

HONORING TOM WOODRUFF AND MELISSA MILLER DURING NATIONAL TEACHERS WEEK

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two of the many outstanding teachers in my home State of Arkansas. Melissa Miller, a sixth grade math and science teacher at Randall G. Lynch Middle School in Farmington, Arkansas, was in Washington this week to accept the National Educator Award from the Milken Family Foundation. She was honored by the foundation for her innovative teaching methods that use real-world applications to make learning relevant and interesting to students.

Then there is Tom Woodruff, who teaches at Rogers High School in Rogers, Arkansas. Tom was recently named as one of five national finalists in the NASDAQ's national teaching awards. The awards recognize teachers for their originality, creativity, and effectiveness in advancing interest in, and understanding of, our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed to have such dedicated people teaching our children in the Third District of Arkansas. It seems fitting since the PTA has named this week National Teachers Appreciation Week to take a moment to thank Tom, Melissa, and all the wonderful teachers who are helping to shape the future of our Nation.

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the American people quite often are seen from time to time from both civilian businesses and the military with some bad actors. We all condemn those. The problem that I have is that too many people focus on just the bad actors and forget about the people that serve us well both in civilian business and in the military. I have served in the military. What irks me is that people that condemn our military are generally the people that have not served themselves. They are generally the people that continually vote against defense, which most of goes to the families to support them coming back. They continually vote against intelligence. And then they have the gall to stand up here and chastise our military. Mr. Speaker, I think that is wrong. I am proud of the men and women that serve in our military. I think if those individuals would speak about their accomplishments more, maybe we would all be better off.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2443, COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2443) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2004, to amend various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FILNER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 2443) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2004, to amend various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, be instructed to insist on the language contained in section 415 of the House bill that requires foreign-flag vessels to have their vessel security plans approved by the United States Coast Guard before entering a port in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The motion that the House has before it is really very simple. It instructs the House conferees on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act to insist on our House provision on section 415. Section 415 simply clarifies that all foreign-flag vessels that may be involved in a security incident in the United States must submit their vessel security plans to the Coast Guard for their review and approval before they enter the United States. It is pretty simple. We are trying to make sure that we do not have a terrorist incident caused by a ship coming to our shores.

We have seen clear evidence that terrorists have the means and capability to use vessels as a weapon. We all know about the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*. Most recently, insurgents in Iraq blew up their boat filled with explosives when a U.S. boarding team tried to inspect their vessel. Two members of our Navy and one member of the Coast Guard died in that attack.

When this Congress enacted the Maritime Transportation Security Act in November of 2002, foreign vessel owners were clearly required to submit vessel security plans to the United States Coast Guard. They were prohibited

from operating after July 1 of this year if those plans were not approved and if they were not operating in accordance with those plans. But in the month after this MTSA, the Maritime Transportation Security Act, was enacted, the Coast Guard went to London and agreed to amendments to the Safety of Life At Sea Convention to require security standards for all vessels engaged in international trade. These amendments are called the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code, or as we refer to them, the ISPS Code.

The Coast Guard never told Congress that they were intending to overturn the new security law by allowing foreign-flag vessels to enter the United States if their security plans were approved not by the Coast Guard but by the government in which the ship is flagged. As many Members know, thousands of ship owners choose to register their ships in so-called "flag of convenience" countries. The ship owners do this to save money because they know that these governments flaunt international law by not enforcing the international maritime conventions to which they are a party.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has learned a great deal about terrorism since 9/11. One thing we have clearly learned is that not every nation in the world is our friend. Each day hundreds of ships enter U.S. ports with dangerous and hazardous cargoes. A weapon of mass destruction, a biological agent could easily be smuggled aboard a vessel in a foreign port. Look at some of the largest registries in the world, like Panama, Malta and Cyprus, and you will find vessels that are often detained by the Coast Guard for violations of international safety laws. Now we expect those same governments to protect U.S. citizens by making sure that their vessels have adequately implemented security plans? Give me a break! I for one am not willing to delegate our security responsibilities to the governments of Panama or Malta or Cyprus.

