

their children, so they can possibly take a vacation, so that they can have enough money to buy shoes when the school year begins.

Mr. Speaker, I was a single mom on welfare 35 years ago, and I had three very small children, 1, 3, and 5 years old. I was working. When my kids would outgrow their shoes, two boys and a girl, and those boys grew like weeds, I am telling you, my heart would stop, because I was scared to death I might not have the money to buy them decent shoes. The people I work for who elected me, women who had been on welfare and who have walked my walk, they know, they know the difference between having it all and having enough and making sure that other people have what they need to survive also.

My constituents support the child tax credit. They want to hear just why the Republicans refuse to bring it to the floor, and they want it debated; and so do I, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time. This is a question of basic fairness. It is a question of priorities.

This House recently passed a \$350 billion tax bill, weighted disproportionately to the very wealthiest in this country. And in the conference on that bill, we cut out the child tax credit for 12 million low-income working families.

The Senate solution is to take \$3.5 billion and address that issue to make sure that we treat those children with decency. The House Republican leadership has said no. They said, we will only accept that \$3.5 billion addition if you pass an additional \$83 billion tax cut package. So they are holding those kids hostage to this other package at the same time that we have a record \$450 billion deficit in this country. As a result of those deficits which have been fueled by the tax cuts to the wealthiest, this past week we were \$8 billion short on the No Child Left Behind bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are being unfair to the basic priorities of the people of the country. We should adopt this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 21, 2003

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE CLEAR ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid to say that it has happened and happened again. A week ago, I rose to tell my colleagues the case of a brutal crime committed by criminal illegal aliens in New York. This time it happened near a small town in southern Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, near Cobden, Illinois, in the congressional district of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), three men, two of them illegal aliens, sexually assaulted a 13-year-old girl and a 15-year-old girl.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are 400,000 individuals who have received their final deportation orders; 400,000. That means they have been apprehended, they have been told to depart, and they have been released and are somewhere in America. They cannot be found within our borders. Of those 400,000, 20 percent, 80,000, of them have criminal convictions; and I am not talking about running a stop sign. They have been in the hands of our law enforcement and have slipped away. Mr. Speaker, I only pray that I am not reporting one of their crimes standing here next week.

Mr. Speaker, not only are the residents of this country continually falling victim to these brutal crimes of criminal illegal aliens, we are also paying for them out of our own pockets. Criminal aliens put an incredible strain on America's law enforcement

and criminal justice resources every day. Taxpayers are footing the bill for the imprisonment of Mazimiliano Silerio Esparza, a 33-year-old criminal alien who brutally raped two nuns, killing one in Oregon. He copped a plea agreement to avoid execution and taxpayers in Oregon now will be paying for his life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we introduced the CLEAR Act, the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act, last Wednesday, to give our local police the authority that they need to detain criminal illegal aliens. I would like to review quickly just a few of the highlights tonight, and we will do it night after night until this becomes clear.

First and foremost, we are going to make it very clear in our law in what it says in regards to the 700,000 local law enforcement officials around the country. They have the inherent authority to enforce immigration laws, period. But it is confusing. We are going to straighten that out so no one will be confused. This is the only major set of Federal laws that local law enforcement are not actively helping to enforce. That is only the first page of a 22-page bill. The rest of the bill provides resources and tools for our local law enforcement people to actually get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, the CLEAR Act will add a new category to the National Crime and Information Center database so that police across the Nation can access the information simply from their patrol cars. Also, Mr. Speaker, once and for all, we are going to make sure that these violent criminal aliens are in the hands of law enforcement and will be deported from this country the day they complete their jail time. We are going to do this by mandating the expansion of the Institutional Removal Program, and one night next week we will talk about that.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, I encourage my colleagues to take a really close look at this landmark legislation and let us help each other put an end to these tragic events that have plagued our country. We cannot do it with 2,000 INS agents. That simply is not in the ability or within the realm of possibility to get these criminals. Some of them who have crossed this border may well be terrorists; 2,000 Federal agents cannot do it. We have to call on the 700,000 local law enforcement agencies to come together and help the Federal Government lock up and then deport these 80,000 violent criminal illegal aliens. I am not sure, and neither is this government, exactly how many of those 400,000 that have slipped across our border, how many of those may be terrorists. Do we not want to know? Is that not what part of homeland security is all about? And my colleagues are telling me we are going to protect this homeland from people who slip across our border with 2,000 Federal agents? It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker.

We have to get serious if we want to protect this Nation's infrastructure.

**SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENT COMMISSION ON WAR WITH IRAQ**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor, once again tonight, to discuss the groundswell of support for an independent commission to discuss the administration's plans regarding Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. After hearing the administration's case for war, many Americans felt they were led to believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction ready to use against America and were on the verge of developing nuclear weapons. Mr. Speaker, we may yet find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, but it is now clear to many Americans that the administration overstated and misrepresented the threat that Iraq posed to the United States. Those Americans can say it better than I can.

Fred, from Ventura, California writes, "I recently read an article that summarized the comments made by the President and members of his administration. I am deeply troubled by how incongruent these statements are with the realities after President Bush declared an end to hostilities."

