offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4103, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. 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 H.R. 4103, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 97) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 97

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I support extending sanctions on Burma for an additional year within the framework enacted into law last year under the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I generally do not believe in unilateral trade sanctions. They are often emotional responses to atrocious acts and have unintended consequences, oftentimes harming the people that we, in fact, were seeking to assist. For example, the State Department notes that the Burma import restrictions have caused 50,000 to 60,000 workers in Burma to lose their jobs. These people were not narrowly helped by the sanctions.

But, at the same time, the actions of the ruling junta in Burma continue to be unacceptable. I believe sanctions are appropriate if the circumstances are, 1, limited; 2, targeted; 3, reexamined yearly, and if we continuously analyze them to make sure they are not causing more harm than good. We must also examine the question of harm and good in short term and in long term.

The law passed last year requires the administration to issue a report on whether sanctions have been effective in improving conditions in Burma and furthering U.S. objectives. The State Department, in its first report, states that the sanctions represent ''a clear and powerful expression of American opposition to the developments in Burma over the past year.'' The Department observes that the overall human rights record in Burma has worsened over the past year. While the junta has made some apparently superficial efforts toward democracy with its ''road map,'' it does not appear that Burma is on the road to true, fundamental democratic reform.

The State Department's report, however, also notes that no other country has implemented the same set of economic sanctions as the United States; and the U.S. import ban would be, according to the report, ''far more effective'' if other countries would do the same.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I support the extension of the sanctions for 1 year, I strongly encourage this administration to pursue a more aggressive multilateral sanctions approach in Burma. That government must be truly isolated. It is vital that the administration work with other countries to reach multilateral sanctions. This effort is key if we are to continue sanctions against Burma.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I also believe that a more multilateral approach is in order. I also think as we discuss Burma, we should look at the experience that international bodies are having, including the ILO and the inability of the ILO, as it is presently structured, to proceed with any real teeth. I think that emphasizes why the United States, as we put forth and put together trade agreements, should incorporate into these trade agreements provisions that relate to the work, for example, of the ILO and core labor standards.

I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the distinguished ranking member, and I ask unanimous consent that he control the balance of the time on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 97, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to express my appreciation to my friend and fellow Californian, (Chairman BILL THOMAS), for his assistance in moving this legislation to the floor so expeditiously, and to my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), for their leadership on Burma and for granting me the privilege of managing this bill today for the Democratic side.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago, the Burmese regime launched a brutal crackdown on Burmese democratic leader Aung San Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy. Burma's authoritarian ruler simply could not accept the fact that Aung San Suu Kyi remained enormously popular a dozen years after the government nullified the fair and free elections that she won.

Just 10 months ago, Mr. Speaker, President Bush signed into law my bill imposing comprehensive sanctions on Burma. My legislation was approved by this House overwhelmingly, 418 ayes to 2 noes.

Sadly, the case for a tough approach toward Burma, including import sanctions, is even stronger today than a year ago. Countless National League for Democracy leaders remain behind bars. Aung San Suu Kyi, a woman of extraordinary courage, is locked inside her house and there is little prospect that the Burmese junta will engage in meaningful dialogue with the National League for Democracy and other democratic leaders.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Burmese regime is currently holding a ''national convention'' to write a new constitution for Burma. The meeting itself is a complete and utter sham. The Burmese leadership refused to let Aung San Suu Kyi participate, apparently afraid that her eloquent words would convince the delegates to move towards democracy and away from dictatorship.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is moving forward with this bipartisan initiative to renew Burma import sanctions. Burma's ruling elite, who have a questionable direct financial tie to most enterprises in Burma, must understand that they will be unable to enrich themselves off the American consumer.

To those who argue that the sanctions have not worked, I have two responses. First, when Congress imposed import sanctions on Burma, we fully understood that such measures might take years, if not decades, to bring change to Burma, certainly not 10 months. If 10 months were the standard duration for American import sanctions, South Africans would still be governed by the apartheid regime, and Libya would have developed and deployed nuclear weapons instead of surrendering them to the United States.

