

JOBS

(Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, over the past 3½ years our country has seen a loss of 2.8 million manufacturing jobs. Manufacturing jobs today are at a 53-year low. In fact, Arkansas, the State I represent, has lost one out of every seven manufacturing jobs since 2000.

Losing these jobs has had a devastating effect on America's working families. Manufacturing jobs have long been a solid source of strength for our Nation's economy, guaranteeing good jobs and a high standard of living for America's working families. But now millions of these manufacturing jobs that were once the backbone of our economy are being exported abroad to other countries. In fact, we lost 1 million jobs alone to China.

We have got to do more to keep our jobs here at home. This should not be a political issue. It should not be a partisan issue. We in Congress must work together and pass commonsense tax incentives that encourage rather than discourage U.S.-based companies to encourage job creation right here at home. The livelihood of America's working families depends on it.

JUSTICE SCALIA SHOULD STEP ASIDE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe, as all of us who have taken an oath to serve in this body, of the sacredness of the three branches of government, respect the United States Supreme Court and the judiciary, as well as the legislative and executive. But I do think it is important to make note of a proceeding that is going on in the United States Supreme Court that is investigating the Vice President's utilization of non-government persons to determine energy policy in a governmentally appointed, Presidentially appointed committee. And I believe that Justice Scalia, in involving himself in this decision, is again warranted in reconsideration not to engage and participate in the consideration of this matter.

This is a very important matter. It is the same importance that was given to the decision regarding health care during the Clinton administration.

In order for the three branches to continue to have the integrity and the respect constitutionally of the people of the United States that we must have transparency, I would ask for Justice Scalia to step aside for a decision to be made for Vice President CHENEY to come forth with the names of the participants.

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.

RENEW THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking here last week, Italian customs officials were stopping a boat that had over 7,000 AK-47s being shipped here to the United States. We still do not know yet what their intended purpose was; but with 30-round clips, it could not have been good with AK-47s.

I have scheduled a meeting with the U.S. Customs officials to discuss this troubling shipment. After all, if it is legal to ship in AK-47s, when we are now looking on the assault weapons bill to expire on September 13, can you imagine the flood of guns that are going to be on our streets in a very short while?

Mr. Speaker, the assault weapons ban expires in 139 days. Today and tomorrow police chiefs from all over the country are calling for President Bush and Congress to renew the assault weapons ban. In Detroit, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, Atlanta, Seattle and many other cities, police chiefs are calling upon us to help them to make sure the assault weapons ban stays in place.

Tomorrow, I will join Members of Congress and the national law enforcement leaders in calling on President Bush to keep his promise during the 2000 year race that he would sign an assault weapons ban if it gets on his desk. Hopefully, the police officers will be able to convince the President to get involved in this issue.

If we cannot bring it up here on the House for a floor vote, it cannot get to the President's desk. I would love to see many of my colleagues there tomorrow at the press conference. The power of law enforcement was what essentially passed the last original bill. There is a reason why our law enforcement supports the ban so strongly: 10 years ago cops were routinely outgunned by criminals in our communities with powered assault weapons, but the assault weapons ban made getting these guns far more difficult. As a result, our police officers are safer today than they were 10 years ago. So are our neighborhoods; so are our communities. Why would we want to turn back this progress?

□ 1930

Can anyone tell me why we need AK-47s, Uzis back on the street? I understand the power of the NRA, but anybody with common sense knows that we do not use these particular kinds of

guns to go hunting. Our police officers do not even like using them. Remember, a police officer is supposed to stop a criminal, not kill them unless their life is under risk.

If assault weapons are coming back on the street again, obviously our police officers are going to be in trouble once again. Please remember, when you have assault weapons and if we go back to the old way with the amount of clips up to 30, 40, 50, 100, what chance do our police officers have? Are we going to have a war right here in the United States, citizen against citizen, criminals against our police officers? Is that where we want to go? I do not think so.

I am asking my colleagues to stand up and be counted on this. Since I have been here I have worked on gun safety issues. I have never tried to take away the right of someone trying to own a gun. Our citizens know darn well if they have nothing to fear they can get the permit to go hunting. They can get the permit to go buy a gun, but why would you go open up the flood gates of assault weapons so our drug lords, our criminals and possibly even terrorists that are here in this country to be able to buy these guns?

Common sense. Think about the officers that have died. Think about the families they have left behind. Think about our community. Think about the school shootings we have had in the past. Do we want to go back there? Can we stop every killing? No, we cannot. But why would we open again the flood gates of having these kinds of guns back on our streets?

I remind my colleagues, I remind the people across this Nation, the guns we are talking about bringing back on these streets are the guns we see every single night being used in Iraq, assault weapons, AK-47s, Uzis, large capacity clips.

I beg my colleagues to think about this carefully. The law has worked. We should make it permanent and we should make sure that they are not allowed on our street.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2004.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept this letter as my resignation as a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, effective immediately. I realize that I served on the Select Committee due to my role as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I no longer hold the position of Chairman, thus I resign from the other.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). The resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, 108th Congress, and the order of the House of December 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) of the House to the Select Committee on Homeland Security to fill the existing vacancy thereon, and to rank immediately after the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

There was no objection.