I raised this issue with the Coast Guard at two separate hearings. The Coast Guard argued that they do not have the resources to approve the security plans for the thousands of foreign-flag vessels that come to our country. I have a simple thing to say, as I said to the commandant: send us a budget request, and we will fight for every nickel you need to review and approve the foreign vessel security plans. The resources will be there if you ask for them. But do not compromise the security of our coastal communities and our whole Nation by placing our security in the hands of these foreign governments.

When Congress wrote the Maritime Transportation Security Act in 2002, we realized that it is up to the United States Government through the United States Coast Guard to protect our citizens. I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion to instruct the conferees on H.R. 2443 to insist on the House provisions requiring all foreign-flag vessels, any one of which may

be a potential terrorist threat, to submit their security plans to the Coast Guard for review and approval before they enter the United States. We ask this in law. We ask now to reinforce the law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of Chairman YOUNG and myself, I have a couple of remarks about this motion. We support section 415 and allowed it to be included in the House bill with the agreement that we would continue to work to improve the language. It is very important that we ensure that all vessels, including foreign vessels, have security plans. However, to protect the United States, we need to support the Coast Guard's efforts as they board and inspect vessels coming into U.S. waters.

However, the Coast Guard and the Department of Homeland Security have expressed strong concerns about the current House language. They are concerned about requiring submission and secretarial approval of all foreign vessel security plans. They are concerned that this requirement could undermine extensive progress on vessel security planning already made in the international arena and would impose an unsupportable resource drain on the Coast Guard. They are concerned that this could conflict with provisions of the Safety of Life At Sea Convention and the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code. This would place the United States at a significant disadvantage when demanding that other nations comply with their responsibilities and would significantly degrade our ability to negotiate new international requirements.

Additionally, other nations could retaliate and demand to review and approve U.S. security plans before our vessels were allowed to trade in their ports. I believe that this is a real danger. Ultimately, the sharing of sensitive U.S. vessel security plans with all nations may not be in the best interests of our own national security. I would like to continue to explore whether acceptance of foreign vessel security plans approved under the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code with aggressive Coast Guard verification and enforcement might better achieve our national maritime security goals.

There is concern that the number of plans that could potentially be subject to review is staggering. Worldwide, there are approximately 40,000 vessels required to have security plans. If section 415 were enacted, the Coast Guard would be required to review the security plan of each of these vessels that wanted to visit the United States. In recent years, approximately 8,000 vessels per year have visited the United States, making roughly 50,000 port calls.

□ 1100

Without significant additional resources, our diversion of resources

from some other area, the Coast Guard could not accomplish this review and approval process in a timely manner. The cost of this effort would be substantial, and the Coast Guard is not funded in this effort.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and I pledge to continue to work with our colleagues and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the Democratic ranking member, and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) to address their concerns on this homeland security issue.

Today we will support this motion, but would strongly recommend that we continue to discuss this issue with the Coast Guard and the maritime shipping industry and our colleagues in the other body to improve and merge our other bills to ensure that the country and our security is protected.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was a little surprised the gentleman was going to accept the motion after speaking out against it, but I appreciate that, and I hope we fight for this at the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

I was just meeting with some constituents in my office, and when I came in I heard the chairman speaking, and it sounded to me as though he was strongly opposed to our motion to instruct to better protect our ports and national security, but apparently from what I heard, he is going to support the motion. So I am a little confused.

But let me make the points that I think need to be made about this. We have a law, a national law, a law in the United States of America, that says under the Maritime Transportation Security Act, that foreign-flagged, that is, vessels that sail to the United States many times with very obscure ownership, in fact, the way international maritime law works, Osama bin Laden could very well own some of these freighters, but we would not be able to find that out.

So we are working on that problem and the Coast Guard has made some slight progress, but not enough in terms of lifting the veil of secrecy around who actually owns these ships, which I think is essential to our national security, but in the interim under the Maritime Transportation Security Act, these foreign-flagged ships of unknown ownership with crews who are not very well identified, that is, there are no foolproof counterfeit-proof IDs or certification for the crews, many of them have false documents, many of them are of a dubious lineage, no security checks that are meaningfully conducted on those people, are cruising in and out of the ports of the United States, and what we have today is a little better than before 9-11.

