

53,000 work hours at the Port. The economic benefits provided by the steel consuming industries and our nation's ports cannot be forgotten in this debate. For example, the Delaware River region generated \$70 million in total tax dollars for the State and Federal government in 2001. It is evident that the ITC's tariff recommendations would cost far fewer American jobs in the manufacturing, shipping and port industries.

Furthermore, since the President's decision, our trade partners have begun to retaliate, which could further hurt the U.S. economy. Immediately following the decision, the Russian Government instituted a ban on the importation of U.S. poultry, which adversely affected the poultry industry in Delaware and throughout the nation. Other nations are also announcing retaliatory actions and filing complaints with the World Trade Organization. For example, the European Union has announced a broad range of possible tariffs on U.S. products, some as high as 100 percent, that would affect countless U.S. industries, including citrus and textiles.

I recognize the need to support our domestic steel workers, but these measures must be done in a fair and balanced manner that generates U.S. jobs and spurs the national economy—not in a manner that adversely impacts these two fundamental principles and favors protectionism. Today, I rise in strong support of free and fair trade and the role of the United States in the global economy. At a minimum, I encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule in order to allow a full and fair debate on this legislation to overturn the President's decision. And I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.J. Res. 84.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH ISRAEL IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House of Representatives today in the name of democracy, in the name of hope, and in the name of peace.

As long-standing supporters of Israel, we recognize and respect Israel's unquestioned right to self-defense.

The United States has a long history of promoting and supporting democracies. It has long considered Israel its closest ally in the Middle East, because Israel is a democracy.

It is because of our passion for democracy that we cast votes against the procedural steps needed to bring House Resolution 392 to the floor.

These procedural steps prevented any amendments or any substitute resolutions to be considered by the Congress. We were not permitted to consider or debate either Senator LIEBERMAN's or Congressman DEFAZIO's language.

We were not given the opportunity to meet with our constituents and hear their thoughts and concerns on this divisive and complicated matter. Nor were there any hearings on this resolution. This is wrong and does not speak to debate that is central to our democratic process.

While we support House Resolution 392 in its final form, we have concerns that this resolution presents a one-sided view of a many-sided reality.

We cannot ignore the suffering of the Palestinian people and the loss of innocent civilians.

We cannot ignore the economic hardship the Palestinians have endured as they continue their attempts to create their own Democratic nation.

And we cannot ignore the physical damage done to Palestinian infrastructure in Jenin, in Ramallah and other towns in the West Bank.

Even with the Resolution's shortcomings, we believe it is critical to speak out against acts of terrorism that have claimed the lives of thousands of innocent Israeli civilians.

The United States is scarred by its own September 11th experience and we have a new and somber national consciousness of terrorism on our soil.

We continue to hold out hope that the Israelis and the Palestinians will be able to achieve the peace of the brave that has proven so elusive. We are confident that the United States will be a true partner for peace and help bring a 21st Century Marshall Plan of resources and hope to those who today carry a rage of desperation.

REMEMBERING HARRY NORMAN

HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Atlanta, Georgia suffered a great loss with the passing of Mr. Harry Norman.

Harry Norman was one of the great leaders in America's real estate industry. Mr. Norman built Harry Norman Realtors into one of the nation's great real estate brokerage companies. Through his tireless efforts in the Atlanta Board of Realtors, he ensured the highest standards of ethics and professionalism in the industry.

There was not a community cause or charity of importance in Atlanta that was not blessed to have the support of Harry Norman. In every sense of the word Harry Norman was a gentleman's gentleman.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, Harry Norman was an inspiration to me during my real estate career in Atlanta. Next to my father, I know of no one in the business that I admired more. I extend my sympathy to his wife, Amy, and the extended family at Harry Norman Realtors.

SAY NO TO CONSCRIPTION

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues who believe that the current war on terrorism justifies violating the liberty of millions of young men by reinstating a military draft will consider the eloquent argument against conscription in the attached speech by Daniel Webster. Then-representative Webster delivered his remarks on the floor of the

House in opposition to a proposal to institute a draft during the War of 1812. Webster's speech remains one of the best statements of the Constitutional and moral case against conscription.