□ 1700

Susan from Solana Beach, California, compares the administration's untruths with recent corporate scandals, "Enough is enough. Whatever deceptions corporate America perpetrated in the last few years, no one died and we continue to investigate. Washington must be held to a far higher standard because American lives were risked and lost on the word of the Bush administration. Without an investigation to answer these important questions about potential distortion of intelligence reports, all the tax cuts in the world will not buy my vote in future elections."

Steve from Bakersfield was more understanding: "If we launch a preemptive war by mistake, God help America."

This is not God's responsibility, Mr. Speaker. It is the Congress's responsibility.

Beatrice from Redondo Beach is upset with those of us here in Congress: "I am angry at the lack of action by our representatives against this Bush administration on their manipulation of facts in order to take our country to war."

J. Lawrence of California seconds that and I will quote him: "Of all things that a government does, the decision to go to war must be made openly and without manipulations. I urge you to support an independent commission to investigate the circumstances surrounding what we, the public, were told about the justification for our re-

cent incursion into Iraq. We spent millions on a sexual dalliance but appear to have been ignoring what may have been a mass deception and manipulation of truth that in the end put U.S. citizens and soldiers in harm's way."

Stan and Sue from Sierra Madre support an investigation also. They say: "Never should we harm another country nor put our own sons and daughters in harm's way under false pretenses. An inquiry is one of the tools to make sure this does not happen in the future."

Mr. Speaker, other Americans want to remind us, in the Congress, that they do not care about partisanship. They only care about getting to the truth.

Steve from Moorpark writes: "In the interest of preserving the freedoms and liberties inherent to our Constitution, I ask you to support an independent investigation of the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program. No matter which political party affiliation any American favors, it is detrimental to our country, our Constitution, and our democracy to have our leaders mislead all Americans for reasons yet unknown."

It is time to get the facts. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2625, the gentleman from California's (Mr. WAXMAN) bill to create an independent commission to uncover all of the facts about the administration's claims and Iraq's weapons. It is time for Congress to stop beating around the bush and take action. Support fact finding. Support an independent commission.

**HONORING REED LARSON**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, it was nearly 5 decades ago in the spring of 1954 that Reed Larson went on what he believed to be a temporary leave from his job as an engineer for the Coleman Company in Wichita, Kansas, in order to lead a new grass-roots advocacy group called Kansans For Right to Work. Larson and his group members were determined to pass a State right-to-work law protecting employees from being forced to join or pay dues to a labor union in order to get or keep a job.

Because they first had to deal with a hostile Governor, the job took longer than originally expected. By the time Kansas's right-to-work law was finally passed in November of 1958, Larson had been on temporary leave from the Coleman Company for 4½ years. After the Kansas victory, Larson was quickly recruited to lead the then 4-year-old national Right to Work Committee from its headquarters right here in our Nation's Capital and his temporary leave from the Coleman Company became permanent.

For the next 44 years Larson stood at the helm of this organization, which has aptly been hailed as the Nation's preeminent defender of workers' freedom. I rise today to pay tribute to Reed Larson because of his long, selfless commitment to the right-to-work cause and because late last month at Mr. Larson's own recommendation, the board of directors of National Right to Work Committee appointed then executive vice president Mark Mix as the new Right to Work president and Larson as executive committee chairman.

Reed Larson is still fighting for the right-to-work cause, but his role in the coming years will be in a different capacity than during the last 5 decades, marking the end of an era for the National Right to Work Committee and for opponents of forced unionism nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for Mr. Larson's continued involvement with the right-to-work cause. Almost anyone else who had accomplished what Reed Larson has over the past 49 years would be content to rest on his laurels. During the 1950s, roughly 30 percent of private sector employees nationwide were forced to join and remain in a union. If they refused, they would be fired. Today it is 7 percent of private sector employees who are compelled to pay union dues or fees in order to keep their jobs. One major reason it is now possible to envision the day when every American private sector employee enjoys the personal freedom to decide whether or not to affiliate with the union is the invaluable assistance Reed Larson and the National Right to Work Committee has given to State right-to-work efforts.

Thanks largely to the sound advice of Reed Larson and the committee, the number of State right-to-work laws has grown to 22, with the most recent law being approved less than 2 years ago in the State of Oklahoma. Furthermore, not a single right-to-work law that was in effect when Mr. Larson took over the committee in January of 1959 has been repealed or rendered inoperative through court action, although Big Labor has spent countless millions of dollars on bids to destroy such laws.

The most notorious of these schemes was union officials' Capitol Hill campaign to eviscerate all State right-to-work laws through repeal of Taft-Hartley section 14(b) in 1965 and 1966. Under Reed Larson's leadership the committee saved State right-to-work protections by convincing Senate minority leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois to lead a filibuster against 14(b) repeal.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly salute my good friend Reed Larson and the National Right to Work Committee's 2.2 million members. I applaud their unwaivering dedication and tireless action on what should be every American's birthright, not to be forced to pay tribute to a labor union in order to get or keep a job.