

Mr. Speaker, it is time the Bush administration realizes shipping jobs overseas and cutting taxes for the wealthy elite in our country will not create jobs. President Bush and congressional Republicans have had 3 years to turn this jobs recession around. They have totally failed. It is time for Congress to pass measures that will encourage companies to keep jobs here in the United States. It is time we level the playing field and protect American jobs here, rather than continuing to export them overseas.

SECURITY FENCES

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am so sick and tired of listening to the whining about this fence and walls in Israel. First, when I heard the complaining about the wall in Israel, I wondered whether they were complaining about the wall around Jerusalem itself. Walls and fences in the Middle East are as historic as the land itself.

I was just in Germany, and in pretty much every city they have a castle or a walled fort. That is true all over Europe, Austria, and other places. Walls and fences have been there historically, and they were not to keep people from leaving. They were to keep people from getting in. They were built in areas where there were disputed territories, or they would not have needed a wall if people were not going to attack them.

In Rome, we see all sorts of walls in different parts of the Roman Empire. It is a historic tradition in Europe. And, of course, there is the Great Wall of China that goes for thousands of miles and is fairly famous. When we look at our own country, let us say the border with Mexico where we have a fence that goes along the border with Mexico, or let us say gated neighborhoods in the United States, are we suddenly going to ban gated neighborhoods? Is the rule when we want to put a fence around our yard or security system at our house in order to keep people from intruding, are we going to say suddenly we need to unlock our doors and we can put no fences up in our own yards? It is the same basic principle of security and the right to protect your property and the people that live in it that is leading to all this whining about the fence in Israel.

Furthermore, some would add that it is disputed territory. The fact that somebody else has designs on the territory does not mean that you cannot put up a fence. Let us take our border with Mexico. There are some in the country of Mexico that believe that us getting California through a war where we had a clear overt pressure was kind of controversial, not to mention the Gadsden Purchase where we more or less forced Mexico to sell us Arizona and New Mexico, or where we pushed settlers into Texas and Texas declared

their independence and we did a fast recognition to bring Texas in. There are many Mexicans who do not believe that border is legitimate, but does that mean we do not have a right as a Nation, since we recognize those States, we freely associate and recognize them that way, that we do not have a right to put a fence there to protect ourselves from terrorists, illegal immigrants or drugs? Of course we have that right; and so does Israel have that right.

Since September 2000, Palestinian terrorists have launched more than 18,000 attacks, killing more than 800 Israelis and wounding 5,600. Such a high number of attacks seem inconsistent with the Palestinian Authority's commitment under the Oslo Accords and Road Map to curb terrorist activities. Without a true partner in peace, Israel alone has been left to defend itself.

One of the best methods of protecting the citizens of Israel is a security fence. In the last 3 years, not one of the 122 homicide bombers that killed 454 people in Israel infiltrated from Gaza. Gaza is separated from Israel by a security fence.

Despite this, there has been outrage and wide criticism when they have tried to put a fence at the West Bank. This case, which has now been taken to the court in front of the United Nations, is clearly within Israel's domestic jurisdiction, which demands that a government protects its citizens.

Highlighting this necessity was a bombing of a Jerusalem bus that just killed eight and injured 60. This homicide bombing occurred just before the international court began hearing the case against the fence. The need for additional security and the need for the fence in Israel has never been more clear. I am sick and tired of the whining and hypocrisy of many around the world who have built their own fences, built their own walls for thousands of years, and now want to stop Israel from defending itself.

Shortly after achieving independence in 1948, the newly formed State of Israel was set upon by its Arab neighbors. Despite an overwhelming opposing force, the fledgling country defeated its attackers. Since that time, Israel has been buffeted by harassment and violence in varying degrees of intensity. In each attack, whether by neighboring states or terrorist groups, Israel has admirably safeguarded its people and defended its borders.

While Israel has long worked to protect its people, Palestinian Arabs have only recently shown a willingness to dismantle terrorist networks and confiscate illegal weapons. Unfortunately, whether through complete duplicity or half-hearted enforcement of their commitments, terrorist attacks against Israelis continue. Regrettably, there is no sign of any serious effort on the part of the Palestinian Authority to take any action against terrorists.

Since September 2000, Palestinian terrorists have launched more than 18,000 attacks, killing more than 800 Israelis and wounding 5,600. Such a high number of attacks seem inconsistent with the Palestinian Authority's

commitment under the Oslo Accords and Road Map to curb terrorist activities. Without a true partner in peace, Israel alone has been left to defend itself.

One of the best methods of protecting the citizens of Israel is the security fence. In the last three years, not one of the 122 homicide bombers that killed 454 people in Israel infiltrated from Gaza. Gaza is separated from Israel by a security fence.

Despite the proven effectiveness of the Gaza security fence, Israel's recent decision to build a similar security fence around the West Bank has been roundly criticized. In an effort to halt the construction of the fence, a suit has been filed in the International Court of Justice. This case is unprecedented in the history of the court. The court was set up to adjudicate international disputes between two members of the United Nations. In this case, the dispute is not between two U.N. members—the Palestinian Authority is not a member of the United States. The actual U.N. member involved, Israel, has not agreed to the hearing.

