

involved in the financing and facilitation of heroin-trafficking activities, which were then shut down by our military operations in Afghanistan. Today, the DEA continues to push forward in identifying narcoterrorism threats that are vital to maintaining our national security. I look forward to seeing a report from the President that will indicate the efficacy of officially including the DEA in our intelligence system. Clearly, the DEA plays an important information gathering and enforcement role in our War on Terror, this report will simply clarify their position in our national intelligence system.

JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL
REUNION—YORK, SC

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend before Labor Day, some 400 alumni of Jefferson High School gathered for their first reunion since Jefferson closed more than 30 years ago.

Jefferson got its start in a frame school house built for African-American students next to Wesley United Methodist Church on West Jefferson Street in York, South Carolina. From there, Jefferson graduated to a Rosenwald school and became the African-American public school in a racially segregated system. Although the system was called "separate but equal," Jefferson never had facilities or teaching materials equal to its counterparts, the white schools that I attended. Used books were passed on from white students, dated and worn. The school district built a new high school for white students in 1950, but left black students to make the best of their old one. The students, teachers and administrators at Jefferson did just that. They made the most of their circumstances. The students who came back for this reunion did not dwell on what they lacked at Jefferson High School. They saluted teachers who took a personal interest, believed in them, and encouraged them to excel. They recalled their formidable teams in football and basketball and the musical talent they produced. They recognized the values instilled in them for a lifetime.

When the alumni sat down for a banquet the last night of their reunion, the pride they felt at being "Jeffersonians" was easily felt and well-founded. Among the 400 attending the dinner, there were graduates who had risen to the highest levels of the Civil Service and become department heads in state government; Ph.D.'s in the sciences and liberal arts; college professors; school teachers; successful entrepreneurs; attorneys; and many more who had distinguished themselves. The banquet speaker, Roberta Wright, symbolized their success. She finished Jefferson and went on to become a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Fisk University and the University of Michigan School of Law. She made a stirring speech, challenging everyone to do more for the common good.

With the onset of integration in the early 1970s, Jefferson High School came to an end. But the 3-day Reunion made clear that Jefferson lives on in the lives it made better. Hundreds of the alumni attending attested to bet-

ter, more productive lives because of what they learned at Jefferson under teachers who cared, encouraged, and challenged.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, because of business in my district (27th Congressional District of Texas) I was absent for rollcall vote Nos. 509–530. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted as indicated below: 509—"Yes"; 510—"Yes"; 511—"Yes"; 512—"Yes"; 513—"Yes"; 514—"Yes"; 515—"Yes"; 516—"No"; 517—"Yes"; 518—"Yes"; 519—"No"; 520—"Yes"; 521—"Yes"; 522—"Yes"; 523—"No"; 524—"No"; 525—"Yes"; 526—"No"; 527—"No"; 529—"Yes"; 530—"Yes."

IS ISRAEL STILL AN ENEMY OF
THE STATE IN THE NEW IRAQ?

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern, and frankly my disbelief, at the arrest of Mithal Al Alusi, an Iraqi citizen who was charged recently for visiting an enemy state.

The world took little notice of what one might expect to be major news in the United States and around the world. Unfortunately, this story has been nearly invisible.

What makes this case so disturbing is the fact that the nation he dared visit, the nation labeled an enemy state by the new post-Saddam government in Iraq is none other than America's strongest ally in the Middle East—the State of Israel.

As unbelievable as it seems, under a 35-year-old law written by Saddam's Baath Party, Israel remains an enemy of the Iraqi State. And any Iraqi who dares visit our ally Israel, can expect the same criminal punishment now being sought against Mr. Al-Alusi.

A New York Times article published on October 6, 2004, described the situation this way:

In recent days, Iraq's special criminal court established by the American occupation authority issued a warrant for Mr. Al-Alusi's arrest based on the 1969 law. According to the Oct. 4 issue of the Iraqi newspaper Al Sabah, a court official said, "Al-Alusi committed a crime by visiting the enemy, the Zionist state," and the official vowed "to protect the Islamic and Arab identity of Iraq."

Is this the new Iraq that we have sacrificed more than a thousand American lives to protect? A country that allows Israel to be labeled as a Zionist threat, and whose courts, which were established under our Coalition rule, are now being used as a tool to inflame anti-Israeli sentiment.

