

□ 2100

The man that is leading the coup d'etat in Haiti was born in New York and holds an American passport. For the life of me, I do not understand what an American, born in New York, with a passport, is doing starting a coup d'etat in another country. Mr. Andy Arpaïd, Jr., not only holds an American passport; he owns 15 factories in Haiti, sweatshops.

Unfortunately, we cannot continue. We will continue this at another time.

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

(Mr. MEEKS of New York 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 Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAYNE 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 Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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.)

AMERICA MUST STAND UP FOR DEMOCRACY IN HAITI

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, my constituents have watched the escalating violence in Haiti with increasing alarm. Their alarm is caused not just by the brutality and the chaos of the revolt, but by this seeming lack of resolve of our own United States Government in confronting this threat to democracy in our own backyard.

While the President has responded admirably in dispatching envoys to

seek a negotiated solution, I remain concerned that this push for dialogue is not matched by equal resolve to prevent the violent overthrow of a democratically elected government. If the Bush administration turns its back on the democratically elected government of Haiti in this crisis, the President will lose any and all credibility he has on preserving the rule of law.

By now, there should be few illusions about Jean Bertrand Aristide. He is not a paragon of virtue. He deserves an equal share of the blame, along with the legitimate opposition in Haiti, for the political gridlock which has paralyzed Haiti for years and prevented both political maturity and economic growth. But he remains a democratically elected leader, one of the few in Haiti's two violent centuries of independence. To turn our back on him would be to turn our back on the values America was founded upon, the values which have guided our foreign policy from Jefferson through Wilson, through Truman, through Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton.

Haiti's political deadlock is no excuse for violent hooliganism. The forces creating violence in Haiti today are opponents of democracy. If President Bush fails to support the elected government against violent hooligans, the United States will forfeit its role as the leader in this hemisphere. How can our government lead in advocating for democracy in Cuba when we will not raise our voices for democracy just a few miles away in Haiti?

The President's initial efforts have so far been positive; but I fear that without firm resolve, backed by a credible threat of repercussions, America risks losing her credibility as an advocate for democracy. The President needs to be more forceful in stating that he will not accept the violent overthrow of the Aristide government and that we remain adamant that we will only accept a peaceful, negotiated solution to this crisis.

The President has outlined a bold vision for expanding democracy, freedom, and the rule of law throughout the world. But if the President will not even defend democracy in our own hemisphere, he will expose his vision as little more than empty posturing.

I urge the President to take action to prevent the violent overthrow of the Aristide government and to preserve America's leadership role in fighting for democracy and the rule of law.

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

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus' Haiti Task Force to urge immediate action to assuage the political crisis that we see in Haiti.

I wrote a letter to Secretary of State Powell dated February 17 urging a more forceful effort to quell insurgents and to maintain democracy and respect for the rule of law in the region. Haiti has long been suffering with dire economic conditions and the devastation of HIV/AIDS. But now, Haiti has reached a state of crisis. To date, more than 60 people have been killed in the rebellion that is quickly escalating to a civil war.

Humanitarian aid and military assistance are needed now given the threat that demonstrators may thwart the delivery of food and other relief items.

I and the other Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have consistently supported an active role for the United States in providing humanitarian and military assistance to Haiti. Many other Members of the House and Senate have expressed a willingness to support more engaged and aggressive peacekeeping activities to prevent a full-scale civil war so close to our border and to head off the large exodus of refugees to our shores that it might precipitate.

Secretary Powell made a statement earlier about Haiti, committing the United States to working toward a political resolution to the situation in Haiti. However, he expressed his concern that the "enthusiasm" does not exist for the United States to take a stronger approach.

It may be necessary to use more forceful means in the short-run to prevent a humanitarian disaster. The United States must act on its commitment to upholding the constitutional process and the rule of law as the optimal way to maintain civil stability and respect for human rights in that region. We should support the proposal adopted by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in Nassau as a viable option to restore peace.

As we work with the government of Haiti to explore the role of the international community in averting civil war, we must also start to look beyond the current crisis. For example, Haiti continues to be in dire need of food aid and medical assistance. The current unrest has already set off an exodus of refugees; and uncertainty regarding the timing and fairness of the next elections is further promoting suspicions and instability. The United Nations has great experience in handling such issues. Even as we concentrate on quelling the violence, we must also think in terms of promoting peace and stability in the aftermath.

Operation Iraqi Freedom provides a strong model of what we should not do. Without reliable or corroborated information, we initiated aggressive war efforts and amassed large war-related expenses and lost lives of our brave young men and women. Former United Nations weapons inspector David Kay has testified to the fact that there have not been, nor

will there be found any stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction as possessed by Iraq. Nevertheless, our troops have been deployed and stationed in that region since the beginning of the war, and the cost has been tremendous. With the government projected to run one of the largest deficits in history, it is not enough to simply consider the cost of the war today; we must also consider how much money we will be spending on it for years to come. Although the stated cost of the war on April 17 was \$34 billion, the actual cost was closer to \$47.6 billion, due to the \$13.6 billion we will be spending in interest. In addition, the cost of occupation is more accurately stated as \$5.46 billion monthly, of which \$1.56 billion is interest.

With respect to the situation in Haiti, there has been a cry for assistance by President Aristide. The poorest country in the Western Hemisphere that is celebrating its 200th anniversary of independence from French rule with over 8 million citizens aided by a 4,000-officer police force has requested humanitarian aid and security forces. The U.S. contingency plan to deal with the massive refugee exodus that will soon occur is to send them to Guantanamo, Cuba, which received thousands of Haitian refugees during the last crisis 10 years ago, when a military junta seized power from Aristide.

