

David Bloom made an imprint on our hearts and minds. That will never, ever be forgotten. Our hearts and prayers go out to his wife, his three daughters, and the entire NBC News family. He will truly be missed.

THE DWINDLING MANUFACTURING BASE AND HIGH-TECH INDUSTRY IN U.S.: WHAT IT MEANS FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I want to relate to a problem that I see as real in this country, so I am going to talk for a couple of minutes about losing our manufacturing base. Now, it looks like we are losing our high-tech jobs in this country. Then, secondly, how serious a situation is it, and then maybe third, what are we going to do about it.

Over the last 30 years, we have lost our manufacturing base as we have made the transition towards a service economy. A lot of that service economy has been in the area of high technology. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science, and one of the concerns is what is happening to outsourcing as more and more American companies are sending their engineering work overseas.

In the last 2 years, in the last 2 years, we have lost over 560,000 high-tech jobs. Why is that?

It is a situation where other countries are doing it cheaper. Companies have decided that they are going to outsource and put related factories and facilities in India, in the Pakistans, and any country where they can get these quality engineers to do the work cheaper; and of course, with our new technology and our ability to communicate so rapidly with the Internet, it does not make a great deal of difference whether one is down the hall or whether one is over in India or some other country.

In relation to repairing automobiles, it is now suggested that within a few years, because of the computerization of those automobiles, a lot of the mechanical work is going to be done by computers, again remotely; so it is not going to make any difference if the local repair shop plugs in their computer or if it is done by some shop overseas.

In the manufacturing industry, which I think we also have to be just as concerned with, we have, over the last 10 years, gone from almost 18 percent of our total working population in manufacturing to a situation today that is a little over 12 percent. If we care about the future of jobs and good-paying jobs for our kids and our grandkids, then it is a situation that we need to consider.

What are some of the possible ways that we can deal with this problem?

One, of course, I think is taxation, and we are going to be discussing that for the next several weeks. Our taxes now on business are approximately 17 percent higher than if that business were in another country.

□ 1930

One of the keys that I see is doing a much better job with matching math and science education. This has to be a priority as we are starting to limit the number of foreign students that can come in and do our research work. On research, what do we think, I ask my colleagues, is the percentage of our research done at universities in this country that is done by foreign students? Over 50 percent. So science and math have to be a priority.

We have had several hearings on science and math. The witnesses suggested that the learning in K through 12 is more a matter of excitement and enthusiasm and lighting a fire under people to be curious rather than filling a container with knowledge. I asked, when is this fire lit for science and math? And most of the witnesses said probably between 4 years old and 6 years old. So if we miss out on lighting the fire with parents that are interested, with communications that are going to stimulate the interest of those parents and those students and quality teachers, then it is going to be tough to light that fire in the future.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I just suggest that it has to be a real concern for our future economy and for future jobs; and for the relative wealth and influence this country has, that we need to pay attention to losing our manufacturing base and now losing our high-tech base. Part of that solution has to be fair taxes, and part has to be a better job with math and science education.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DAWSON FAMILY COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of brave families fighting to take back their neighborhoods from the clutches of drug abuse and the violence of the illicit drug trade.

Throughout the country, communities are losing this fight. The voices of families are being silenced, lost through the isolation and suppression that comes through the use of verbal threats, physical intimidation, and even murder.

April 16 marks 6 months since Angela and Carnell Dawson and their five young children were murdered in apparent retaliation for their local action in the fight against the open-air drug markets being operated on the streets before them in my district.

The Dawsons' house was firebombed at 2 a.m. in the morning in an attempt to silence their important and powerful voices, and the voices of other families committed to our troubled neighborhoods in this country.

We must not allow their voices to be stifled. We must support these brave families and protect their loved ones while ensuring that they can work freely with police and other law enforcement officials to push the drugs out of their communities. We must not fail to support them, for if we do, these neighborhoods and these neighborhood residents are doomed.

We need to strengthen the support for these brave families as they struggle to maintain their activism in their communities and on their blocks. Witness relocation programs are necessary and invaluable in protecting witnesses in individual criminal cases, Madam Speaker, but they are not sufficient to combat the problem of intimidation of entire neighborhoods patrolled by violent drug gangs actively involved in the interstate trafficking of illegal drugs.

In such communities, there are many dealers who will rush to fill the space of a single convicted dealer or enforcer. Courageous souls like the Dawsons are far less common and impossible to replace. Thus, it is vital that we support those families who insist on remaining in their neighborhoods and who are committed to working with police to repel drug trafficking in their neighborhoods.

That is why I am introducing today the Dawson Family Community Protection Act of 2003. The bill serves both to memorialize the Dawson family's commitment and activism, and to remind us all of what may result when families in an at-risk neighborhood do not receive adequate support.

Moreover, this bill would ensure that in the future, providing support for such communities is a Federal priority within the context of our National Drug Control Policy.

The Dawson Family Community Protection Act would require the director of the National Drug Control Policy to direct each year \$1 million in HIDTA funds to support HIDTA initiatives aimed at increasing safety and encouraging cooperation in neighborhoods like the Dawsons', neighborhoods that are not fighting one sole drug dealer, but a competitive open market of drug trafficking; neighborhoods where threats of reprisal for cooperation with police are commonplace, and where activist families working with law enforcement officials are in the most danger; neighborhoods that are doomed without increased support.

Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials understand the importance of ordinary families courageously taking a stand and cooperating with the police like the Dawson family did. The cooperation of such people is essential to the success of law enforcement efforts to disrupt violent drug

trafficking organizations and shut down markets that fund their illegal drug enterprises.