It is a disgrace that as we shed American blood, and the blood of our allies to bring democracy to the people of Iraq, those who have persecuted Mithal Al-Alusi remain in authority.

Secretary Powell is reported as saying that he is looking into the outrage committed

against Mr. Al-Alusi. I encourage him to swiftly complete his examination and to provide guidance toward a U.S. policy that forever eliminates this type of bigotry from Iraqi law.

I hope President Bush, Secretary of State Powell and Members of Congress will step forward and without reservation, condemn this continuation of an anti-Semitic policy that is a hateful and dangerous residue of Saddam Hussein's failed regime.

9/11 RECOMMENDATIONS
IMPLEMENTATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10) to provide for reform of the intelligence community, terrorism prevention and prosecution, border security; and international cooperation and coordination, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment as offered by my Texas colleague Mr. Bonilla of the 23rd Congressional District to increase the number of beds available for immigration detention and removal operations in the Department of Homeland Security. As the Ranking Member of the House Immigration Subcommittee, I recognize the urgent need for this proposal.

The growth of the Immigration and Enforcement Agency's (ICE) and Border Patrol Services (BPS) enforcement efforts, along with the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which requires INS to detain aliens subject to mandatory detention, have increased the Department's need for detention bed space in recent years.

The average daily bed space usage has more than doubled from 8,279 average daily detention beds in FY 1996 to 18,518 in FY 2000. Every year the Department of Homeland Security arrests over 1.6 million aliens.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement has 19,444 beds a night. But an average 22,500 detainees are in custody on any given day. The lack of space has led to a \$1.3 billion shortfall that must be made up in other areas of the budget for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and detention.

One of my concerns is the rise of the harmful effects of the "capture and release" program. Brought on by a shortage of detention space, the program allows immigration officials to routinely release tens of thousands of illegal immigrants from countries other than Mexico after extracting a promise from each to show up at a future detention hearing.

DHS officials acknowledge that more than 70 percent of those released disappear from law enforcement's radar, resulting in a fugitive population of 400,000 nationwide. Mexican migrants who are detained are deported and are usually bused to a port of entry where they cross the bridge to Mexico.

Some 15,000 of these people (non-Mexican migrants) are in communities in Texas in the last eight months. Nearly half of non-Mexicans arrested since October 2003 were released on

the U.S. side of the border, according to Department of Homeland Security statistics released last week to the Chronicle. So far this fiscal year, which began Oct. 1, 2003, Homeland Security officials released from Border Patrol custody 21,979 of the 49,705 illegal immigrants from countries other than Mexico, known to the Border Patrol as OTMs.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Border Security and Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Control I joined Mr. BONILLA and another of my Texas colleagues, Mr. SOLOMON ORTIZ for a series of briefings and field visits at the Brownsville border areas.

When Border Patrol (BP) officers catch undocumented immigrants, they take them to a facility to be processed. If they are Mexican, they usually are placed on a bus and returned to Mexico. If they are not Mexican, BP classifies them as "OTM" (other than Mexican). Under a new detention policy popularly known as "catch and release," thousands of OTMs are released on their own recognizance pending a deportation hearing scheduled to be held months after they are released. Apparently, a large percentage of the OTMs abscond instead of appearing for removal proceedings.

I share many of the concerns that my colleagues SOLOMON P. ORTIZ and HENRY BONILLA have expressed about border security. The catch and release policy appears to be the result of a lack of funding for detention facilities. The security concern about the catch and release policy is that it includes individuals from nations the U.S. defines as state sponsors of potential terrorism. Before commenting on the catch and release policy, I want to emphasize that immigration does not equate with terrorism. All but a few of the immigrants who enter our country unlawfully are hardworking people who are coming to the United States because they want better lives for themselves and their families.

I favor the approach that Canada takes to border security, namely, they emphasize identifying the people who might be dangerous. We must improve intelligence operations so that our border patrol officers will be able to separate out the potential terrorists. This involves a two step process. We must first identify the potential terrorists, and then that information must be made available to the border patrol officers.

My colleagues SOLOMON P. ORTIZ and HENRY BONILLA have said that we need to increase the number of immigration judges. They believe that an increase in the number of immigration judges will dramatically reduce the need for detention facilities. I agree that we need more immigration judges. I also think that we need more Board Members for the Board of Immigration Appeals. Attorney General Ashcroft removed 5 experienced Board members a few years ago in a misguided effort to increase the productivity of the Board.

