

some Russian content. Clearly Chairman BOEHLERT's interpretation is the same as Chairman HYDE's and my own: Russian content is allowed up until the January 1, 2012 date.

Finally, I would just echo the comments made by Chairman CALVERT during the floor debate: the ISS program requires long-term flexibility for NASA to safely and cost-effectively execute both for our taxpayers and to meet our international commitments. We are partners with Russia in the Space Station. Both NASA and its commercial providers need to be able to exchange goods and services at ISS with nonproliferation compliant Russian entities for the lifetime of the station, particularly as we seek to engage the U.S. private sector in ISS operations. Last week the House made clear that even in a time of great concern over the manifest threat from Iran, we want NASA and industry to have this ability at least through January 1, 2012.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 1, 2005, I was unable to vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3548, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located on Franklin Avenue in Pearl River, New York, as the "Heinz Ahlmeyer, Jr. Post Office Building (rollcall 557); and on H.R. 3989, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 37598 Goodhue Avenue in Dennison, Minnesota, as the "Albert Harold Quie Post Office (rollcall 558). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make votes today on the House floor because of an untimely and unexpected crisis requiring me to travel back home to be with my family in California. Unfortunately, I missed recorded votes and would like my intentions included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1606—Online Freedom of Speech Act.

I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 4061—Department of Veterans Affairs Information Technology Management Improvement Act of 2005. This important bill will help improve Veterans' health services by improving the technology resources of the Veterans' Affairs Department.

The VA has spent about \$1 billion per year for the last decade to improve its information technology systems. This new bill will provide some key oversight to ensure that this money is spent in the most efficient way possible, and to reorganize the VA's information technology to best serve the healthcare needs of the Nation's Veterans.

While there has been recent improvement in the VA's technology systems, there is a lot they can do to provide better healthcare to Veterans. I am proud to support this effort to better the lives of the men and women who have given so much for this country.

Had I been present, I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 1691—John H. Bradley Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic Designation Act.

#### SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTING CONFEREES ON THE FY2006 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

### HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 2, 2005*

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for instructing conferees on the FY2006 Defense Appropriations bill to include the amendment by our colleague in the Senate, JOHN MCCAIN. This provision would simply provide for uniform standards for the interrogation of persons under the detention of the Defense Department and a prohibition on cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment or punishment of persons under custody or control of the U.S. Government.

Senator MCCAIN knows the ravages of war and devastating effects of inhumane treatment at the hands of an enemy. He and other American soldiers during the Vietnam War were subjected to terrible treatment that no human being ought to endure. In recent floor remarks, Senator MCCAIN explained that during his time in captivity he and his fellow American soldiers drew strength from knowing that the institution to which they belonged, the U.S. military, and the country they served stood for the highest of principles and ideals. They believed that the U.S. would never treat prisoners of war the way that they were being treated.

No one would disagree that "torture, cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment" is unjust, but there is clear evidence that it is also ineffective. When put under extreme levels of pain or duress during interrogation, a detainee is more likely to say anything to stop the pain, regardless of its accuracy. Moreover, our own cruel treatment of others legitimizes the torture of American citizens. Look no further than the desecrated bodies of American citizens and soldiers killed in Iraq for tragic evidence of this reaction. Furthermore, torture and inhumane treatment aids in the recruitment of terrorists and fuels further terrorist activity.

As members of Congress, we have the Constitutional obligation, under Article I, Section 8, to speak out on this issue and others related to treatment of foreign detainees in war. We also have a moral obligation to oppose cruel and degrading treatment of human beings, and a patriotic obligation to stand up for the honor of this country.

In the wake of the scrutiny and embarrassment that our nation has endured following the treatment of detainees at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay, it is imperative that we proclaim to the rest of the world that this policy reflects the law of the land and the conscience of our country. Providing our soldiers with clear, written guidance on how to treat detainees not only protects their interests but under-

scores the freedoms and values we cherish as Americans and that we claim to be the reason we have gone to war in Iraq, Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

Today, as a Congress we must respect and honor our nation, those that risk their lives to serve it, and the high standards and ideals on which it is based. Supporting the McCain amendment is not an issue of political difference; it is an issue of national identity.

The McCain amendment is needed to close a loophole in current policy that does not explicitly describe standards for foreigners held under U.S. custody abroad. This amendment reiterates and clarifies our existing policy that prohibits the use of torture, cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment by U.S. soldiers and agents who are detaining and interrogating prisoners in the global war on terror, requiring that they use the techniques sanctioned in the Army Field Manual on Intelligence and Interrogation.