Despite the threat posed to the very existence of the young republic by the invading British Empire, Congress ultimately rejected the proposal to institute a draft. If the new nation of America could defeat what was then the most powerful military empire in the world without a draft, there is no reason why we cannot address our current military needs with a voluntary military.

Webster was among the first of a long line of prominent Americans, including former President Ronald Reagan and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, to recognize that a draft violates the fundamental principles of liberty this country was founded upon.

In order to reaffirm support for individual liberty and an effective military, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 368, which expresses the sense of Congress against reinstating a military draft. I urge my colleagues to read Daniel Webster's explanation of why the draft is incompatible with liberty government and co-sponsor H. Con. Res. 368.

ON—CONSCRIPTION

(By Daniel Webster)

During America's first great war, waged against Great Britain, the Madison Administration tried to introduce a conscription bill into Congress. This bill called forth one of Daniel Webster's most eloquent efforts, in a powerful opposition to conscription. The speech was delivered in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1814; the following is a condensation.

This bill indeed is less undisguised in its object, and less direct in its means, than some of the measures proposed. It is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the free men of this country into the ranks of an army, for the general purposes of war, under color of a military service. It is a distinct system, introduced for new purposes, and not connected with any power, which the Constitution has conferred on Congress.

But, Sir, there is another consideration. The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this Government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution—"to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws."

The question is nothing less, than whether the most essential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered, and despotism embraced in its worst form. When the present generation of men shall be swept away, and that this Government ever existed shall be a matter of history only, I desire that it may then be known, that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished and unforwarned. Let it then be known, that there were those, who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, and held you back, as by the skirts of your garments, from the precipice, over which you are plunging, and drawing after you the Government of your Country.

Conscription is chosen as the most promising instrument, both of overcoming reluctance to the Service, and of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the Exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take one out of every twenty-five men, and any part or the whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. Persons thus

taken by force, and put into an army, may be compelled to serve there, during the war, or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defence or for invasion, according to the will and pleasure of Government. This power does not grow out of any invasion of the country, or even out of a state of war. It belongs to Government at all times, in peace as well as in war, and is to be exercised under all circumstances, according to its mere discretion. This, Sir, is the amount of the principle contended for by the Secretary of War (James Monroe).

Is this, Sir, consistent with the character of a free Government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, Sir, indeed it is not. The Constitution is libelled, foully libelled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure and their own blood a Magna Carta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war, in which the folly or the wickedness of Government may engage it? Under what concealment has this power lain hidden, which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous and baleful aspect, to trample down and destroy the dearest rights of personal liberty? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations and references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that that instrument was intended as the basis of a free Government, and that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free Government. It is an attempt to show, by proof and argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, and that we have a right to chains and bondage, firmly secured to us and our children, by the provisions of our Government.

The supporters of the measures before us act on the principle that it is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of National Liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free and limited Government, and to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises and conclusions, that Government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more arbitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood and murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort and degree of misery, than has been exercised by any civilized Government in modern times.

But it is said, that it might happen that any army would not be raised by voluntary enlistment, in which case the power to raise armies would be granted in vain, unless they might be raised by compulsion. If this reasoning could prove any thing, it would equally show, that whenever the legitimate powers of the Constitution should be so badly administered as to cease to answer the great ends intended by them, such new powers may be assumed or usurped, as any existing administration may deem expedient. This is a result of his own reasoning, to which the Secretary does not profess to go. But it is a true result. For if it is to be assumed, that all powers were granted, which might by possibility become necessary, and that Government itself is the judge of this possible necessity, then the powers of Government are precisely what it chooses they should be.

The tyranny of Arbitrary Government consists as much in its means as in its end; and

it would be a ridiculous and absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means and instruments which a free Government exercises, as well as the ends and objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, and to be conformed to its genuine spirit. A free Government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free Government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free Government, with an, uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous and abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations and sorceries, but by open force and violence.

