

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

## PRESIDENT'S BUDGET DOES LITTLE TO CLOSE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Bush recently announced his opposition to the affirmative action plan used by the University of Michigan in admissions. It is troubling that the academic achievements of white students and African American students at Michigan are markedly different, but it is troubling for a reason that President Bush apparently did not consider. It is troubling that almost a half century after the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* there remain such disparities in the academic achievements of white students and African American students.

Mr. Speaker, the public schools are where we deliver on the promise of equality of opportunity. The public schools must deliver on that promise to white children; to black children; to children whose parents do not speak English in their homes; to the children of parents who care passionately about their children, who read to them every night, who join the PTA and volunteer at their children's schools; to the children of parents who are themselves children and are as little prepared to be parents as their parents were before them.

Just days after President Bush announced his opposition to the University of Michigan's affirmative action plan, he announced his proposed budget. We see from that budget what he would do to close the achievement gap so that universities can achieve a diversity in population without affirmative action plans like Michigan's. Mr. Speaker, he would do very little.

The very programs that are most effective in closing the achievement gap and delivering on the promise of equality of opportunity for every child are hardest hit. The proposed budget cuts No Child Left Behind by \$9 billion. The act gives a nod to the promise of equality of opportunity, but the budget breaks that promise.

The budget cuts after-school programs by more than 40 percent, teacher training by almost \$200 million. It cuts

individualized instruction in math and reading for disadvantaged children. President Bush's budget guts Head Start, our effort to reach disadvantaged children who now arrive for kindergarten so far behind they can never catch up.

□ 1330

I sat in a first grade class in my State and had one child after another read out loud to me. Some children read effortlessly in a sing-song voice because the material lacked such challenge. Other children read laboriously, sounding out every word, getting every third or fourth word wrong.

When those children apply for college 13 years later, I fear there will be the same differences in their academic achievement, and we will still need affirmative action plans like Michigan to achieve diverse populations in our colleges.

Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable to me that our children's chances in life depend so greatly on the circumstances into which they were born. President Bush's budget shows that he is not bothered by that.

## SECURING AMERICAN BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought forward to the House a picture and a little story about an individual who died on the border last August. His name was Chris Eggle. Mr. Eggle was an employee of the United States Government acting in the capacity of a park ranger down in the Oregon Pipes National Park in Arizona. He was killed in the line of duty by people who had come across the board after being involved in some sort of drug altercation where three others were killed in Mexico.

The point of my presentation yesterday was to explain to the Members of this body that we have, in fact, a war zone on our southern border, and to a certain extent, on the northern border.

Today, unfortunately, I have the sad occasion to bring to Members' attention another young man named Jorge Salomon Martinez. Mr. Martinez was brutally murdered in Mexico just a short time ago. He was a Border Patrol agent working for the United States. Mr. Francisco Javier Rosas Molina, who is 18 years old, is in custody, and the Mexican authorities continue to search for others that they say have probably fled across the border into the United States.

Mr. Martinez had apparently met Mr. Rosas Molina earlier in the week near the border town of Naco. They began to party together and converse, and Salomon had originally identified himself to the group as a member of the Border Patrol, as employed by the Border Patrol. Then they met some other

people and Rosas Molina evidently told the other members of the group that Mr. Martinez was indeed a Border Patrol agent, and what happened next is described as the following.

He said that is when Rosas Molina identified him to the others as a Border Patrol agent, and that appears to be the reason that they killed him. Martinez was beaten and his head bashed in with rocks. His Ford pickup was stolen along with other belongings, including a gold chain and a medallion. A passerby discovered the body early Wednesday and notified Mexican police. Later police received a tip about the slaying and robbery of a U.S. Border Patrol agent. The caller led agents to Rosas Molina, who had the agent's truck and medallion. Rosas Molina has admitted involvement in the slaying.

The purpose of the slaying, as it appears from the evidence gathered, is because Mr. Martinez was a Border Patrol agent. He is not the first Border Patrol agent to be killed in the line of duty on the border, he is not the first Border Patrol agent to be accosted. It happens all too frequently. It is because our borders are war zones. We were are in the process of debating whether or not, and the President is in the process of determining whether or not to send Americans off to fight a war in the Middle East. Without discussing the merits of that particular decision, I will tell Members there is a war going on on our borders. People are being killed on our borders. Troops are needed on our borders.

Our homeland needs to be defended. These people need to be defended. They need to be trained, and they need to be protected. We have to make a decision as a Nation as to whether or not we want borders or not. If we choose not to enforce our borders, we should move away from them and let people come into this country at their will. We should stop this process of sending a few people down to our border, put them into harm's way, and then refuse to actually secure the border.

Mr. Martinez, before him Mr. Eggle, and others, are examples of this kind of policy, this policy that puts people at risk without really having a desire on the part of this Nation to defend those borders or to protect our people on those borders.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the family of Mr. Martinez. Our prayers go out to that family. I hope that we will not forget his face or his story.

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

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## WINNING WITHOUT WAR

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offered President Bush, as did so many others here, immediate bipartisan support for the war on terror, but regime change in Baghdad, rather than disarming Iraq, represents a diversion from that bipartisan effort.

Not only do we have continuing concerns about Osama bin Laden, but also we have grave concerns about the looming nuclear threat from North Korea, which does have long-range missiles. This threat was deliberately hidden from this House until after our vote on Iraq.

