

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, several months ago now the President signed the Syria Accountability Act, which was passed overwhelmingly by this House and the other body. Since that time, however, the act has not been implemented; and I believe, as do the vast majority of Members in this House and the other body believe, that the time is now to slap sanctions on Syria.

Just the other day, the word came out from Iraq that Syria was allowing weaponry to come from Syrian territory into Iraq and guerrillas to come from Syrian territory into Iraq to do harm to American troops. Syria has not patrolled its border and has allowed these anti-U.S. guerrillas to come in and kill our troops.

Also, the other day in Jordan a plot was discovered where poison gas was to have been released and there was to be an attack on the U.S. Embassy in Amman, Jordan. It was documented that this gas and these attacks came from Syria across the border into Jordan.

Syria is a major sponsor of terrorism. Syria illegally continues to occupy Lebanon, has a weapons of mass destruction program, and, as I mentioned before, is allowing its border to be used by terrorists to come into Iraq to do harm to U.S. troops. Those are the four things that this bill, the Syria Accountability Act, called on Syria to end. Syria has not ended, and the President should implement the sanctions immediately.

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.

ARE WE SAFER NOW?

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, we are here in this House; and it is our duty, it is our obligation to debate the important questions of the day, and that is one of the unfailing obligations of this House.

One of the questions I hear asked, particularly from the other side, but sometimes from my side of the aisle, are we safer now than we were a year ago? Are we safer now than at the time we went into the country of Iraq? I just think back to a year ago and what was going on in my congressional office here in Washington. And I look out over the floor of the House, and I see a gas mask under every seat. Truly in March 2003, we were concerned about the possibility of a poison gas attack within our country. And, of course, one of the reasons for that was because

there was country that was very much opposed to us who had a history of using that type of weapon in an offensive pattern different from any other world leader. So as we debate these points now, are we safer now than a year ago, we would be wise to remember what was going on in this body a scant 12 or 13 months ago.

As preparations were made for what eventually became Operation Iraqi Freedom, I was not in this body when the vote was taken. I am a newcomer to Congress, but certainly I recall during the fall of 2002 and during the early months of my first term when we could not get the time of day out of Saddam Hussein unless there was a gun held to his head.

As a consequence, the President of our country, who is now being called to task by the 9/11 Commission for not being aggressive enough, not having enough of a criminal mind ahead of time to envision the type of attacks brought against this country on September 11, 2001, our President is being criticized for not having the ability to foretell that kind of unthinkable act against our country. But at the same time, as the run-up to Operation Iraqi Freedom was going on, Iraq was perceived as a gathering threat. We knew in the past they had held weapons of mass destruction. No one in this House or on the other side of the Capitol seriously questioned that. The previous administration did not seriously question that, nor did the United Nations seriously question that.

□ 1330

But at the same time, in order to get just the ability to get the inspectors who had been kicked out in 1998, just the ability to get them back in the country, we had to put 150,000 troops on the border. When we do that, the clock starts ticking because in that part of the world, in order to have a military exercise, we are just not going to be as successful if we put off doing that until the summer months.

And I remember very well the talking heads and the pundits, before I came to Congress and after, talking about if Bush is going to do something, he needs to do it soon. We cannot let the clock fritter away while the weather gets warmer over there and it makes it even harder on our troops who may have to don protective gear to protect them from chemical attacks.

Again, the 9/11 Commission currently is criticizing the current administration and the previous administration, but the real loser in that criticism is the Bush administration because the Clinton administration is not running for reelection. But the 9/11 Commission is criticizing the President for not having a creative enough criminal mind to anticipate the types of attack that came to our country.