Second, the United States must make it a top priority to convince our key allies in Europe and in Asia to adopt import sanctions on the Burmese regime. Unfortunately, the executive branch has made little or no effort to accomplish this important task. If sanctions fail to quickly bring change

to Burma, it is not because they represent the wrong approach; it is because high-level administration officials have not picked up the phone to urge our European Union counterparts to adopt targeted import sanctions on Burma.

While we would all like to see a negotiated solution to Burma's political crisis, we cannot be naive enough to believe that Burma's leaders have changed their stripes. They have no intention of allowing Aung San Suu Kyi, a woman they tried to kill just a few months ago, to participate meaningfully in free and fair elections, let alone to transfer power to her political party.

If I am proven wrong, Mr. Speaker, and Burma's ruling thugs win the Noble Peace Prize in 2005 for working out an agreement with the opposition, we will have plenty of time to express our congratulations and to lift sanctions at that point. Until then, we must ratchet up pressure on the Burmese thugs who are running that country and assure that our allies do so as well.

Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to a day when we will welcome Aung San Suu Kyi to Washington as the leader of a free and democratic Burma. She will follow in the footsteps of Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic and of all of the other leaders who fought for freedom in Central and Eastern Europe. But we will achieve that goal only by maintaining strong pressure on Burma's ruling dictatorial clique and convincing our allies to do so as well.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for his extraordinary leadership on this issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my colleague for the kind words. I too want to make sure that the record reflects that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) once again shows that his concern is in the forefront for peoples all over the world and simply for their ability, their right to express themselves.

I strongly urge passage of H.J. Res. 97.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of H.J. Res. 97, a measure to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. At the outset, let me express my appreciation to the leadership of the distinguished Chairmen and Ranking Members of both the International Relations and Ways and Means Committees for moving this resolution on a timely basis.

On March 25, the Subcommittees on Asia held its third hearing in 2 years on developments in Burma. Unfortunately, it was made clear during the course of the hearing that Burma made little progress toward democratic reform in the past year, and in fact the country has yet to return to even the admittedly low, but hopeful status it had achieved prior to the May 30 attack on democracy activist Aung San Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy (NLD).

Indeed, as many suspected would be the case, Burmese Prime Minister Khin Nyunt's announcement of a seven-point "road map" for political reconciliation in the fall of 2003 has been revealed to be a sham. Burma's military junta, known as the State Peace and Development Council, has proceeded with a so-called National Convention despite the nonparticipation of the National League for Democracy (NLD), and without freeing the NLD's leader Aung San Suu Kyi. In so doing the Burmese military leadership has exposed for all to see its determination to push for a new constitution that would legitimize its dominance and control over the country's politics and governance, even under a future "civilian" administration.

As my colleagues understand, Burma presents one of the most complicated and vexing foreign policy challenges in Asia for the United States and the world community. Numerous political prisoners remain in detention, including one of the most remarkable and courageous leaders of our time, Aung San Suu Kyi. The issue is how can the U.S. best secure their release and help start a meaningful political dialogue in Burma, while also endeavoring to advance a panoply of other priorities, including stable democratic governance, human rights, counternarcotics, regional stability, combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic, as well as economic and human development more broadly.

In this context, it is self-evident that the U.S. is confronted by multiple dilemmas in pursuing our objectives in Burma. For illustrative purposes, I would note just a few: the strongly nationalistic, self-centered outlook of the ruling regime; the reliance by the military elite on an illicit, underground economy for power and survival; the inability of major industrial countries to agree on comprehensive sanctions as the basis for a common strategy; competition for geopolitical influence in Burma between China and India; and the ongoing humanitarian crisis for the people of Burma—including for the hundreds of thousands of internally displaced ethnic minority groups along the country's borders—that calls out for a more robust and humane international response.

Nevertheless, in response to repeated efforts by the ruling military to thwart the democratic aspirations of the Burmese people as well as to ongoing serious human rights violations, the U.S. has been compelled to utilize sanctions and coercive diplomacy as the centerpiece of our policy. Given the deeply disappointing lack of progress in Burma over the past year, there is no credible option at this time but to renew current sanctions.