Proposals I had made subsequent to a ship accident have been implemented by the Coast Guard to hold the vessels that are in international align and to require manifests and other things and do boardings when they think they are necessary, and that is all well and good. But the Maritime Transportation Security Act goes one step further. They are supposed to have a plan that has been approved by the United States Coast Guard, these foreign-flagged vessels of uncertain lineage. Now, the issue before us is are we going to allow foreign classification societies, flags of convenience, and others to certify these plans in foreign languages with no review by the Coast Guard and just assume that everything is hunky-dory? That is really the issue that is before us.

I mean, let us take Liberia, for instance. There is no government in Liberia, pretty plain and simple, but they are a major flag of convenience for these freighters, these freighters which may be owned by Osama bin Laden. We really do not know. But they are done in an obscure way through nonexistent countries like Liberia. They exist, but they do not have a functioning government. They certainly do not have a Coast Guard. In fact, the government of Liberia, I think, recently moved. They were in Reston. I think they moved somewhere else in Virginia. They have a bunch of ex-Coast Guard people who are running their registry, which is just a for-profit thing they do, a flag of convenience, so that vessel owners, whoever they might be, can avoid the strictures of U.S. law for crewing and for safety and a whole host of other reasons.

I have never been comfortable with this arrangement, but I am particularly uncomfortable with an arrangement where the nonexistent government of Liberia will be certifying vessel security plans without any review by the Coast Guard, except perhaps the retired Coast Guard who are being paid a fabulous salary to pretend that there is a government in Liberia and that they are processing these plans on behalf of that government.

That is the situation we are confronted with. This does not give me great comfort. And, in fact, the international standards say, well, these nonexistent governments of Liberia, or its substandard performers like Panama, Malta, and Cyprus, again, all who are just trying to make money on flagging ships, and if they get tough with those people, like make them have an actual real vessel security plan, really certify the crews, well, they will just go to another country or so-called country, as in the case of Liberia, and get a flag from them for a few bucks more or less.

That is what it is all about. They are trying to avoid safety, security, crewing requirements, and all that. And this becomes to me another major security loophole for the United States of

America to say that Malta, Cyprus, Liberia, who do not care about the interests of the United States in these matters, would certify in foreign languages these vessel security plans. This is not adequate. It does not meet laws that were enacted with, I think, virtually unanimous support of the United States Congress under the Maritime Transportation Security Act. They undermine the Maritime Transportation Security Act. And then as I came in, I heard my chairman, with whom I have tremendous respect and he is a great advocate for the Coast Guard and he has helped them get more money, saying if we made the Coast Guard review these plans, they would not have enough people. They would need more resources.

Then let us ask for the resources. This is a pattern I keep hearing from the administration. Yesterday I was at a hearing with the Transportation Security Administration folks, and we were raising concerns about rail and port security in the Railroads Subcommittee, and I said, Look, just be honest with us. Tell us you do not have enough people and you need more money. And they cannot do that because the political minders down at the White House are watching them. They cannot ask for more money for homeland security. We cannot ask for enough money to help the Coast Guard. I mean, the Coast Guard could contract this out if they do not have the staff, and the administration loves contracting out. We could hire a firm, a U.S. firm, who has security credentials or something else to certify these plans. But to allow Liberia, which does not have a government, to approve these plans of ships of unknown lineage and ownership in foreign languages and say that meets U.S. law, that is providing optimal homeland security for the United States of America, is absolutely wrong.

So I hope that the ranking member was right in saying that the chairman will support this. I hope he will and I hope he will not just support it with his vote, but he will support it wholeheartedly through conference. We need these protections for homeland security. And if it is a matter of a few more dollars, then let us ask for that money so we do it compliant with our law and not with a loophole-ridden international organization that does not give a darn about U.S. security.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for his comments. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and I do support this, but as we have worked through the committee all along in a very strong bipartisan way, we are expressing that there are some legitimate concerns such as our turning over our vessel security plans to this nonexistent government of Liberia. These are things that we should be talking about. These are things that we want to talk about so that in the

end the final product that we have is a product that will ensure our national and homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that there are no ships with American flags going to Liberia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, ranking member, for his stout defense of the committee position and for his splendid service, and I also wanted to express my great appreciation to the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of the full committee, who has, from his first day in this body, been a stout defender and advocate of the U.S. Coast Guard. He sometimes calls it "my Coast Guard," and rightly so, because Alaska has the largest coastline to protect in all of the Coast Guard's work.

