

POWERS AND DUTIES

(c)(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(2) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so shall notify the Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Committee of the Subcommittee's action.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee during any of its meetings and hearings, but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the meeting or hearing.

(4) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chairman of the Committee deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—TRANSCRIPTS AND RECORDS

(a)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular and additional meeting and hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees. Any such transcript shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and each of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of House rule XI and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 or clause 4 of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER
TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

There was no objection.

MARINE CORPS AND NAVY TEAM

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 34, which would expand the name of the Department of the Navy to be Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, we have four services that stand alone that represent the greatness of our men and women in uniform, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marine Corps. Mr. Speaker, all these services have great heritage and great history. The Marine Corps and the Navy are a team. Both are separate under the Department of Navy. The Marine Corps is not part of the Navy. The Navy is not part of the Marine Corps. It is under the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that the four services should be appreciated and recognized separately. I think it is important that the Marine Corps and the Navy, which are a team and remain a team, that the coach of the team, in this case which is the Secretary of the Navy, carry the name Secretary of Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third year that this bill has been introduced. Each year the House in a bipartisan way sends this bill over to the Senate, but so far the other body has not been willing to accept the House position. Already we have close to 70 Members, both Republican and Democrat, who have joined me again in H.R. 34 to expand the name of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, let me share with you some of the comments from those who have served, the first one being Wade Sanders, who in 1993 to 1998 served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs. I want to read from his letter:

"As a combat veteran and former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that, a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

Let me also read a letter from the former commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Charles Krulak: "I heartily endorse this bill as an initiative that appropriately honors all of the superb men and women of the Naval Service, sailors and Marines."

Mr. Speaker, very quickly, from the Fleet Reserve Association, which is made up of Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guardsmen: "And, finally, the Corps as the second most senior armed service should receive the honor it truly deserves, equitable distinction among the military departments in the U.S. defense structure. Recognizing the Corps as an equal partner in a new Department of the Navy and Marine Corps gives the Marines the distinction and esteem they truly deserve."

Mr. Speaker, let me close by pointing out why I believe this is so important. To my left is a blow-up of the citation of the Silver Star presented to the fam-

ily of a Marine who was killed at Nasiriyah. His name was Michael Bitz.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see at the top, it was in the official heading, the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C. and there is a Navy flag. Mr. Speaker, the Navy and the Marine Corps are a team, and this headline should be as a team.

Let me show you, Mr. Speaker, when I take down the order and we had the graphic department to work with us on this. Let me show you just how dynamic this team is, this Marine who gave his life for his country, and his family received the Silver Star, tell me 15 years down the road, Mr. Speaker, when his children look up at their daddy and their daddy gave his life for this country and he was a Marine. If this was hanging on the wall, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps with the Navy flag and the Marine flag, the team, Mr. Speaker, would that child not be proud of his daddy to know that his father died for this country and he was recognized as a Marine in the heading, Secretary of Navy and Marine Corps?

Mr. Speaker, I intend to come down on the floor at least once a week for the next few weeks and try to get more and more of my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to co-sponsor this legislation with me. It is time that the Marine Corps be treated equally and fairly. There are four services, which the Congress has said twice over the last 30 years. We have four services: Marine Corps, Army, Navy, and Air Force. It is time that the Department of the Navy carry the name Navy and Marine Corps.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform and to bless their families. I ask God to please bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan or Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God three times, please, God, please, God, please, God, continue to bless America.

STOP DENIAL OF ARMENIAN
GENOCIDE BY TURKEY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans, the U.S. Ambassador to Armenia, recently when meeting with Armenian Americans during visits in several U.S. cities referenced the Armenian genocide. In a series of public statements, Ambassador Evans who has studied Russian history at Yale and Columbia and Ottoman history at the Kennan Institute stated, "I will today call it the Armenian Genocide."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans' statements did not contradict U.S. policy, but rather articulated the same message that the Bush administration has sent to the public, the only difference in this case is that Ambassador

Evans simply assigned the word to the definition that was already provided by President Bush as well as members of his administration.

Breaking with a pattern on the part of the State Department of using alternative and evasive terminology for the Armenian genocide, Ambassador Evans pointed out that "no American official has ever denied it."

Now, Ambassador Evans was merely recounting the historical record which has been attested to by over 120 Holocaust and genocide scholars from around the world. In so doing, he was merely giving a name, the accurate description of genocide, to this very administration's statements on the issue.

President Bush on April 24 of each of the last four years when commemorating the Armenian genocide used the textbook definition of genocide with words and phrases such as "annihilation" and "forced exile and murder." Before him, President Reagan used the word "genocide" in 1981 when describing the annihilation of over 1.5 million Armenians.