The Korean peninsula crisis worsens by the day with Administration mismanagement and neglect heightening the far greater danger from this xenophobic, despotic regime. The Administration has a "Don't Talk, Don't Tell" policy that is steadily narrowing our options and increasing the risk of what could easily become a devastating conflict.

Just yesterday, former Defense Secretary William Perry and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright warned that North Korea could be headed toward "serial production" of nuclear weapons.

I believe that the Administration's fixation with regime change in Baghdad is diverting precious intelligence and other resources that we need to protect American families from what is a very genuine threat. Despite its clever marketing campaign, and it has been clever indeed, attempting to link 9/11 with Saddam Hussein, as of this very moment, the Administration has not offered one shred of evidence to make that connection stick, nor has it demonstrated why Iraq represents any greater danger of attacking our families today than it did on September 10, or since the time we were supplying them aid.

Today, we have crisscrossed Iraq with weapons inspectors. It does not even pose such a threat that its next-door neighbor, Turkey, is willing to challenge it.

The Central Intelligence Agency, in reports that we forced out of the Administration, has indicated that the real threat to our families would come with an invasion to Iraq and the danger that any weapons of mass destruction might spread and affect us.

Overthrowing a single tyrant, in what many will perceive to be a crusade against Islam, will ultimately jeopardize families across America as we create a generation of terrorists. Further attacks will only reinforce those here in America, who are determined to ensure our safety by trampling our civil liberties.

Attacking Iraq is apparently the first step in implementing a dangerous new security policy that dramatically alters a half century's bipartisan reliance on containment that has served to protect us from villains as bad as Saddam Hussein. America will now attack first with preemptive strikes in what could spiral into wars without end be-

cause other countries are likely to copy our model.

Fighting wars as a first choice, not a last choice, is a formula for international anarchy, not domestic security. A quick draw may take out the occasional tyrant, but it comes at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and, ultimately, it makes all of us unsafe.

True security certainly requires a strong military and a willingness to use it. We are strong enough to conquer Iraq and others, but we must be wise enough to rely on our many other strengths to rid the world of dangers. Ultimately, imposing our will by force unites our enemies and divides our allies. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld may dismiss our major partners as "Old Europe," but many yearn for "Old America" that collectively and successfully worked to prevent and remove threats to peace and ensure the safety of our families.

This is not a choice between "war" and "appeasement." Rather, the better alternative is to isolate Saddam Hussein and unite both his neighbors and our allies behind an aggressive inspection and weapons destruction program.

We know that the real cost of war is paid in blood. But Americans are already paying for this war at the gas pump. And with so few allies, hundreds of billions of our tax dollars that could be spent on the needs of Americans will be spent abroad.

A robust debate in an elected Congress on whether war should be waged with Iraq is the sign of a strong democracy. Unfortunately, this year, that debate took place in Turkey, not here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### FREEDOM FROM FEAR

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns regarding domestic violence that plagues our Nation. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said there are four essential human freedoms, the last being freedom from fear.

Today there still are too many women and children who have never experienced a life free from fear. These women and children are the 1 to 4 million women who experience serious assaults by an intimate partner each year. They are the 3.3 million children who witness their mothers being abused every year. They are the 3.2 million victims of child abuse each year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Lifetime Television and its partners for drawing attention to this most important and most persistent problem. To those women and children who are out there who are victims, please know that there are people and there are programs out there to help you become free from fear.

#### PLEA FOR PEACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to plead for peace. Every day our great Nation moves ever closer to war with Iraq. I know many Americans believe war is unavoidable. I hope and pray that they are wrong.

It is not an easy thing to disagree with the administration at a time when hundreds of thousands of our brave men and women are poised in the Persian Gulf. I want to make it clear that I will support our troops regardless of what happens, but I cannot, in good conscience, betray the nonviolent principles on which I have worked my whole life. I cannot sit silent when I believe there is still time to use diplomacy and let the inspectors do their job.

□ 1345

While I believe that the hour is late, it is not too late to stop the rush to war. It is not too late to embrace peace. War with Iraq will not bring peace to the Middle East. It will not make the world a safer or better or more loving place. It will not end the strife and hatred that breed terror.

War does not end strife. It sows it. War does not end hatred. It feeds it. War is bloody. It is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes, and aspirations of people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that war is obsolete.

As a great Nation and a blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual: "I am going to lay my burden down, down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more." For those who argue that war is a necessary evil, I say you are half right. War is evil. But it is not necessary. War cannot be a necessary evil, because nonviolence is a necessary good. The two cannot co-exist. As Americans, as human beings, as citizens of the world, as moral actors, we must embrace the good and reject the evil. To quote Ghandi: "The choice is nonviolence or nonexistence."

America's strength is not in its military might, but in our ideas. American ingenuity, freedom, and democracy have conquered the world. It is a battle we did not win with guns or tanks or missiles but with ideas, principles, and justice. We must choose our resources, Mr. Speaker, not to make bombs and guns but to solve the problems that affect all humankind. We must feed the stomach, clothe the naked bodies, educate and stimulate the mind. We must use our resources to build and not to tear down, to reconcile and not to divide, to love and not to hate, to heal and not to kill. Let us, in Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s words, "take offensive action in behalf of justice to remove the conditions which breed resentment, terror and violence against our great Nation." That is a direction in which a great Nation and a proud people should move.