

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 576, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) authorizing the printing and binding of a supplement to, and revised edition of, Senate Procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRINTING OF SUPPLEMENT TO, AND REVISED EDITION OF, SENATE PROCEDURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following documents shall be prepared under the supervision of Alan Frumin, Parliamentarian and Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate, and shall be printed and bound as a Senate document:

(1) A supplement to “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Supplement to Riddick’s Senate Procedure”.

(2) A revised edition of “Riddick’s Senate Procedure”, to be styled “Frumin’s Senate Procedure”.

(b) COPIES.—One thousand five hundred copies of each document described in subsection (a) shall be printed for distribution to Senators and for the use of the Senate.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 86) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 86

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

Section 9(b)(3) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–61; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking “three years” and inserting “six years”.

SEC. 2. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a “renewal resolution” for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or July 26, 2006, whichever occurs first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 86. According to the State Department, the Burmese military regime has resisted all international pressure to enact meaningful political reforms and create true democracy. In response, for many years now, the United States has imposed sanctions, including banning all imports from Burma. Additionally, we have prohibited exportation of financial services from the United States to Burma and have targeted the regime itself by freezing certain assets.

Today the passage of this resolution is necessary to extend for 1 year the import restrictions enacted within the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. On February 7, 2006, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Christopher Hill, testified that these sanctions are “an essential component of our strategy.” He went on to say that “they serve as a constant reminder to the regime, and everyone else concerned with Burma, that its behavior is unacceptable, and that regime leaders will remain international pariahs as long as they continue this behavior.”

As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, I do not support trade sanctions lightly. However, Burma has not taken the necessary steps to warrant lifting these sanctions. The Burmese regime claims it is implementing its so-called road map to democracy, but in truth it is taking no such steps.

The State Department has found that the delegates charged with creating the constitution that this democracy would be built upon are all hand-picked supporters of the current regime. Additionally, pro-democracy advocates remain imprisoned, and military conflicts continue with internal groups.

Perhaps most disturbing are reports that Burma’s human rights record con-

tinues to worsen. In 2005, security forces in the country continued to rape and murder Burmese citizens, force them into slave labor, and compel people into serving in militia units to defend the regime that they abhor.

Since enactment of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, the Treasury Department has blocked over \$16.8 million in transactions and frozen hundreds of thousands of dollars of assets belonging to the Burmese regime. The vast majority of democratic opposition within Burma supports the continuation of these sanctions and even welcomes additional actions.

It is now incumbent upon all of us to ensure that the “essential component” Assistant Secretary Hill referenced remains in place until this murderous regime yields to the desire of its citizens to be free. To back down now would send the wrong message to the military regime in Burma as well as the international community. Most importantly, it would send the wrong message to those pro-democracy advocates within Burma fighting for the freedom of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important measure and vote “aye” on H.J. Res. 86.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 86, a resolution extending trade sanctions against Burma.

It is imperative that the United States continue sanctions against Burma so as to maintain pressure on the government of Burma to end its brutal repression against the Burmese people.

The government of Burma’s litany of abuses is appalling. According to the U.S. State Department and human rights organizations, the government of Burma has continued to arrest and imprison supporters of democracy for alleged political offenses. Over 1,100 persons remain in jail today for their political beliefs.

Earlier this year, the government of Burma extended the detention of Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the National League of Democracy, a pro-democracy party, and her deputy. Aung San Suu Kyi has spent 10 of the last 17 years in confinement.

Burmese security forces regularly monitor the movement and communication of residents, search homes without warrants, and relocate people without compensation or legal recourse. The government of Burma has failed to crack down on trafficking in persons; and, in fact, the government of Burma has sanctioned the use of forced labor. In fact, the government of Burma has supported the use of forced labor for large infrastructure projects, forced children to join the Burmese Army, imprisoned individuals who have communicated with the International Labor Organization on the subject of forced labor.

Further, the Burmese government has destroyed nearly 3,000 villages in its campaign to forcibly relocate minority ethnic groups.

Mr. Speaker, the world simply cannot stand by as Burma continues its brutal policies. I am pleased that the European Union recently acted to renew its sanctions against Burma and that many nations in the world have spoken out against the repression in Burma. It is particularly meaningful that in December 2005 the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, which counts Burma as one of its members, issued a statement calling for the release of political prisoners and democracy reforms in Burma.

Mr. Speaker, the Western world and those who are concerned about human rights are united: Burma cannot be allowed to continue its oppressive actions. The use of sanctions is appropriate, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my good friend and colleague, Congressman BEN CARDIN, for his leadership on trade and human rights issues.

I also want to express my appreciation to Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL THOMAS for his strong support, over many years, for import sanctions against Burma, and for moving this legislation to the floor expeditiously. As always, I also remain deeply appreciative of the work of the Ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, my friend and colleague CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. Speaker, former South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu—the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for his tireless and ultimately successful fight for freedom in South Africa—spoke eloquently about the key role of the international community in helping to free oppressed nations.

He said, “If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality.”