The exodus will indeed be massive; but we can avoid or at least ameliorate it by taking more forceful action to quell the situation immediately.

FEBRUARY 17, 2004.

Hon. COLIN L. POWELL,
*Secretary, Department of State,
C Street NW, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SECRETARY POWELL: I am deeply concerned about the escalating violence in Haiti. Haiti has long been suffering with dire economic conditions and the devastation of HIV/AIDS. But now, Haiti has reached a state of crisis. The recent uprising could rapidly degrade into a catastrophic civil war. I respectfully urge you to move immediately to get humanitarian aid and military assistance to the people of Haiti, in order to help bring about some safety and stability.

I understand that you may feel there is no "enthusiasm" at present for sending U.S. troops or police to Haiti to help quell the violence. However, I believe that the political will to address the problem is rising. We Members of the Congressional Black Caucus have long been supporters of an active role for the United States in providing needed assistance to Haiti. Many other Members of the House and Senate have expressed a willingness to support possible peace-making and peace-keeping activities, to prevent a full-scale civil war so close to our border, and to head off the large exodus of refugees to our shores that it might precipitate.

Furthermore, there seems to be a feeling in the international community and in Haiti itself, that some foreign intervention may now be necessary in Haiti. I hope that you will work with our allies and the United Nations to craft a resolution to this crisis. I am confident that you will exercise your excellent diplomatic skills to craft a political approach to promoting long-term democracy in Haiti. However, please also consider that it may be necessary to use more forceful means in the short run to prevent a humanitarian disaster.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss this matter or if I can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,
Member of Congress.

MORE HEMORRHAGING OF AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I begin this evening by offering the comments of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who could not stay with us this evening, but to announce her support of our efforts, or opposition, if you will, to the Central American Free Trade Agreement and her good work on opposing this agreement that will expand NAFTA to Central America and ultimately lead to the quadrupling of low-income workers, the doubling of the size of NAFTA and more hemorrhaging of American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush last Friday officially notified Congress that he supports the Central American Free Trade Agreement, that he plans to send it to Congress, probably sometime in May, and this body sometime after that will make a decision on whether it wants to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

It just amazes me, Mr. Speaker, that President Bush continues the same very much failed economic policies that he has promoted in this country for the last 3 years.

The Bush economic policies basically are twofold: continued tax cuts for people who need it least, for the most wealthy people in our society. Roughly half the tax cuts have gone to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country as we continue to run up huge budget deficits. That is one part of the President's economic recovery program which has led us to a jobless recovery, or, more precisely, Mr. Speaker, a job-loss recovery. One aspect is tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans as part of his policy for economic recovery.

The other part is to continue to pass trade agreements which have, frankly, shipped jobs overseas. That is why he is asking Congress, because he believes these trade agreements for some reason seem to be helping; but it is pretty clear we have lost lots and lots of manufacturing jobs, to China, Mexico, south of the border, across the ocean, to countries all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Ohio, one out of six manufacturing jobs has simply disappeared since President Bush took office. That means that tens of thousands of Ohioans are out of

work; literally hundreds of thousands of Americans in manufacturing have been thrown out of work. And it means something else: 30 or 40 years ago when we were in the midst of a recession, you figured most of those jobs, seven out of 10, statistics say, would return, people would get their jobs back. They would have temporary layoffs at a Ford plant, temporary layoffs at a steel mill. Seven out of 10 of those jobs would come back. Three of them would be lost forever. Other jobs might be created during a recovery.

During the Bush recession and recovery, they are predicting now only three of the 10 manufacturing jobs lost will return, and they have not even returned yet. So we have this jobless job-loss recovery, when the President says his tax cuts are working. They may be working for upper-income people who both get the tax cuts and now are seeing the stock market doing a little better, only a little better; but they are not working for Ohioans who have lost jobs. They simply are not working. The promises the President made simply have not been fulfilled.

The front page of The Washington Post today, a newspaper that has been pretty pro-Bush on Medicare, very pro-Bush on Iraq, pretty pro-Bush on a whole host of issues, this newspaper wrote on the front page, talked about the Bush job forecast.

With President Bush, every time he issues a statement, an economic report, every time he introduces legislation on the economy to Congress, he makes predictions. He predicted there would be 3.4 million more jobs in 2003 than there were in 2000.

Now, this prediction was not made before September 11, upon which he blames much of the economic stumbling, economic recession in some places, depression in others in this country. This was a prediction made 2 years ago.

The President said by 2003 there would be 3.4 million more jobs in this country than there were when he took office. You know what? We have actually seen a loss of 1.7 million jobs; 1.7 million fewer jobs today than when President Bush took office.

That is some kind of a record. There has not been a President of the United States for 7 decades that has actually seen a net loss of jobs during his presidency. Herbert Hoover was the last one, and Herbert Hoover obviously paid a political price at the next election; and, more importantly, Herbert Hoover paid a historical price in that he became the President that perhaps managed the economy worse than any President in the last century, until this President, who is kind of competing for the same kinds of records.

The President also predicted a couple of years ago the budget deficit would be down to \$14 billion. Well, it turns out that the budget deficit is \$521 billion. So he predicted, way after September 11, a couple of years ago, he predicted a 3.4 million jobs increase