I urge my colleagues to resist any efforts to accept a watered down version of Senator MCCAIN's language that would grant exceptions for the CIA to conduct its own investigations of detainees in locations overseas that are independent of the Army Field Manual. Such a move, which apparently is being orchestrated by the Vice President's office, would only defeat the intent of the provision adopted in the Senate and cause further confusion among military and civilian service people charged with detainee interrogations.

The Army Field Manual has been used as the standard for interrogation guidance since it was established during the Reagan Administration. The Manual does not cast any technique into stone, but changes with time and includes techniques and descriptions that are classified so as not to be uncovered by enemies.

In a sign of broad bipartisan support, the Senate overwhelmingly approved the McCain amendment in a 90 to 9 vote. In addition, 28 retired military leaders, including General Shalikashvili, General Hoar, and General Colin Powell, have supported legislating the use of the Army Field Manual through the McCain amendment.

In today's global war on terror, men and women in the armed forces are charged with the critical task of detaining and interrogating prisoners of war and enemy combatants without clear instructions on what is and what is not permissible. These ambiguities contributed to the absence of standards that resulted in the degrading and inhumane treatment that we, and the rest of the world, witnessed at Abu Ghraib and what apparently occurred at Guantanamo at the hands of young and ill-advised soldiers.

The abuses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo stained the honor of our country and our military. I know that most of our constituents want to amend these wrongdoings. In order to do this, and to help protect the treatment of American soldiers who may be held as prisoners of war, we must give our troops clear instructions on acceptable treatment during detainment and interrogation, without equivocation.

Let us not shrink from the responsibility that stands before us; let us rise as a united body

to defend our principles, uphold our proud traditions and articulate to the world what America stands for. I urge my colleagues to express their support to Chairman YOUNG to retain the McCain amendment, without modification, in the conference agreement to the FY2006 Defense Appropriations bill.

TRIBUTE TO ST. STEPHEN'S ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF HARTFORD-NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT AND ARAM "OTTO" BAYRAMIAN

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 3, 2005*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished congregation, St. Stephen's Armenian Apostolic Church of Hartford-New Britain, Connecticut, which is celebrating its eightieth anniversary on November 6, 2005. The Church is also honoring in memoriam Aram "Otto" Bayramian, a beloved parishioner and extraordinary leader.

St. Stephen's is the oldest Armenian church in Connecticut and one of the oldest in our Nation. Armenians began immigrating to the United States in large numbers in the late 19th century when troubles in their historic land, now part of Eastern Turkey, began mounting. They brought their Christian faith with them and began conducting religious services in rented churches. Fundraising for St. Stephen's began in 1912, but it was interrupted several times by world events. The groundbreaking took place in 1925, the culmination of many years of arduous work.

St. Stephen's is honoring extraordinary parishioners during its 80th birthday celebration and the event's special honoree is Aram "Otto" Bayramian, who died in 1996. He served St. Stephen's with distinction for more than 20 years.

Otto's father, Umrah Bayramian was one of the founders of St. Stephen's. Otto, a lifelong resident of New Britain, was one of the most respected business and community leaders in the region. He was a decorated veteran of World War II, flying eight subpatrol and 40 missions successfully, retiring as a Captain in the Air Force.

Upon returning home, Otto joined his father in the family business, founding the Epicure Market in Farmington, Connecticut. It became known as the "gold standard" in the food business throughout Connecticut.

Otto graced the stage of the theatre, including the New Britain Repertory, the Mark Twain Masquers, the Producing Guild, and the Waterbury Civic Theatre.

He was an organizer and Charter member of the Joel Eshoo Post 1 Assyrian American War Veterans which was established in 1946.

His great love was St. Stephen's Church and he did everything possible to strengthen its future.

It is highly appropriate that as St. Stephen's celebrates its founding 80 years ago, that the life of Otto Bayramian and his countless contributions to the betterment of St. Stephen's is celebrated as well.

It is also fitting that the Church's three archdeacons, Aram-Sumpad Khachoyan, Sebouh Asadourian and Edward Varjabedian

are being honored for their 25 years of dedicated service on the altar. The Annual Youth Award recipient is choir member Maral Firkatian, and parishioners Dirouhi Avakian, Mary Boornazian and Susan Shabazian will each be presented with certificates of appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring St. Stephen's Armenian Apostolic Church of Hartford-New Britain on the occasion of its 80th anniversary, honoring the life and contributions of the beloved Otto Bayramian, and in extending thanks to those being honored at the anniversary celebration.