I am happy that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, with whom I serve as ranking member, supports me in this effort and is an original cosponsor of this legislation. I deeply appreciate his support for families like the Dawsons, and urge all of my colleagues to support the Dawson Family Community Protection Act, not only to protect families, but also to allow their voices to be heard.

Lastly, I especially thank Tony Haywood, our counsel to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his tireless work on this legislation; as well as Michael Christianson, Kimberly Ross, and Asi Ofosu on my staff for their assistance.

TRIBUTE TO NBC NEWS REPORTER DAVID BLOOM

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a son of Minnesota who died tragically this weekend while embedded with the 3rd Army Infantry Division in Iraq.

NBC news reporter David Bloom was a native of Edina, Minnesota, in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent. David's parents, Harold and Laura Bloom, and his brother, John Bloom, are residents of Edina.

David distinguished himself at an early age as a champion debater and hockey player at Edina West High School. David was also an avid fan of his beloved Minnesota Vikings and Minnesota Twins, and he often touted his hometown teams on national television.

David Bloom's meteoric rise as a journalist was nothing short of spectacular. As his NBC colleague, Katie Couric, said, "David was always there for the story and not the glory. He was a reporter's reporter." Another NBC colleague, Matt Lauer, said, "David personified energy, passion, compassion, and balance."

With his engaging personality, sound intellect, high level of energy, and great sense of humor, David Bloom's 10-year career at NBC News always drew rave reviews. From his early years at the network in Chicago and Los Angeles to his years as White House correspondent and co-anchor of *Weekend Today*, David Bloom always got the story.

As NBC Washington Bureau Chief Tim Russert said, "David was first and foremost a competitor. He was very resourceful, stretching every deadline he ever met. One marvels at how much he did and how well he did it."

Mr. Russert and many other close friends and colleagues also have said

that David loved his wife, Melanie, and his three daughters more than anything. When Russert gave him the nickname "Bloomster", David readily told them it was his second favorite nickname. His favorite nickname was "Dad."

Madam Speaker, David Bloom was well-liked and respected by everyone who knew him. That was evidenced by the lofty praise that has filled the airwaves and the newspapers across America since his tragic and untimely death at age 39.

David Bloom was a great credit to his native Minnesota, his beloved family and friends, and his profession. As his co-anchor, Soledad O'Brien, put it, there was not a dry eye anywhere at NBC. I know my colleagues here in the House of Representatives feel the same profound sadness at the loss of David Bloom. Our thoughts and prayers go out to David Bloom's family, his wife, Melanie, and daughters Nicole, Christine, and Ava, as well as David's parents, Harold and Laura, and his brothers, John and Jim.

IMPACT OF THE LACK OF ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS ON THE ADAMS FAMILY

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, it was a little over a year ago that I had the opportunity to visit with a gentleman who was, at that time, the head of a ministry in the Vicente Fox government in Mexico. His name was Juan Hernandez. Mr. Hernandez was head of a new agency that was called the Ministry for Mexicans Living in the United States. It was interesting that that would be the name of any new governmental entity that had just been created, but that was it, a new agency, the Ministry for Mexicans Living in the United States.

In the discussion we had, I found it interesting in that when I asked him specifically what was the purpose of such an agency, he said, well, it was to, first of all, increase the flow of Mexican nationals into the United States. I asked him for what purpose. He said essentially that in doing that the hope was, of the Mexican Government, that it would influence United States policy towards Mexico, because he wanted to have a large number of Mexican nationals living in the United States, but with political, economic, and cultural ties remaining to Mexico. So his job was split between encouraging the flow, on one hand, and then encouraging this connection on the other, a connection that would remain.

We talked a little longer. There were two other Members of the Congress there with me that evening. He said something that I thought we were all kind of amazed at. He said, Congressman, it is not two countries, it is just a region.

I know that he believed that, and many other people do. I think perhaps even people in this body may think of it that way: It is not really two countries, it is just a region where the border does not matter; it is inconsequential, and it is sometimes even problematic because it does restrict the free flow of people across that particular part of the country. There are folks who look at it in that way. Borders, they think, are anachronisms, not necessary, anymore; and after all, it was really just a region.

What has happened as a result of this shift in philosophy, this shift in government philosophy in Mexico in particular, the push for people to come north? In the past, Mexico had treated people coming across the border with some disdain, and there was actually a derogatory term applied to people who left Mexico.

But in the last 5 to 6 years, because of the importance of what Mr. Hernandez was described as trying to influence American foreign policy vis-a-vis Mexico, and also because of the importance that remittances play. Remittances is the amount of money made in the United States, or countries outside of Mexico, but sent back into Mexico to family members that now accounts for something over 30 percent of their gross domestic product. Therefore, of course, they are very interested in using America as a way of expanding that particular phenomenon. That is fine.

On our side, we have, of course, abandoned the borders. We have made sort of an unwritten agreement with Mexico that we would not really do anything to significantly impede the flow of those people into the United States for our own reasons, some of it dealing with cheap labor and our demand for it; others because of the political consequences that arise as a result of a massive flow of people across the border into the United States who will sometimes themselves vote, even illegally, but eventually become voters after a period of time, or their children will after they have been born here and are citizens of the United States.

But this has had an impact on certain folks. We do not hear anything about them. That is why I come just about every week with another individual, another person. Tonight I am going to talk a little bit about Frank Adams. Frank and his wife Barbara operate a small ranch of about 500 acres. It is about 3½ miles north of Douglas, Arizona.

Here is a picture of Frank. They have lived on this ranch for about a half a century. They are only 3½ miles north of the border. Their daughter lives on that ranch with them, and they have two grown sons living in Texas. Their experience is not an awful lot different from many of the other ranchers on that border area who I have brought to the attention of the body in the past.