And I have enormous respect for the gentleman from New Jersey, who has one of the largest Coast Guard facilities, perhaps the largest in his district, who has chaired the subcommittee with great distinction.

But I must say I am disappointed in the Coast Guard and in the administration, whoever it is. It is uncertain. The Coast Guard has been shifted from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Homeland Security. We hardly know who is the Secretary to whom they report for all the various functions of the Coast Guard, or whether this message is coming from the White House or the Office of Management and Budget. Whatever it is, the Coast Guard is on the wrong track.

We passed the port security bill, known as the Maritime Transportation Security Act, in November, 2002, hard on the heels of all of the horrific events of September 11 and in the spirit of vastly improving security in all of the modes of transportation. We had extensive discussion, debate within our committee, all aimed at one objective, protecting transportation in America from terrorist threats. Every step of the way, the purpose was to elevate security in transportation, make it substantially better, not just an increment, not just a little step better. And I was at the White House for the signing of the bill. I think the gentleman from New Jersey was there as well, as I recall. A delegation from the other body was there.

The President was very proud of that bill. Hardly was the Coast Guard involved in the International Maritime Organization negotiations on the Safety at Sea law, negotiating something that really undercuts a main thrust of this legislation. When we crafted this bill, the MTSA, the original law, I drew on our experience in aviation in the aftermath of Pan Am 103. I served on that commission with the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hammerschmidt,

and one of the great failings we saw was that the United States really did not have the ability to go into foreign countries' aviation programs and see whether they had a strong security program, whether they were doing security inspections and screening of passengers, screening of luggage, screening of mail, as we were doing and as we were proposing to do in even stronger fashion; so we crafted in that legislation language to establish foreign security liaison officers within the FAA in foreign countries with the authority to go in and inspect, with the authority to look at aviation security plans of foreign governments.

And I took that theme and introduced it into our Maritime Transportation Security Act. It was missing one word. I sort of take the responsibility for it. We did not put the word "foreign" vessel, thinking that was pretty clear that vessels coming into U.S. ports that are suspect would be from other countries. The Coast Guard went and negotiated away that power of the U.S. to inspect the security plans of other countries and to see whether vessels operating under a foreign flag were in compliance with the security plan of the country of registry of that vessel.

□ 1115

Well, seeing that shortcoming, in the course of hearings that the chairman of the committee conducted, the issue came up. It was raised by members on both sides in the course of our hearings. So the language was tightened up, just to make it very clear we would have the ability to inspect, that the Coast Guard have the ability to inspect, the security plans of foreign governments.

Now, why is that a concern? Because this is the document that the U.S. Coast Guard negotiated, the Safety of Actions At Sea. It was 17 December 2002, and the relevant language, "Ship security plans are not subject to inspection by officers duly authorized by a contracting government to carry out control compliance measures in accordance with regulations specified in section 9.8.1."

Here is section 9.8.1. "Officers," meaning U.S. Coast Guard in this case, "will have limited access to the specific section of the plan allowed in the exception, only with the consent of the contracting government," meaning Malta, Liberia, Panama, the Philippines, "or the master of the ship concerned. Parts of the code are considered as confidential and cannot be subject to inspection unless otherwise agreed by the contracting governments concerned."

Did our President not say, the President of the United States say, and has he not said repeatedly, "I will never ask permission of the United Nations to defend the United States. I will never ask permission of a foreign government to protect the citizens of the United States. We are not going with a permission slip"?

This is a permission slip. This is what has been agreed to. I heard what the chairman said, that, oh, if we insist on protecting our interests, then other governments will insist on inspecting security plans of the United States.