I have been to Iraq twice myself during this past year, and I know many other Members of this body have been there as well. I wanted to share with

the House of Representatives this afternoon a picture from the air base just north of Kirkuk in Iraq. This is a picture that I did not take. It was taken by a man named Doug Cox, a man down in my district who is actually a member of the Corps of Engineers, and he was one of the first groups in there with Operation Restore Iraqi Oil, or Operation RIO, and he took this picture off the wall of the air base in Kirkuk, and this was a picture used presumably for training or for whatever purpose by the Republican Guard generals who were in charge of the air base there in Kirkuk before we took it over. And it shows an Iraqi gentleman standing, looking off across the countryside, and we see a depiction of the map of the United States of America. We see a man standing there with either a cowboy or a pilgrim hat on, and in his heart is the cross hairs of this man's intellect, and pointed against the United States of America we see an Iraqi tank, we see an Iraqi jet, and we see Iraqi missiles.

There was no question in their mind what their intent was when they made this picture, when they used this picture to educate or indoctrinate their troops of the Republican Guard that were stationed at the Kirkuk airfield, and I simply want to remind my colleagues in this body it is our responsibility to question. It is our responsibility to have oversight. But we do need to be careful when we cross that line and provide aid and comfort to the enemy and give them additional embellishments to take on the kind of terror that they have done in the country of Iraq this past month.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. HENRY WAXMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS) laid before the House the following communication from Kimonia Alfred, staff member of the Honorable HENRY WAXMAN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 19, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States Tax Court, for testimony and documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KIMONIA ALFRED.

OUR TRADE POLICY WITH CHINA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today Chinese Vice Premier Wu is in town

meeting with Commerce Secretary Evans and Trade Representative Zoellick. This would give the President a chance to right mistake number seven of his administration, which is trade. The United States last year ran over a \$500 billion trade deficit. We have exported hundreds of thousands of manufacturing and now high-technology jobs outsourced under the Bush administration. And their response has been, from the President's chief economist Mr. Mankiw, this is a good thing, it is efficiency.

It is not a good thing. It is not efficiency. Americans need jobs. We need an economy. We need an industrial base. That is wrong-headed thinking.

So today they have got a chance in meeting with Vice Premier Wu to rectify the mistake of their trade policies. The mistake is at the insistence of President Bush, this Congress voted to give China, the Communist Government of China, permanent most favored nation or special trade status.

We gave up the right to annually review their compliance with trade laws. Big mistake. But the President said, Do not worry, I have a plan. Yes, he is right. They are stealing our products and our intellectual property left and right. Yes, they have violated five agreements on stealing our intellectual property and our products over the last 5 years or 7 years. But he had a plan. He was going to put them in the World Trade Organization because the President is big on rules-based trade.

So the President got his way. China is now in the World Trade Organization, and guess what? Last year, according to statistics of the Chinese Government, let alone our own government which will not talk about these things, they counterfeited and stole between \$20- and \$24 billion of U.S. products and intellectual property. Those are the numbers of the Communist Chinese Government about how much they are stealing.

Has the President filed one, one single complaint in his rules-based trade organization, the WTO, against the theft of product, property by the Chinese Government? No, not a single one. Yet I have a company in my district, Videx. Their company not only had their property stolen by China, they were totally cloned. The Chinese put up a fake Website to attract people with a little waving American flag on it, saying they were an American company, made an inferior product, have stolen the Chinese market, and now are stealing the Asian market from this American company.

I thought this is a no-brainer. The President likes rules-based trade. So I appealed to the Commerce Secretary and to the President. I said, help this company. They are not big enough to fight the Government of China. And the response was, no, we will not help that company because the big companies in the United States who are manufacturing in China do not care about the theft of property. In fact, they

think it might hurt their interest in accessing cheap labor and avoiding environmental laws and outsourcing jobs to China. So the Bush administration will not lift a hand to help Videx. The only response we have gotten was Lou Dobbs and Moneyline, and after my company Videx was on Lou Dobbs and Moneyline, they got calls from all over America, from other small businesses who have been stolen blind by the Chinese Government. And the response of the Bush administration is to do nothing.