UNITED FOR AMERICAN SOLDIERS

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today to call for a higher level of political dialogue and to request that we set aside the recent onslaught of partisanship concerning the war in Iraq.

Being in Kansas over the last several weeks has reminded me of the need to come together, to unify behind our forces fighting overseas. While not everyone will agree on the reasons they got there or whether these reasons justify war, the reality is that American soldiers are engaged in battle. Our troops are fighting for the rights that we have in this Chamber that we must uphold: The cause of liberty, of justice, and freedom from oppression.

This Congress adopted a resolution authorizing the use of force on October 16, 2002 with a vote of 296 to 133.

In recent weeks we have seen the reports of some of the deadliest fighting of the war. We have received reports daily that another soldier has been killed and that another young person has died. Timing is important and priorities must be established. I believe there are legitimate questions to be asked and answered about intelligence that we received before the war, but now we have thousands of troops that are depending upon Americans to unite behind their efforts. Partisan fingerpointing surrounding the 9/11 Commission is not productive, either to the Commission or to the troops. It undercuts the jobs our troops have loyally agreed to do.

These are not Republicans or Democrats in Iraq, these are American soldiers, our men and women, our sons and daughters, our neighbors and friends, fighting so that the people of Iraq might have a chance for a better tomorrow and to reduce the threat of a terrorist attack on our own country.

These are critical times. Historically during times of crisis, some of our greatest leaders have risen above the partisanship of the moment to unite

behind our troops and our President. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, from my State of Kansas, is just one example. Following the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, Eisenhower emerged from his farm and from retirement to meet with President Kennedy and to defend the President's actions.

Eisenhower understood. He knew what it was like to be President, but he also knew what it was like to be on the front lines as a soldier. He knew that criticizing the President during difficult times would provide encouragement to our foes and weaken our Nation's resolve. Eisenhower knew that using war for partisan gain would only serve to undermine the mission of the troops and dishonor the sacrifices of their families.

But today candidates and elected officials alike rush to the evening cable news shows to berate President Bush, to the detriment I believe of the troops he commands, diminishing the validity of their efforts. I am troubled as I imagine a soldier or a soldier's family listening to insensitive remarks, wondering if the soldier will be forsaken by a country whose call to duty he or she answered. Our soldiers and their families deserve better. Partisanship for the sake of scoring political points has no place on the front lines of the war.

Last week, a friend told me, "This is just another Vietnam." Well, I thought a lot about that and concluded it is only another Vietnam if we create that environment. I came of age during the Vietnam era. I remember the protests, the body counts, the escalation and the retreat. This is not today's Vietnam, not unless we choose to make it through inconsistent policies, contradictory strategies and weakened resolve. We can win both the war and the peace in Iraq, and emerge having given the people of Iraq and the region new reason for hope.

An e-mail from a Fort Riley soldier arrived in my office this month and ended with this quote: "You have never lived . . . until you have almost died . . . for those that have fought to protect it . . . freedom has a special flavor . . . the protected will never know."

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues and all Americans to think of our men and women overseas before they rush to criticize the conduct of this war. Our soldiers' efforts must be upheld and honored. I do not consider it unpatriotic to question governmental decisions, but what we need today are politicians who put country above partisanship and their Nation ahead of the next election. We need statesmanship.

By unifying behind our troops and their efforts, by requiring our political and military leaders to develop not an exit strategy but a winning strategy, and by making certain that the Iraqi people fully fight for the future of their own country, we can sustain our troops and the mission can be accomplished. With consistent policies, clear strategies, and a firm resolve, we can avoid

the war in Iraq becoming just another Vietnam.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

There was no objection.

MISSING WITHOUT ACTION

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the previous speaker. The growing division in America over war in Iraq pales by comparison with the gut wrenching images that divided America during the Vietnam War. Thousands of men were called to serve their countries in Vietnam. Senator JOHN KERRY did just that. Other Americans chose to be conscientious objectors and serve their country in non-combatant roles.

Still other Americans had one or another kind of deferment or joined the National Guard. A week ago, the administration chose to enlist Republicans in a new kind of draft for a new kind of war.

In this Chamber, Republicans launched a sneak attack against the heroism and patriotism of Senator JOHN KERRY. The American people deserve to know the service records of Senator JOHN KERRY and President George W. Bush. He can provide one of them. In 1968, JOHN KERRY commanded a U.S. Navy swift boat in Vietnam. This was a 50-foot aluminum boat that was heavily armed but had no armor protection.

In 1968, George W. Bush joined the Texas Air National Guard jumping ahead of 150 people on the waiting list.

On the night of December 2, 1968, JOHN KERRY commanded a Navy swift boat. It came under intense fire while on patrol. JOHN KERRY was wounded and awarded the Purple Heart.

George W. Bush meanwhile was accepted into pilot training after scoring the lowest score possible to qualify.

In early 1969, the swift boat JOHN KERRY commanded in Vietnam was in a fire fight with the enemy. JOHN KERRY was wounded by shrapnel and awarded a second Purple Heart.