that impacts aid. And they would not have approved a tax cut that takes care of the children of the wealthy few while ignoring 250,000 children of active duty military personnel.

That is a regrettable message to send to the troops just days before the Fourth of July.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 2003

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to oppose H.R. 1, the Republican Medicare bill.

Tonight we have an opportunity to provide seniors with a Medicare prescription medicine benefit. But the Republican Majority has thrown aside bipartisanship and crafted a bill that will confuse and short-change seniors while slowly eroding the time-honored guarantee of Medicare. I cannot vote for this seriously flawed bill.

Seniors in North Carolina's Second District, like those across the country, deserve a real Medicare prescription medicine benefit. They want a plan that is simple, comprehensive, and a part of Medicare. I have consistently voted for such a plan throughout my career in Congress.

But H.R. 1 subjects seniors to a complex plan that features fluctuating premiums, a huge gap in coverage, uncertainty about who's going to provide them with medicines, and it will end Medicare as we know it.

First, nothing in this legislation requires the drug-only insurance groups that will administer this plan to fix premiums at \$35 a month. That number is merely a suggestion. Our seniors do not want suggestions Mr. Speaker, they want certainty.

Second, the \$400 billion the Majority set aside for Medicare related spending in their Fiscal Year 2004 is woefully inadequate. This

plan will only cover a fifth of what seniors will spend over the next 10 years on prescription medicines. To fit inside their budget, the authors of this bill have developed a huge gap, or doughnut hole, that forces seniors who spend between \$2,001 and \$3,500 on medicines to pay all of their costs. This is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Third, this plan relies on an untested mechanism to deliver medicines to seniors. H.R. 1 creates a drug-only insurance market that will not work, especially in rural areas. But what makes this bill worse is that it makes no effort to provide a fallback for rural seniors should private drug-only plans decide to stop offering them coverage.

Finally, in this plan we see the Republican Majority's true colors. H.R. 1 is simply a shell-game that will privatize Medicare. Under this legislation, in 2010 private plans will be allowed to compete against Medicare to cover hospital and physician benefits. As private plans seek to siphon off healthy seniors, the cost of remaining in traditional Medicare will rise and seniors will be forced to join an HMO, along with all of its restrictions, to get coverage.

When President Lyndon Johnson signed Medicare into law over 38 years ago, Medicare was designed to be a guarantee that our seniors would be able to get affordable health care services regardless of their age, ability to pay, or degree of sickness. In the spirit of that landmark law, I will vote for an alternative amendment to H.R. 1 that creates a simple, comprehensive, prescription medicine plan under Medicare. This plan also includes superior rural provider provisions in comparison to those contained in H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, for the third Congress in a row we have another Medicare bill pending before us. And once again, the bill is a sham. It provides no guaranteed benefit, contains a huge gap in coverage, and it will privatize Medicare.

America's seniors want bipartisan cooperation in this body. They want us to come together to strengthen Medicare, not dismantle it. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1 tonight.

CENTRALIA SESQUICENTENNIAL RECOGNITION

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 2003

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the City of Centralia, Illinois as she celebrates her sesquicentennial. Since 1853, the people of Centralia have lived and prospered and given so much to this great nation.

Centralia was founded as a result of the building of the Illinois Central Railroad, hence the name Centralia. It was also a coal-mining town almost from the first years of its existence. The town has experienced an oil boom in the mid 1900s and is home to much industry.

Over the years Centralia has produced many leaders who have been instrumental in our Nation's history. One reason is due to the quality education provided. It is also the home of the "Winningest Basketball Team in America," the Centralia Carillon, and the Centralia Balloon Fest; just to name a few.

I am proud to represent the people of the great City of Centralia and to share in this special occasion. I thank them for all they give to our country and I wish them another successful 150 years. Congratulations and "Go Orphans!"

JOHN L. GROVE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 8, 2003

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and loss of John L. Grove, whose accomplishments have made an everlasting impact to Pennsylvania and the Nation.

John Grove committed his life to the Franklin County community as a defining model for entrepreneurship and the American dream. Mr. Grove personally had a hand in the creation of numerous successful companies and contributed his expertise and advice to a whole host of other business ventures.

John Grove was noted for his brilliance and huge innovations in the world of hydraulics. He was most notably, the "father" of the hydraulic telescoping crane boom. In addition to his prowess for business and ingenuity, he was also extremely generous to his community. Today his philanthropic endeavors, including the John L. Grove College of Business at Shippensburg University and the John L. Grove Medical Center in Greencastle, stand as a reminder of his faith in those around him and his determination to provide a better life for others.

John Grove and his brother formed Grove Manufacturing Company by building farm wagons out of a two car suburban garage. But brilliance would not be constrained by just farm wagons. In just three short years, he and his brother developed and built the industry's first industrial yard crane. Quickly the wagons were superceded by the demand for the cranes and the small business in a garage became an industrial giant.

After a very successful run in this career, Mr. Grove and his brother sold the company in the 1960's and John Grove took a well-deserved vacation. But as most truly gifted people find out, the body may rest but the brain never pauses. It was in the course of his vacation travels across this great country of ours, that Mr. Grove realized the pitfalls of those who needed to work on platforms and scaffolding. To that end, he invented the self propelled work-basket vehicle and in an instant a second career was born.

In implementing his new vision, Mr. Grove and a partner bought a small factory in McConnellsburg and began with only 15 employees. Soon, JLG Industries would grow to a internationally recognized company that would employ thousands from around the community.

In 1993, Mr. Grove retired from a hugely successful career at JLG, but he continued to offer both his business experience and philanthropy to the area he so dearly loved.

Few people have had such a tremendous impact on south central Pennsylvania. With the passing of John L. Grove, Pennsylvania and America have lost one of their greatest citizens.