

values of this country are such that torture is not a part of our soul and our being." I agree.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to ensure that we not only outlaw torture conducted directly by U.S. government personnel, but that we also stop any practice which involves outsourcing or contracting out torture to other nations.

I urge Members to join in cosponsoring this legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FORMER LEBANESE PRIME
MINISTER RAFIK HARIRI

SPEECH OF

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, offered by Representative RAHALL of West Virginia, condemning the terrorist attack of February 14, 2005, that killed former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri and to honor the life and legacy of the former Prime Minister.

Born in Sidon, Lebanon, in 1944, Rafik Hariri, a Sunni Muslim, was not born into wealth, but into a farming family. In 1965, seeking a better life, he moved to Saudi Arabia where he worked as a schoolteacher and accountant before starting his own business. Through hard work and particular skill in the construction industry, former Prime Minister Hariri acquired what many have estimated to be a fortune in excess of \$2 billion.

Mr. Hariri began his involvement in the political and economic life of Lebanon long before he became prime minister. As a Lebanese businessman living in Saudi Arabia, he played a behind-the-scenes role as a mediator, advisor and promoter of cease-fires and agreements to end the civil war that ravaged Lebanon from 1975 to 1990. He invested his time and extensive contacts throughout the world to bring peace to his war-torn country.

In 1984, Mr. Hariri participated in the Geneva and Lausanne conferences to bring about political reconciliation in Lebanon and helped broker initiatives to put an end to the civil war.

In 1989, Mr. Hariri was the power behind the Taif Agreement, which succeeded in ending the war and the drafting of a new constitution for Lebanon. This agreement was the political contract that laid down the principles of national reconciliation that ended a dark chapter in Lebanon's history.

In 1992, he returned to his home country to assume office as prime minister after 28 years of living and working in Saudi Arabia. He formed his first government on October 22, 1992.

He immediately began an ambitious rebuilding program whose crown jewel was the rebuilding of Beirut's war torn central district. Today, this district is a vibrant and beautiful center of commerce and culture that rivals that of the world's other great cities.

Rafik Hariri was a man of peace and a man of diplomacy. He was the kind of man the United States and our allies need as we seek to spread freedom and democracy throughout the Middle East.

I had the opportunity to meet Mr. Hariri on a number of occasions. He was a kind and

humble man and the extent of his generosity towards the people of Lebanon, and those throughout the world, may never be fully known. He used his own personal wealth to give thousands of students the opportunity to gain a college education that they would have otherwise been unable to afford.

Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that a thorough and internationally validated investigation will uncover many facts about the assassination of Lebanon's former Prime Minister who remained a sitting member of parliament. Rafik Hariri was the leader of a political faction that many thought would take back control of Lebanon's government in parliamentary elections scheduled to take place in May. I know, from my personal meetings with Prime Minister Hariri, that he held deep reservations and misgivings about the continued presence of Syrian troops and Syrian secret police in Lebanon. Most often, it was not what he said, but what he indicated he could not talk about that most starkly expressed the reservations he had about Syria's role in Lebanon.

Following this national tragedy, Lebanon must now try to hold free and fair parliamentary elections in May. It is my fear that the assassination of Mr. Hariri, and the many other past assassinations that have too often gone without significant investigation in Lebanon, will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech and those who would vocally criticize the continued Syrian presence.

To say it plainly, it is time for Syrian troops and all the Syrian secret police to leave Lebanon. The security that Syria once provided is no longer needed and having security only for those who ally themselves with the continued Syrian presence is incompatible with democracy in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I support UN Resolution 1559 that demands a, "strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon," and for all, "foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon."

Rafik Hariri fought for a democratic and prosperous Lebanon. The United States, even after his death, should continue to press for Prime Minister Hariri's vision for Lebanon and a better Middle East.

BROADCAST DECENCY
ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in cautious support of the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005. While I believe the public should be able to trust that the content of programming during peak viewing times is age-appropriate for children, I am concerned that strict regulations, if improperly applied, can result in infringements on our right to free speech.

Parents ought to be able to watch or listen to public broadcasting without fear that obscene material is foisted on their children. The Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) role in encouraging and enforcing decency regulations provides parents with a level of se-

curity that their family can watch television together or listen to the radio on the way to school without concern about the appropriateness of the information for their children.