Our Nation has been enriched by the lives and the faith of generations past, as well as parishioners of St. Stephen's today. We are unmistakably a better community and a more decent Nation because of the Church, because of Otto Bayramian and because of the contributions the Parish continues to make.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS ACT

**HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, November 3, 2005*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with 17 other bipartisan, original cosponsors, am introducing the American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act (AMCA). This bill will help our manufacturing companies and their workers in a time of need. Right now, America's manufacturers are facing unprecedented international competition so it's critical that we pursue policies that make American manufacturing industries the strongest in the world.

In order to be competitive on the global market, our manufacturing base has to have access to timely supplies of competitively priced raw materials. Our manufacturers have to sell their goods at globally competitive prices, so they need to get their inputs at globally competitive prices too.

The problem is excessively high raw material prices are hurting our manufacturers. For example, U.S. steel prices are now the highest in the world. As just one example, the price for hot-rolled coil is over \$100/ton higher than anywhere else in the world. When the costs of inputs for our manufacturing base are higher than the rest of the world, it undermines their ability to compete.

Government policies are part of the problem. For example, there are now over 150 different import restrictions covering over 20 steel products from over 30 nations. Some of these have been in effect since the 1980's, and cover steel products that are more expensive here than anywhere in the world. These restrictions can cause large distortions in the U.S. market for raw materials, and can inflict harm on the manufacturers and workers who need those materials to make their products. They hobble our manufacturers in tight markets, and choke off our larger manufacturing base.

However, the astonishing reality is this harm to our manufacturing base is being ignored when decisions about import restrictions are made. The International Trade Commission (ITC) and Department of Commerce (DOC) don't even allow the industrial users any

meaningful participation in the process. Think about this. American companies are directly impacted by these decisions, but they are not even considered in the process. In fact, foreign producers have more rights in this process than our own American industrial users. This is especially disturbing since steel consuming jobs outnumber steel producing jobs by over 60 to 1. This is extremely unfair and unwise.

I testified at the ITC twice earlier this year during hearings on 5-year sunset reviews for duties on hot-rolled steel and stainless steel sheet and strip. Duties on these types of steel had already been in place for 5 years, and now the ITC was required to make a decision about whether they should continue. Companies who need these types of steel testified at these hearings too and provided information about the trouble they have getting the quantity and quality of the steel they need at competitive prices. When a manufacturing company can't get the raw materials it needs, that causes damage to the company particularly when they have to deliver their products just-in-time. Because of these duties, the industrial users are suffering damage.

I also introduced House Resolution 84, which urges the ITC to consider the effects of duties on industrial users during these sunset reviews. This resolution has 48 bipartisan cosponsors. All we were asking was that the ITC consider the effects of these duties on the consuming companies.

When the report explaining the ITC's decision to keep the duties in place came out, I was shocked that there was no evidence at all that the ITC considered the effects of the duties on the industrial users. Nothing. These are American companies with American workers, but there was no evidence the ITC listened at all.

Furthermore, during one of the hearings a representative for the steel industry stated "the Commission is precluded from considering the impact of imports of the subject merchandise on domestic steel consumers in determining whether the antidumping order should be revoked." This person was saying in effect that the ITC is not even allowed to consider the effects of their decisions on our manufacturing base. This is just wrong and it must be addressed to prevent unnecessary damage to our manufacturing base.

Antidumping and countervailing duty laws are necessary and they're in the interest of the United States, when applied in an objective and fair manner, to prevent unfair pricing and subsidized competition. But it's not fair and it's not acceptable when American companies being hurt by duties on imports can't even be considered in the process.

Mr. Speaker, basic fairness and common sense require us to change the law. My bill will address this problem by giving industrial users legal standing to participate in the antidumping and countervailing duty processes. It will require the ITC and the DOC to consider the information provided by the businesses that use these products. This is only fair. Furthermore, the process for imposing duties will remain the same, with the addition of a simple test that looks at the downstream harm. Under this bill, when making decisions on import restrictions, an economic impact test would be conducted by the ITC to determine the net effect on the American manufacturers affected by those decisions. In order for a restriction to