We have only 37 American-flagged vessels in international commerce. They do not call on ports at Malta and Liberia. That is not the issue. The issue is whether we, the biggest trading Nation in the world, 11 million containers coming into the United States every year, will have the ability to see whether those ships were loaded in accordance with the security plan that meets our standards and will protect our security, and that there is not anything going on those ships that does not belong on those ships, like bombs, nuclear devices, weapons of mass biological destruction.

We do this already with aviation. Why can we not do it for maritime? Time and again, we have heard our biggest threat, the biggest unknown is what might be in a vessel coming into a U.S. port, what could be there that could destroy a city, not only on the coastal plain of the United States, but in the interior as containers move from the port to the interior of the country.

Now, why have this motion to instruct? The purpose is that the Senate, excuse me, the other body, has language in its version of our bill that simply accepts the international convention. The Senate version simply recognizes the ISPS Code, security plans drawn up by foreign-flag states, and allows the country of registry to do the signoff.

Well, I know from experience and having been at this for some time that in those countries of foreign registry, very frequently the security plan is contracted out to some private entity, a private entity that has been approved by the classification societies. And as we know, those international ship classification societies are not repositories of great strength and great courage and great oversight or great concern about security. So I do not want to see a security plan and have us just on faith accept a security plan of another country of registry, done by a contractor, which we do not even review.

Furthermore, under the international convention, which I just read, the Coast Guard has to get the equivalent of a search warrant. They have to have probable cause. They have to find something that they say, we know there is something wrong. We have evidence that this ship has been improperly loaded and there may be ricin stored in one of these containers, or the equivalent thereof.

Why do we have to do that? That is nonsense. Are we going to protect America, are we going to protect our shores, are we going to protect our ports, or are we just simply going to leave it to the good will and good offices of other countries? We do not do that in aviation, and we ought not to be doing it for port security.

Why do I take the time to say this? Because I feel very strongly about this. I have given 25 years of my service in this body to security in aviation and to maritime security, to on-land security. A good part of my career has been on aviation safety and aviation security, and I do not think that we should do anything less than the best.

So, yes, we had that language in our bill. I think we need to have this vote here on that language to reinforce the position of the conferees when we go to the other body because their language simply embraces the international convention. We have to tell them, wait a minute, that is not good enough. That does not do a good enough job. If you are serious about protecting our ports and protecting the homeland of the United States, with 11 million containers coming in, 8,000 vessels calling at our ports every year, let us get serious about it and make sure we provide the Coast Guard with the personnel and financial resources to carry out this mission.

It is crucially important. Either we are serious about port security or we are not; and not being serious is swallowing this International Convention on Safety of Life At Sea.

That is not safe. I will trust the U.S. Coast Guard. I know what the men and women of the Coast Guard can do. They are serious, they are experienced, and they will do the job of security.

So let us reaffirm the position of the House. Let us make sure when we go to conference, we stand firm; that the four principal negotiators on the part of the House are backed up by the voice of this body, so that we stand firm on this language. Let us give the Coast Guard the authority it needs. Let us stand up to make sure that we are protecting our ports. Protect the House position, protect security in the homeland of the United States through the one major Achilles heel afflicting us right now, and that is port security.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, we are in agreement with so many points that the gentleman made. No Member and no one should get the impression that any of us are not completely committed to maritime anti-terrorism, to homeland and port security. What we are saying here is we believe there needs to be just a little bit of additional fine tuning.

But in principle, I agree. I will support the gentleman's motion to instruct, and I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. We will stand firm in conference.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 627, DEPLORING ABUSE OF PERSONS IN UNITED STATES CUSTODY IN IRAQ

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 628 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 628

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 627) deploring the abuse of persons in United States custody in Iraq, regardless of the circumstances of their detention, urging the Secretary of the Army to bring to swift justice any member of the Armed Forces who has violated the Uniform Code of Military Justice, expressing the deep appreciation of the Nation to the courageous and honorable members of the Armed Forces who have selflessly served, or are currently serving, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 628 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of House Resolution 627, deploring the abuse of persons in United States custody in Iraq, regardless of the circumstances of their detention, urging the Secretary of the Army to bring to swift justice to any member of