Here it is critically important for Congress and the Administration to reaffirm our unflinching support for those who want freedom in Burma. We honor the leadership of Aung San Suu Kyi and her colleagues in the pro-democracy movement, including representatives of Burma's numerous ethnic minorities. The American people stand with the people of Burma in a common determination to see decent democratic governance and national reconciliation in Burma.

I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, too often in this world, evil is not called evil. In our rush not to offend others or to avoid making judgments, speech is couched in euphemisms or soft tones. Evil is ignored or glossed over.

Last year, the United States saw evil in Burma. And last year, the United States had the courage and conviction to call evil by its name. Last year, the United States Congress and President Bush imposed harsh sanctions on the military dictatorship controlling Burma.

Some may say that the term evil is too harsh or that it is offensive, but in my estimation, there is no other word for what is happening right now in Burma. Men are routinely pressed into forced labor for the military. Women are raped and beaten. Countless children have been orphaned. Villages suspected of resistance are burned. Food is confiscated or destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of people are displaced in Burma and surrounding countries. And anyone can be thrown into prison at anytime for the slightest infraction or for no reason at all.

Last week, we heard a lot about freedom. We heard that millions of people are now living in freedom because the Cold War came to an end because of the unrelenting pressure Ronald Reagan brought to bear against the Soviet Union. It is easy to think that because the Cold War is over, freedom has completely triumphed. Sadly, that is not the case. Millions of people, including the people of Burma, still live under the lash of dictatorship.

In 2003, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act passed this House by a vote of 418–2. Four hundred eighteen Members recognized the junta's evil deeds and voted to isolate Burma from the outside world. This Congress and this Administration realize that putting pressure on the dictatorship will hasten its demise almost as certainly as did American pressure on the Soviet Union.

The United States was once nobly described as a shining city on a hill. Indeed, millions of people around the world look to the United States as a beacon of liberty. We must shine our light of freedom wherever freedom and justice are denied and wherever evil is present.

Today, we have the opportunity to send a message to the people of Burma and to the rest of the world. By extending the sanctions the United States imposed on Burma last year, we declare there is still evil in Burma, and it is unacceptable.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 97.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 97.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. 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 House Joint Resolution 97.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

STROKE TREATMENT AND ONGOING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3658) to amend the Public Health Service Act to strengthen education, prevention, and treatment programs relating to stroke, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3658

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Stroke Treatment and Ongoing Prevention Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT REGARDING STROKE PROGRAMS.

(a) STROKE EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS.—Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART R—STROKE EDUCATION, INFORMATION, AND DATA COLLECTION PROGRAMS

''SEC. 399AA. STROKE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an education and information campaign to promote stroke prevention and increase the number of stroke patients who seek immediate treatment.

''(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In implementing the education and information campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary may—

''(1) make public service announcements about the warning signs of stroke and the importance of treating stroke as a medical emergency;

''(2) provide education regarding ways to prevent stroke and the effectiveness of stroke treatment; and

''(3) carry out other activities that the Secretary determines will promote prevention practices among the general public and increase the number of stroke patients who seek immediate care.

''(c) MEASUREMENTS.—In implementing the education and information campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

''(1) measure public awareness before the start of the campaign to provide baseline data that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the public awareness efforts;

''(2) establish quantitative benchmarks to measure the impact of the campaign over time; and

''(3) measure the impact of the campaign not less than once every 2 years or, if determined appropriate by the Secretary, at shorter intervals.

''(d) NO DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall avoid duplicating existing stroke education efforts by other Federal Government agencies.

''(e) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary may consult with organizations and individuals with expertise in stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

''SEC. 399BB. PAUL COVERDELL NATIONAL ACUTE STROKE REGISTRY AND CLEARINGHOUSE.