They are having meetings today with Vice Premier Wu. She is going to give them the same empty assurances the Chinese have given us for the last decade: Oh, we will stop stealing \$24 billion a year worth of our product, sure. Do my colleagues believe that? I do not believe that, and I cannot believe that the President or his administration believes that. So what they should do today is tell the Chinese they are in the WTO, they said they would follow the rules, they are not, and that we are informing them today if they do not shape up by next week, then we are going to the WTO with complaints on the theft of products from Videx and dozens of other small companies across America.

This is an administration that supposedly cares about small business, yet when small business is being robbed blind by the Chinese, and big business says, hey, do not upset the Chinese apple cart, we are manufacturing really cheap over there, \$1-a-day labor, now they might get upset with us, and they might charge us \$1.25 a day for the labor over there, or they might even let them have a labor union or something else.

Help America's small business. Help them to fight the Communist Chinese Government. Help stop stealing America blind. Help stop stealing our industrial and intellectual base, and help turn around the international trade deficit. That is a mistake the President can begin to undo today in these conversations with Vice Premier Wu.

THE ANNAN PLAN FOR CYPRUS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, for all of my 22 years in Congress, I have constantly and loudly proclaimed the need for a peaceful reunification of the Republic of Cyprus. That unification must be just and balanced.

Thus I rise here today to voice my serious concerns with the Annan plan for the reunification of Cyprus. I believe that the final version of the plan which was submitted on March 31, 2004, is unbalanced and biased against the Greek-Cypriots.

There are a number of provisions in the Annan plan that do not alleviate the basic fears of the Greek-Cypriot community. These concerns were not

appropriately resolved and may very well lead the Greek-Cypriots to reject the Annan plan. Security issues regarding the number of troops that will remain on the island and clarifying the Treaty of Guarantee to exclude military intervention are two major concerns for the Greek-Cypriots because Turkey insists that it will continue to have the right to intervene militarily in Cyprus. This Turkish arrogance increases the Greek-Cypriot fear of a repetition of the 1974 invasion and its tragic consequences.

The plan also would permit the vast majority of approximately 115,000 Turkish settlers who are now illegally in Cyprus to stay in Cyprus. At the same time, the plan sets complicated and restrictive provisions regarding the right of Greek-Cypriot refugees to return to their homes in the north. Additionally, the Annan plan makes the eventual return of territories from the northern part of the island to the Greek-Cypriot constituent state dependent upon the goodwill of Turkey and Turkish-Cypriots.

On the issue of property rights, the Annan plan allows for one-third restitution and two-thirds compensation for property owned in the north by Greek-Cypriots who will be losing the use of their properties. The funds for the restitution and compensation will be guaranteed by the Federal State and the Constituent State. Since nine-tenths of the Federal State's resources and 100 percent of the Constituent State's resources will be derived from Greek-Cypriots, they will be paying for, to a large extent, their own loss of property.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to state that the Greek-Cypriots are asked to trust, to trust the Turkish Government and to have faith that the Turkish-Cypriot leaders will keep their promises. The problem is that since 1974, neither the leaders of the Government of Turkey nor Mr. Denktash has ever given the Greek-Cypriots any reason to trust them.

Each side will decide whether the plan would be beneficial for them and for the future of their children. Even though both sides knew they were not going to get everything they wanted, each side was guaranteed a fair plan and one that would be immediately functional. Unfortunately, I do not believe the Annan plan is balanced, and we should not be surprised if the Greek-Cypriot people do not support it.

The Cypriot people hold the future in their hands. During this difficult time, it would be inexcusable, Mr. Speaker, for foreign governments or organizational heads to exert excessive pressure or to issue ultimatums to the people and President of Cyprus to vote one way or the other. They must be free of pressure and free to vote with their conscience. If the plan is voted down, it would be an indication that the Greek-Cypriots, whose country suffered an illegal invasion in 1974, and a community which has for three decades advocated for a settlement, felt that they