My alien smuggling bill, the CASE Act, or H.R. 2630, will address one of the major impediments to gaining control over our borders. The CASE Act would establish a three-point program to facilitate the investigation and prosecution, or disruption, of reckless commercial alien smuggling operations that features incentives, penalty enhancements, and an outreach program. This three-point program would provide government investigators

and prosecutors with tools that have proven their worth in other areas of criminal law and would be just as useful with commercial alien smuggling operations. The result would be fewer deaths from alien smuggling operations.

Therefore, this amendment will address a very clear need, and I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 2004, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes 494, 495, and 496. Had I been present I would have voted, "no" on rollcall vote no. 494, H.R. 163; "yes" on rollcall vote no. 495, H.R. 2929, and "yes" on rollcall vote no. 496, H.R. 5011.

EGYPTIAN SINAI BOMBINGS

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in deep disgust to speak about the ghastly attacks on three Egyptian Sinai resorts.

It should be obvious to all of us that these attacks were perpetrated because we are entering the final days of the Jewish holiday of Sukkot.

The terrorists who committed these heinous attacks had one goal—that goal was to kill as many innocent Israelis as possible.

The three terrorist attacks murdered at least 29 people and injured scores of others but unfortunately I fear the number of dead will rise as rescue teams search through the rubble.

The international community to the fullest extent must condemn these attacks.

It is time for the anti-Israeli elements within the United Nations to stop their one-sided resolutions and recognize that terrorism is a continuing threat to Israel and to the world.

The nations who continually work to pass these anti-Israeli resolutions within the United Nations General Assembly—must stop their rhetoric and instead do something to stop these attacks.

These nations can no longer be content by sitting on the sidelines and criticizing the actions of the Israeli government to protect their citizens.

Instead, it is time for these nations to help the Palestinian people who seek a nation that is not lead by corrupt leaders who support terrorism.

If these nations really want to see the success of the Palestinian people they will not only condemn these attacks, but they will finally begin to work toward ending terrorism and the attacks we see in the Middle East and around the world.

SPECIALTY CROPS COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 2004

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3242, the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004, albeit with reservations about the scaled down version of the substitute bill that comes before us today.

When I joined Representative DOUG OSE last year in introducing H.R. 3242, it was a natural reflection of my longstanding interest in a prosperous and competitive specialty crops sector.

U.S. farm policy has long overlooked the importance of specialty crops, despite the fact that these non-subsidized crops account for the majority of crop production in this country. Instead, U.S. farm policy has tended to focus on so-called "program" crops, such as cotton, rice, sugar, peanuts, wheat, corn, oilseeds, feed grains, and others, which account for less than half of domestic production.

H.R. 3242 was introduced not to bring fruits, vegetables, tree nuts, and other horticultural products into the category of "program commodities" but instead to focus federal attention and resources on the problems facing this segment of U.S. agriculture. The bill as introduced included various regulatory reforms as well as a modest level of federal dollars to invest in non-market-distorting ways in the competitiveness of the U.S. specialty crop sector.

As the lead Democrat sponsor of H.R. 3242, however, I am very disappointed that the version of the bill that moved out of the House Agriculture Committee and is before us today is significantly scaled down from the original bill. In particular, the federal funding provided by this substitute bill has gone from a mandatory spending level of \$508 million per year for five years, to a discretionary authorization of only \$54 million per year that is further subject to annual appropriations.

This is a far cry from the level of federal commitment to the specialty crop sector that is warranted.

Specialty crops have an annual farm-gate value of \$52 billion and receive no federal subsidies. Program crops, on the other hand, have a farm-gate value of only \$48 billion. Yet the program commodities received federal subsidies in the amount of \$12–13 billion, the equivalent of 27 percent of their farm-gate value.

This bill does not change the fact that producers of specialty crops receive no federal subsidy payments, and instead rely solely on the market for their income. No new federal price supports, direct payments, marketing loans, or counter-cyclical payments are created in this bill.

A serious federal commitment to this sector, however, requires a serious level of federal dollars.

The bulk of federal expenditures under H.R. 3242 would go to a block grant program that would distribute federal dollars to interested states for research, marketing, promotion, and other competitiveness-enhancing programs for their specialty crop industries. These funds are designed to increase consumer awareness and demand for specialty crop products and