As our society's values have changed with different trends, the FCC has provided a standard to guide broadcasters and encourage them to take into account the diversity of their audience when making programming decisions. This bill will retain these standards and dramatically increase the amount a broadcaster can be fined for each violation. While I support keeping broadcasters accountable to the public, I believe excessive fines could be a slippery slope toward violations of first amendment rights and public access to a diverse discussion of ideas. I am, therefore, supporting this legislation but with a deep concern that Congress may well have to re-examine the nature of these fines in future legislation, particularly if they have the effect of prior restraint on first amendment freedoms.

In light of recent scrutiny of indecent material, many broadcasters, artists, and performers are looking toward unregulated airwaves, such as cable and satellite radio. If these programs and performers move to these arenas, the quality of public airwaves leaves with them. The free flow of ideas is the cornerstone of our society, and opens the minds of Americans to different ideas, cultures and lifestyles. Public television and radio provides a medium for these ideas to reach all Americans, not just those who can afford it.

So it is with some deep hesitation that I vote for this bill, as I hope it will not set a dangerous precedent of excessive fines and regulation on television and radio content and possibly infringe on our first amendment rights, but instead ensure that broadcasters are aware and accountable for the content which they air.

I am including an editorial printed in the Rocky Mountain News in March 2004, which I think raises important concerns to consider regarding the increase in fines that this bill will administer.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, March 15, 2004]

CONGRESS SHOULD RETREAT IN 'INDECENCY'
WAR

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives stampeded Thursday to pass a bill to appease voters offended by the Superbowl display of Janet Jackson's breast. Unfortunately, all of Colorado's House delegation (with the exception of Mark Udall, who did not vote) displayed a herd mentality.

The Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act, H.R. 3717, raises the maximum fine for a decency violation to \$500,000, an amount that applies both to on-air personalities and to broadcast outlets. But because broadcasters often own many outlets, and programs often air in multiple markets, the total fine for even a single slip of the tongue (or the wardrobe) can be astronomical. The legislation was introduced in January, before the Super Bowl, so it is probably just coincidence that the new fine amounts to just about one dollar for each of the more than 500,000 complaints about the halftime show that flooded into the offices of the Federal Communications Commission. But the rapid passage is certainly no coincidence. Public outrage spooked Congress into acting.

The vote was 391-22, with Ron Paul, R-Texas, the lone Republican to stand up against congressional censorship.

A Senate measure, S. 2056, has similar provisions for raising fines, but also suspends

for a year FCC rules about how many media outlets a company can own while the General Accounting Office investigates whether consolidation in the broadcast media is connected with indecency on the airwaves. It's awaiting action by the full Senate.

We're glad there is still lots of full-throated public reaction against sleaze in the media (even if the public is often fickle about what it considers inappropriate). The FCC is supposed to uphold some standards, which is why it monitors complaints and spells out the rules for what constitutes "exhibitionism," "obscenity" and "blasphemy." But the best pressure, we believe, is the voice of thousands of individual consumers making their views known to the companies that market the stuff.

We understand that few politicians, especially with an election nearing, are willing to risk being accused of "defending indecency." But Congress should tread lightly in such matters. A law broad enough to ensure that no one's ear or eye is offended will end up silencing speech—indignation at government policies, for example, expressed in strong language—that ought to enjoy full constitutional protection.

"It's a shame we have to address this issue," declared House Majority Leader Tom DeLay, R-Texas, "but when members of the broadcast industry violate the boundaries of reasonable tolerance, that's exactly what we're forced to do."

Forced? Panicked is more like it, and the spectacle is embarrassing.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "CALLING FOR 211 ACT OF 2005"

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor of the Calling for 211 Act of 2005, and I look forward to working with my congressional partner Rep. BILIRAKIS to move this proposal forward.

Every hour of every day, someone in the United States needs essential services for themselves or someone close to them. These services can range from finding an after-school program for a child, to securing care for an aging parent, to finding drug or alcohol counseling. Faced with a myriad of agencies and help lines, many people end up going without services that they need just because they don't know where to start.

When someone calls 2-1-1, an information and referral specialist assesses the caller's needs and determines which service provider is best equipped to handle their problems or crises. These specialists are also trained to determine whether a caller may be eligible for other programs. 2-1-1 service providers maintain comprehensive databases of resources, including federal, state and local government agencies, community-based organizations and private non-profits.

In 2000, the FCC designated 2-1-1 for community information and referral purposes. Today, 2-1-1 reaches 107 million Americans—about 37 percent of the U.S. population—with call centers operational in 31 states and the District of Columbia. The goal of the Calling for 211 Act of 2005 is to ensure that all Americans have access to quality community information and referral services through 2-1-1.