This case falls squarely within Israel's domestic jurisdiction which demands that the government protect its citizens. Highlighting this necessity was the bombing of a Jerusalem bus that killed 8 and injured 60. This homicide bombing occurred just before the International Court began hearing the case against the fence. The need for additional security and the need for the fence has never been more clear.

Opponents argue that the fence poses undue hardship to Palestinian Arabs by limiting their employment opportunities or separating them from other Arabs and each other. Certainly, the fence poses a hardship to Palestinian Arabs. The extra security will undoubtedly cause difficulties when moving from the West Bank into Israel but the Israeli government has done its best to be as accommodating as possible. In most places, the fence follows the pre-1967 border. Israel has provided passageways for Palestinian Arab farmers to tend their fields, replanted trees uprooted by fence construction, and protected a water reservoir used by West Bank farmers. In recent days, Israel has shortened the fence citing among its considerations the impact on Palestinian Arabs living near the fence.

As obliging as Israel has been in constructing the security fence, Israel should never be forced to sacrifice its security for convenience. Palestinian Arabs tired of Israel's security measures need only demand that their leaders live up to their commitments to rein in terrorist groups based in the West Bank and Gaza.

It is unfortunate that opponents denounce Israel for protecting itself while ignoring the terrorist attacks that precipitated the need for the fence. At \$1.6 million per mile, I am sure that Israel would prefer to spend its money elsewhere. Unfortunately, the current level of terrorist activity precludes Israel from doing that.

Israel does not wish harm upon its neighbors. Since its establishment, it has only wished to live in peace. Regrettably, Israel's neighbors have never shared this vision. Relentless attacks have forced the Israelis to take steps that seem punitive but only serve to defend the State of Israel and its citizens.

I applaud Israel's security measures. Israel simply has done what the United States of America does everyday, which is protect its

citizens from forces that would harm or destroy them.

□ 2030

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to bring to my colleagues' attention the extreme emergency that the country of Haiti finds itself in with gangs, rebels, renegades, protesters, thugs, drug lords, in combination and in different groups in different parts of the nation of trying to drive out the first duly elected President in the history of Haiti, President Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

There are a number of activities going on here in the Capitol that are intended to move our government and national organizations and international organizations into an effective combination that would allow peace to quickly come to this beleaguered nation where poverty, suffering and misery is so endemic.

I begin my comments with an appeal to the President of the United States, and I quote from a resolution that has been drafted by our colleague from California (Ms. WATERS) which urges the United States to support the principles of democracy and constitutional rule in the Republic of Haiti under which President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was elected and oppose any and all attempts to remove President Aristide from office prior to the completion of his term under the Constitution of Haiti. And that we additionally condemn the violent activities of groups of thugs, former members of Haiti's disbanded army, and paramilitary organizations in Haiti.

This is an appeal to urge the President of the United States to make a statement, to break his silence and to let the world and the people of Haiti know that this country promotes democracy, respects the right to protest, but appreciates that free speech cannot be equated with violence and intimidation.

In addition, we are seeking to invoke the awesome prestige of the United Nations through its Security Council which will be meeting tomorrow. We intend to communicate, Members of Congress, with the Organization of American States to urge that they continue their important work, that CARICOM be invited to offer assurances; in other words, that we pull these international organizations together and make certain that our country does not by its silence give a wink and a nod to the violence that is going on there.

Last of all, we appeal to our distinguished Secretary of State, Colin Powell himself, whose ancestors came from the Caribbean. We thank him for his

negotiations by which he attempted to reach agreement, and he extended the time. It was finally at 5 p.m. this evening that the rebel opposition rejected and refused to continue any negotiations. And so now we ask the Secretary of State in his wisdom and judgment to move to a new and higher plane in trying to bring this matter, the differences of other groups and citizens with their President, to a peaceful resolution.

It is very important that we recognize that the United States' role in this is so important since we were prominently involved in bringing a democratic election and a President to Haiti.

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

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

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

(Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2004 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2004 THROUGH FY 2005

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels on on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2004 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 501 of the conference report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 (H. Con. Res. 95). This status report is current through February 6, 2004.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 95. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2008, because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 95 for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2008. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 401(a)(3) of the

budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal years 2004 through 2013. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2004 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This table also compares the current level of total discretionary appropriations with the section 302(a) allocation for the Appropriations Committee. These comparisons are needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would branch either the section 302(a) allocation or the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The last table gives the current level for 2005 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 95. This list is needed to enforce section 501 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2004 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 95

(Reflecting action completed as of February 6, 2004—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2004	Fiscal years 2004–2008
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,880,555	(1)
Outlays	1,903,502	(1)
Revenues	1,325,452	8,168,933
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,875,397	(1)
Outlays	1,894,792	(1)
Revenues	1,330,756	8,375,403
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	– 5,158	(1)
Outlays	– 8,710	(1)
Revenues	5,304	206,470

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2005 through 2008 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2004 in excess of \$5,158,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2004 in excess of \$8,710,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2004 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2004 in excess of \$5,304,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below level set by H. Con. Res. 95.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period FY 2004 through 2008 in excess of \$206,470,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 95.