Mr. Speaker, with passage of this legislation, Congress will once again signal firmly that the United States is not neutral when it comes to Burma. We are firmly on the side of imprisoned Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi and all those who are oppressed by Burma's ruling thugs.

Some argue the U.S. sanctions do not help those who suffer the most under Burma's oppressive political and economic system. Again, I would respectfully refer them to Archbishop Tutu, whose homeland of South Africa is free today because the international community refused to remain silent about the brutal system of Apartheid.

By voting to maintain our Nation's tough approach towards Burma, we once again lead the world by example. Step by step, we will move assertively towards a global sanctions regime against Burma involving all of the world's leading economic players.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are signs that American leadership on Burma is paying off.

Just a few short months ago, the United Nations Security Council held an unprecedented debate on Burma's horrendous human rights situation and its destabilizing role in Southeast Asia. Further Security Council action against

Burma is on the near horizon, particularly since the Burmese leadership thumbed its nose at Kofi Annan's hand-picked special envoy to Burma, and refused to release Aung San Suu Kyi.

The political leadership of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—ASEAN—has also long maintained that Burma's political situation was an “internal affair.” But Singaporean Foreign Minister George Yeo recently said that Southeast Asia may need to “distance itself” from Burma if it does not undergo political reform, and the ASEAN leaders refused to let Burma become chairman of the important regional organization in 2006.

The European Union has also firmly resisted the entreaties of the European commercial class—always eager for new trade opportunities with the world's rogue regimes—to reduce sanctions against Burma.

Mr. Speaker, while these are positive developments, we remain a long way from a comprehensive, global sanctions regime. But Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to wait as long as it takes to convince the international community to act properly.

The only hope for promoting far-reaching political change is by making Burma's thugocracy pay an economic price for running their nation into the ground. I would welcome a negotiated solution to the crisis in Burma, but I believe firmly that such negotiations will only bear fruit once those pulling the levers of power feel a strong economic pinch.

Today, we will act decisively to renew import sanctions against Burma, and send an unmistakable signal of support for the restoration of democracy and human rights in that impoverished nation.

One day, Aung San Suu Kyi will lead a democratic Burma, and I look forward to being at her inauguration before a throng of her countrymen, all finally free. Until then, we in this country must do what we can to hasten that day.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution that my good friend from California, Mr. LANTOS introduced. I am proud to have my name attached to this resolution as an original cosponsor.

Mr. LANTOS has been leading the way when it comes to fighting the repressive junta that controls Burma with an iron fist and I would like to commend him for his continued support.

The United States has been a leader in pushing the world to recognize the atrocities the military junta in Burma commits on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, because of our country's diplomatic efforts on a multilateral front the military junta is feeling the pressure.

The European Union had joined us in placing sanctions on the regime, a step that shows the unity of the West against the junta's human rights violations. Two weeks ago, for the first time Swiss banks froze all assets of the military regime.

For the first time the ASEAN nations are openly calling for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and all political prisoners. Countries like Singapore and the Philippines have made strong statements showing that ASEAN has lost its patience with the continued lack of promised reforms from the junta.

The United Nations Security Council has met twice over the past seven months to dis-

cuss the horrible situation in Burma, a first for the U.N.

Thankfully, the Security Council is currently considering its first-ever resolution on Burma.

We are at a monumental point in the history of Burma. My hope is that all members of the Security Council will support this resolution.

I urge all of my colleagues to continue to support the people of Burma who have suffered under this brutal military junta.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 86, a bill intended to extend the import restrictions imposed by the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. This act was initially passed in response to the failure of Burma's ruling body to take significant actions to establish a democratic government, and for its reluctance to address violations of human rights and the pervasive drug problems within its borders. The governing body of Burma has yet to take effective corrective action.

Burma is presently under the rule of a military regime, the State Peace and Development Council. This military junta, or one like it, has been in control of the Burmese government for the greater part of Burma's independence since 1948. Democratic rule in Burma ended in 1962 in a coup d'etat. The National League for Democracy, led by Aung San Suu Kyi, won a free election held in 1990, but the ruling military regime, then the SLORC (State Law and Order Restoration Council), voided the election and impeded the formation of a democratic government.

The SLORC has since become the SPDC, and Aung San Suu Kyi has spent the last 17 years in and out of detention and house arrest. She has been offered freedom in exchange for her voluntary exile, but she, with the backing of millions of supporters around the world, continues to stand against an oppressive regime and fight for democracy. She was in detention in 1999 when her husband died from cancer, as authorities would not allow for him to visit or for her to return if she visited him while he was ill. Aung San Suu Kyi has been relentless in her work and advocacy and was the recipient of the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize for her struggle. It will take more men and women of her courage and character to free her country from its oppressors within. Yet the world has yet to respond with the required urgency.

In the year 2004, Burma was the world's second largest producer of illicit opium, with an estimated production of 292 metric tons. Though this number was down 40% from 2003 due to eradication efforts and drought, land cultivation in 2004 was still 30,900 hectares. The government has shown little interest in addressing this problem.

Human rights violations in Burma have been documented for years, and it is generally agreed to that the military regime currently in power is one of the most repressive, violent, and inhumane in the world. The atrocities include forced labor, conscription of children, repression of free speech and political freedom, and the state-sanctioned use of torture and rape as weapons of war.