The largest barriers for communities seeking to implement 2-1-1 are funding and awareness. In many states, limited resources have slowed the process of connecting communities with this vital service. Current funding where 2-1-1 is operational comes from diverse sources including non-profits, state governments, foundations, and businesses.

The Calling for 211 Act is strongly supported by the United Way and builds on the ongoing efforts to make it easier to connect people with important community services and volunteer opportunities through the nationwide implementation of 2-1-1. The legislation provides federal matching grants to enable some dramatic and much needed changes to the way people connect to their communities, including: Providing the infrastructure to connect individuals with precise information and social services that address their needs; Empowering the nation to better respond to large-scale emergencies and homeland security needs by relieving pressure on overwhelmed 911 call centers; Providing aggregated data from 2-1-1 systems nationwide to better assess the needs of our communities.

I believe the 2-1-1 system has great potential; this legislation will establish a federal partnership with states and local communities to give more Americans access to 2-1-1 services. By augmenting existing funding from state and local governments, nonprofits, and the business community, we can ensure that 2-1-1 can finally be a truly national system. A small investment at the national level would pay immediate dividends in terms of faster, more efficient responses to non-emergency but still critical situations.

In a crisis no one has time to flip through their phonebook. When an urgent medical or safety issue arises, we dial 911 knowing we can get help anywhere and at anytime. We should expect the same when it comes to tracking down important social services as well.

I urge my Colleagues to support this legislation and help to implement this critical safety net for all Americans.

BLACK HISTORY TRIBUTE TO HATTIE J. HITE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, throughout the month of February, I would like to recognize outstanding African Americans of the 2nd Congressional District of Mississippi, and their contribution to Black History. The 23 counties of the 2nd District are well represented from both a local and national perspective.

Americans have recognized black history annually since 1926, first as "Negro History Week" and later as "Black History Month." In fact, black history had barely begun to be studied—or even documented—when the tradition originated. Although blacks have been in America as far back as colonial times, it was not until the 20th century that they gained a presence in our history books.

Though scarcely documented in history books, if at all, the crucial role African Americans have played in the development of our nation must not be overlooked.

I would like to recognize Mayersville's unsung hero, Mrs. Hattie J. Hite. Known as Ms. Hattie, Hite is 70 years old and the mother of one deceased daughter, Lillian Hite. She is very instrumental in the community and her church family. Every morning, Mr. & Mrs. Hite prepare and deliver breakfast to elderly citizens in the community.

She prepares meals for all of the church functions. Each May, she hosts a memorial program at church honoring her mother, sister and daughter. She invites family, friends, and community members to come over for breakfast. She is and has been a mother figure to the entire community.

I take great pride in recognizing and paying tribute to this outstanding African American of the 2nd Congressional District of Mississippi who deserves mention, not only in the month of February but year round.

REMEMBERING THE TRAGEDY OF KHOJALY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 2005

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for years a number of distinguished Members of this House have come to the Floor of this Chamber every April to commemorate the so-called Armenian Genocide—the exact details of which are still very much under debate today almost 90 years after the events. Ironically and tragically, none of these Members has ever once mentioned the ethnic cleansing carried out by the Armenians during the Armenia-Azerbaijan war which ended a mere decade ago.

Khojaly was a little known small town in Azerbaijan until February 1992. Today it no longer exists, and for people of Azerbaijan and the region, the word "Khojaly" has become synonymous with pain, sorrow, and cruelty. On February 26, 1992, the world ended for the people of Khojaly when Armenian troops supported by a Russian infantry regiment did not just attack the town but they razed it to the ground. In the process the Armenians brutally murdered 613 people, annihilated whole families, captured 1275 people, left 1,000 civilians maimed or crippled, and another 150 people unaccounted for in their wake.

Memorial, a Russian human rights group, reported that "scores of the corpses bore traces of profanation. Doctors on a hospital train in Agdam noted no less than four corpses that had been scalped and one that had been beheaded. . . . and one case of live scalping."

Various other witnesses reported horrifying details of the massacre. The late Azerbaijani journalist Chingiz Mustafayev, who was the first to film the aftermath of the massacre, wrote an account of what he saw. He said, "Some children were found with severed ears; the skin had been cut from the left side of an elderly woman's face; and men had been scalped."

Human Rights Watch called the tragedy at the time "the largest massacre to date in the conflict."

The New York Times wrote about "truckloads of bodies" and described acts of "scalping."