□ 2000

In the day of the genocide, our U.S. ambassador, then Henry Morgenthau, had the courage to speak out against the atrocities which he stated were a planned and systematic effort to annihilate an entire race.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my name and my voice to all those who, like Ambassador Evans, know the truth and speak it plainly when discussing the Armenian genocide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). 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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. STRICKLAND) time.

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

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in strong opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement, otherwise known as CAFTA, or DR-CAFTA.

CAFTA is largely based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, also referred to as NAFTA.

By signing CAFTA, the Bush administration has ignored the mistakes that we know here in the U.S. because of NAFTA, and in fact, CAFTA is nothing more than what I would say NAFTA-plus.

Ten years ago, NAFTA proponents promised increased wages and economic development in the U.S., Mexico, Canada and promised decreased migration. The agreement has failed on all accounts.

Over 750,000 jobs in the United States have been lost due to NAFTA, and immigration to the U.S. has increased. Through NAFTA, the administration granted a gift to corporate interests who prioritize access to cheap labor first and working families last.

Inadequate free trade agreements not only hurt the U.S. but they also hurt our neighbors.

I recently visited Mexico and saw firsthand for myself the devastating consequences of NAFTA. In the Maquiladora zone in Ciudad Juarez and other border cities, wages are low, union organizing is suppressed and industrial pollution jeopardizes the health and safety of workers and residents.

Now, those same U.S. jobs that were exported to Mexico are being sent to China, leaving the economic situation in many areas of Mexico worse off than before NAFTA.

As in Mexico with NAFTA, CAFTA would cause the loss of family farms and would lure more workers, most of them women, from the rural areas, poor women. CAFTA may create jobs for women, but the working conditions are unimaginable to the American public.

The bulk of these jobs are found in the export processing zones known as the Maquiladoras. Women that work in the Maquiladoras have reported forced pregnancy testing, sexual harassment and physical abuse.

CAFTA does not require compliance with international labor rights and does not protect women from being discriminated against.

In 2001, I traveled to El Salvador and witnessed first hand hundreds of young girls lined up at 5 o'clock in the morning to enter into the sweatshops. It provides for many of the textiles that are now being imported here, going on shifts anywhere from 12 to 14 hours a day.

I am not opposed to trade. So I want to be clear on that. I support free and fair trade. Let me be clear. Fair trade.

We need to level the playing field and enact trade agreements that include meaningful labor and environmental standards that will prevent the exporting of our U.S. jobs and the exploitation of workers abroad.

Our trade policies should lift people out of poverty, not keep them in poverty.

Opposition to CAFTA is strong in Central America, too. In fact, I was contacted, as well as other Members of Congress, by elected officials rep-

resenting El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras. They sent many letters to other Members of Congress asking us and urging us to defeat CAFTA.

CAFTA will mean more job loss and wage decline for American workers, as well as Central American workers. Lack of enforceable labor standards leads to a downward push on U.S. workers' wages, particularly Latino workers.

U.S. Latino workers have been disproportionately hurt by NAFTA because they tend to be concentrated in industries such as textiles and other manufacturing sectors.

While Latinos now represent well over 12 percent of the U.S. workforce, they account for 26 percent of the textile and apparel industry workers, and in California, the State that I represent, Latinos make up an estimated 80 percent of the hardest hit California garment industry. Almost 50 percent of U.S. workers applying for trade adjustment assistance, that this Congress approved, happen to be Latino.

In fact, 51 percent of American voters oppose NAFTA and claim it would hurt workers, wages and hurt our jobs. They also believe that CAFTA would do the same thing. So I know that in my community there is a strong, strong resistance to move forward on any semblance of what NAFTA and now CAFTA-plus would do.

In fact, the league of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC, one of the oldest and largest Latino civil rights organizations in the country, has come out in opposition to CAFTA. LULAC claims that CAFTA falls short of being acceptable and fears it will unleash enormous losses for all workers in the United States, including Central America.

As the only Member of Congress of Central American descent, I understand the importance of supporting efforts to promote sustainable development and preservation of agricultural sectors in regions. However, U.S. policy towards Latin America should go well beyond free trade policies that do little to raise wages and working conditions of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also submit for the RECORD information on surveys and a letter from LULAC, as well as to make a notation that a book on CAFTA and free trade, *What Every American Should Know*, has just been released, and I would urge the public to look it up. It is by the author, Greg Spotts.

NEW POLL SENDS A CLEAR MESSAGE TO
WASHINGTON: AMERICANS OPPOSE CAFTA

A RESOUNDING NO! ON CAFTA

American voters oppose CAFTA by a solid margin:

A majority of American voters oppose CAFTA! 51% of American voters said they oppose this trade agreement while just 32% support it. After presenting both pros and cons about CAFTA, opposition increased to 54% and support fell to 30%.

Voters oppose CAFTA regardless of their party. Democrats oppose CAFTA by a 53 to 31 percent margin, Independents oppose it by