It is estimated that several hundreds of thousands of men, women, children, and elderly are being forced to work against their will in what the International Labor Organization of the UN calls a “modern form of slavery.” Human Rights Watch estimates that some 70,000 of the regime's soldiers are children. A

2004 report by Amnesty International estimates that more than 1,300 people were wrongfully imprisoned between 1989 and 2004; and there were an estimated 1,600 political prisoners in 2005, 38 of which were elected members of Parliament.

The U.S. State Department and two NGOs have confirmed that torture and rape are being used as weapons of war. A report issued in 2002 by The Shan Human Rights Foundation and the Shan Women's Action Network documents 173 cases of rape and sexual violence involving 625 girls and women. The study points out that 61 % were gang-rapes and that 25% of these girls and women died, some of whom were detained and repeatedly raped for up to four months. A report released by Refugees International in April of 2003 also documents cases of rape. These crimes are largely targeted at ethnic minorities, including the Shan, Mon, Karenni, and the Karen.

Testifying before the House Committee on International Relations earlier this year, Human Rights Watch advocacy director Tom Malinowski stated that, "Government armed forces continue to engage in summary executions, torture, and the rape of women and girls. This campaign can only be described as ethnic cleaning on a very large scale. Hundreds of thousands of people, most of them from ethnic minority groups, live precariously inside Burma as internally displaced people."

A CBO report estimates that supporting this legislation could cost the U.S. \$500,000 in 2006 and \$1 million in 2007. It is likely that there will be economic costs on the other end as well, and not just for those in power. So while it is understandable and even necessary to take action in opposition of the current military regime and to condemn their oppressive rule and blatant abuses of human rights, we should explore other methods to express our disapproval and impose sanctions. We must be careful that our actions do not oppress the innocent who are caught up in this ongoing struggle.

So I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 86, but I also ask that we devise additional ways to assist the people of Burma, ways that may not entail economic backlashes. Over the years we have seen situations like this arise and escalate and we have watched with shameful apathy as millions have perished or fallen victims to unspeakable physical, sexual, and emotional violence. And here we are again with another opportunity to act or be apathetic. Let us not squander it under the cover of feigned ignorance. We are all aware now. Let us not get selective amnesia by confining our thoughts to tangential concerns of a lesser gravity, for history will not forget when we stand idly by while these people suffer, scream, and die. Instead, let us free Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi, and free those for which she remains confined.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 86.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials with regard to H.J. Res. 86.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 2003, the United States stopped fighting a war in Iraq and became the occupants of Iraq. That was when the U.S. occupation began.

March 1, 2003, is the day that President Bush, speaking under a huge banner with the words "Mission Accomplished" declared major combat operations in Iraq had ended. At that moment, the United States military should have left Iraq.

Military commanders and policy experts advised the President, but he failed to grasp that deploying hundreds of thousands of soldiers to Iraq and invading Baghdad would be like sticking your hand in a beehive and trying to remove it without getting stung.

Even the President's father, President George H.W. Bush, agreed on this point. That is why during the first Gulf War during 1991, he stopped short of having the U.S. military actually enter Baghdad.

If we had left after, according to the President, the "mission" had been "accomplished," we could have prevented the deaths of over 2,400 American soldiers. More than 18,000 others wouldn't have returned home with life-changing injuries, and thousands of others wouldn't suffer from severe psychological trauma as a result of fighting a war halfway across the world. And countless thousands, tens of thousands

of innocent Iraqi civilians who have been killed might still be alive in Iraq.

The last 3½ years since the President's "mission accomplished" speech have been unsuccessful in all ways in Iraq. This war has drained America's coffers of nearly \$400 billion, money that could have been used for underfunded programs right here at home, like addressing key homeland security needs, providing health care to all Americans, giving all American children a first-class education.

This war has diminished America's role as an international leader. Our role and our image have suffered great damage as a result of our involvement in Iraq. We are even less safe here at home, and Iraqis are less safe in Iraq than before the United States invaded Iraq.

It is actually the very presence of 150,000 American soldiers in Iraq that has enraged and dissatisfied the people of the Arab world.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a war; this is an occupation. The Pentagon and the White House have turned our troops into occupiers against their will, placing them in an absolutely impossible situation. This is not what they were trained for. Soldiers can win a war, but how do they win an occupation? An occupation is by its very nature unwinnable. There is no winning; all you can do is come home.

The President does not seem to understand this truth which is made very clear in comments he makes like "we will accept nothing short of total victory in Iraq"; or "we will stay in Iraq until the job gets done."

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand that there is no such thing as "getting the job done in Iraq" because it is not a job, it is an occupation. What Congress needs to do is take back the powers it gave to the President more than 3 years ago. It is time to rescind the legislation that gave him the authority to use force in Iraq. And while we are at it, let's do the right thing for our soldiers, their families and the entire country: end the occupation.

The least we can do for our troops is thank them for their service and bring them home to their families.

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

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to take Mr. OSBORNE's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas is a little richer today. But the