''The Secretary, acting through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall maintain the Paul Coverdell National Acute Stroke Registry and Clearinghouse by—

''(1) continuing to develop and collect specific data points and appropriate benchmarks for analyzing care of acute stroke patients;

''(2) collecting, compiling, and disseminating information on the achievements of, and problems experienced by, State and local agencies and private entities in developing and implementing emergency medical systems and hospital-based quality of care interventions; and

''(3) carrying out any other activities the Secretary determines to be useful to maintain the Paul Coverdell National Acute Stroke Registry and Clearinghouse to reflect the latest advances in all forms of stroke care.

''SEC. 399CC. STROKE DEFINITION.

''For purposes of this part, the term 'stroke' means a 'brain attack' in which blood flow to the brain is interrupted or in which a blood vessel or aneurysm in the brain breaks or ruptures.

''SEC. 399DD. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.''.

(b) EMERGENCY MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—Section 1251 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–51) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1251. MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN ADVANCED STROKE AND TRAUMATIC INJURY TREATMENT AND PREVENTION.

''(a) RESIDENCY AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL TRAINING.—The Secretary may make grants to public and nonprofit entities for the purpose of planning, developing, and enhancing approved residency training programs and other professional training for appropriate health professions in emergency medicine, including emergency medical services professionals, to improve stroke and traumatic injury prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

''(b) CONTINUING EDUCATION ON STROKE AND TRAUMATIC INJURY.—

''(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, may make grants to qualified entities for the development and implementation of education programs for appropriate health care professionals in the use of newly developed diagnostic approaches, technologies, and therapies for health professionals involved in the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of stroke or traumatic injury.

''(2) DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give preference to qualified entities that will train health care professionals that serve areas with a significant incidence of stroke or traumatic injuries.

''(3) APPLICATION.—A qualified entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a plan for the rigorous evaluation of activities carried out with amounts received under the grant.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

''(A) The term 'qualified entity' means a consortium of public and private entities, such as universities, academic medical centers, hospitals, and emergency medical systems that are coordinating education activities among providers serving in a variety of medical settings.

''(B) The term 'stroke' means a 'brain attack' in which blood flow to the brain is interrupted or in which a blood vessel or aneurysm in the brain breaks or ruptures.

''(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the allocation of grants under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the results of activities carried out with amounts received under this section.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009. The Secretary shall equitably allocate the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section between efforts to address stroke and efforts to address traumatic injury.''.

SEC. 3. PILOT PROJECT ON TELEHEALTH STROKE TREATMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 330L the following:

''SEC. 330M. TELEHEALTH STROKE TREATMENT GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS.—The Secretary may make grants to States, and to consortia of public and private entities located in any State that is not a grantee under this section, to conduct a 5-year pilot project over the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 to improve stroke patient outcomes by coordinating health care delivery through telehealth networks.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall administer this section through the Director of the Office for the Advancement of Telehealth.

''(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, for the purpose of better coordinating program activities, the Secretary shall consult with—

''(1) officials responsible for other Federal programs involving stroke research and care, including such programs established by the Stroke Treatment and Ongoing Prevention Act; and

''(2) organizations and individuals with expertise in stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation.

''(d) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State or a consortium under this section unless the State or consortium agrees to use the grant for the purpose of—

''(A) identifying entities with expertise in the delivery of high-quality stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation;

''(B) working with those entities to establish or improve telehealth networks to provide stroke treatment assistance and resources to health care professionals, hospitals, and other individuals and entities that serve stroke patients;

''(C) informing emergency medical systems of the location of entities identified under subparagraph (A) to facilitate the appropriate transport of individuals with stroke symptoms;

''(D) establishing networks to coordinate collaborative activities for stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation;

''(E) improving access to high-quality stroke care, especially for populations with a shortage of stroke care specialists and populations with a high incidence of stroke; and

''(F) conducting ongoing performance and quality evaluations to identify collaborative activities that improve clinical outcomes for stroke patients.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSORTIUM.—The Secretary may not make a grant to a State under this section unless the State agrees to establish a consortium of public and private entities, including universities and academic medical centers, to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1).

''(3) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not make a grant under this section to a State that has an existing telehealth network that is or may be used for improving stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation, or to a