Nor is it, Sir, for the defense of his own house and home, that he who is the subject of military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. You will put him upon a service equally foreign to his interests and abhorrent to his feelings. With his aid you are to push your purposes of conquest. The battles which he is to fight are the battles of invasion; battles which he detests perhaps and abhors, less from the danger and the death that gather over them, and the blood with which they drench the plain, than from the principles in which they have their origin. If, Sir, in this strife he fall—if, while ready to obey every rightful command of Government, he is forced from home against right, not to contend for the defense of his country, but to prosecute a miserable and detestable project of invasion, and in that strife he fall, 'tis murder. It may stalk above the cognizance of human law, but in the sight of Heaven it is murder; and though millions of years may roll away, while his ashes and yours lie mingled together in the earth, the day will yet come, when his spirit and the spirits of his children must be met at the bar of omnipotent justice. May God, in his compassion, shield me from any participation in the enormity of this guilt.

A military force cannot be raised, in this manner, but by the means of a military force. If administration has found that it can not form an army without conscription, it will find, if it venture on these experiments, that it can not enforce conscription without an army. The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, and in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; and having already thrown away our peace, we may thereby throw away our Government.

I express these sentiments here, Sir, because I shall express them to my constituents. Both they and myself live under a Constitution which teaches us, that "the doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind." With the same earnestness with which I now exhort you to forbear from these measures, I shall exhort them to exercise their unquestionable right of providing for the security of their own liberties.

NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

HON. MELISSA A. HART

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 2002

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, a recent USO/NFL tour to U.S. Army bases throughout Germany

served as a fresh reminder of the invaluable service the men and women of the U.S. armed forces are providing to our nation. NFL Commissioner Paul Tagliabue, Pittsburgh Steelers running back Jerome Bettis and Tennessee Titans running back Eddie George met with U.S. troops to convey America's gratitude for all of the their service.

May is National Military Appreciation Month. This is a time when we recognize and honor our nation's 1.4 million highly-trained, active duty soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. These brave Americans voluntarily put their lives on the line so you and I can live in peace and freedom.

We owe these heroes our active appreciation and support as they fight to preserve democracy.

We share the sentiments Commissioner Tagliabue conveyed to our armed forces: "So long as [our troops] are on the front lines, [we should] make sure [they] remain on the front page."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD several news accounts of this important and noteworthy event.

[From USA Today, Apr. 26, 2002]

BETTIS SALUTES USA'S REAL HEROES

(By Jon Saraceno)

While wondering how Cleveland Browns fans will ease the pain now that cult hero Ben Gay is gone. . . .

Jerome Bettis is better known as the Bus, but this week he was into tanks and heavy artillery.

The Pittsburgh Steelers' rumbling running back accompanied NFL Commissioner Paul Tagliabue on Thursday to Germany, where they visited with U.S. forces on two military bases. Bettis flew in a black-hawk helicopter and spent time inside an M1-A1 Abrams tank. Tennessee's Eddie George will join them Friday as part of the league's Armed Forces Weekend, which includes an NFL Europe game.

"I want our servicemen to understand we care," Bettis said from overseas. "We appreciate what they're doing to guarantee our freedoms."

The trio will visit Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, where U.S. troops hurt in Afghanistan recuperate.

"It puts my job into perspective," Bettis said. "I guess I'm considered a hero of sorts, but I'm only a football player. The guys on the front lines are the real heroes. This is not some commercial you see where guys are jumping out of helicopters doing pretty stuff. This is real." . . .

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Apr. 26, 2002]

AT LAST, THE BUS MEETS THE TANK

(By Ed Bouchette)

The Bus climbed inside a tank yesterday, and, along the way, Jerome Bettis confirmed that the patriots are mostly the good guys.

"It's incredible to see the troops and their daily living," Bettis said yesterday from Frankfurt, Germany, where he was part of a four-day USO/NFL tour of U.S. military bases.

Earlier, he rode in an Abrams M1A12, and, if only someone had made the connection earlier, Bettis might be known as The Tank today.

"I've been interested in that tank because my middle name is Abram," Bettis said. "Knowing about that tank and actually seeing it, getting into it and finding out that a tank can go 55 miles per hour with all the armor and everything . . ."