

legislation. For example, the bill expressly prohibits an employer from directly or indirectly intimidating; threatening; coercing, or attempting to coerce, any employee for the purposes of interfering with an employee's right to take or not to take comp time or to use accrued comp time. The bill creates a new remedy under the Fair Labor Standards Act for employers who violate the anticoercion language just described.

Let me note that this bill is not mandatory for anyone. The employer need not opt to offer family time, and the employee need not opt to take family time. It is all about choices. The employer chooses whether to offer the option, and the employee chooses whether to use the option; and if an employee changes his or her mind, he or she can at any time choose to cash out, and the employer must make the payout within 30 days.

H.R. 1119 is a comprehensive, balanced bill that gives more choices for employees and more opportunities for employers to keep their employees happy. This bill is not a mandate on employers or employees. It simply gives both parties the opportunity to agree to these arrangements, an opportunity which is now denied to them by law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Family Time Flexibility Act.

CALLING FOR THE RESIGNATION OF PAUL WOLFOWITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled 2 weeks ago to read that Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, one of the key policymakers in this administration, had publicly criticized, for Turkish consumption, the Turkish military for abiding by democracy. In an interview, which I will put into the RECORD, with CNN Turk, Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz repeatedly criticized the Turkish military because it had allowed democracy to function in Turkey. And he ought to resign. We have much too much at stake in our effort to bring stable democracy to the world in general, and particularly the Middle East, to allow a man to stay in that high office who has allowed himself to say that the military did too little, was not strong enough in pressing a democratically elected government. Indeed, it is especially disturbing to have that said with regard to the government of Turkey.

Trying to encourage Islamist movements that are genuinely democratic is one of our highest goals. The clash that some have argued exists between Islamic fundamentalism and democracy is a terrible threat to the world. We have in Turkey now a government that

has Islamist groups, the political majority, and is also committed to democracy. And that parliament made a decision, not the government but the parliament, that we did not like. It failed to get a sufficient majority to join us in the war effort.

And here is what Paul Wolfowitz has to say: "... many of the institutions in Turkey that we think of as the traditional strong support is the alliance were not as forceful in leading in that direction."

Question: "Which traditional alliance are you talking about?"

"... I think particularly the military." This is Mr. Wolfowitz: "I think for whatever reason they did not play the strong leadership role on that issue that we would have expected." And the questioners were somewhat puzzled. Here is a high American official. We have said we are going to war in Iraq in part to bring about democracy, and he is criticizing a military in Turkey because it had not strongly tried to influence the elected officials? So they say what kind of a role the military might have because after all the military is not in parliament. And another interviewer says: "And they have been criticized by getting involved in politics."

Mr. Wolfowitz seems to realize he said something that he should not have, but he cannot help himself. His contempt for the democratic process, if it comes out with results he does not like, was too strong. His partisanship on this issue was too strong. So here is what Mr. Wolfowitz says: "I'm not suggesting you get involved in politics at all. I mean, I think, all I'm saying is that when you had an issue of Turkey's national interest... I think it's perfectly appropriate, especially in your system," my emphasis, "for the military to say it was in Turkey's interest to support the United States in that effort."

The interviewer says: "Didn't they say that?"

Mr. Wolfowitz's response: "I don't know. My impression is they didn't say it with the kind of strength that would have made a difference."

In other words, they did not muscle the government. They did not use armed force, the threat of armed force, as unfortunately the Turkish military has in the past, to force the Turkish Parliament to take an action which we wanted them to take.

Mr. Wolfowitz is the Deputy Secretary of Defense. As David Greenway pointed out in the Boston Globe last week, "The Turks are perfectly aware of the Pentagon's creeping takeover of U.S. foreign policy. There will be some who consider Wolfowitz's remarks as encouragement to boot out Erdogan," the Turkish prime minister.

Let me stress again how important it is for the experiment we are seeing in Turkey to succeed, a democratic Islamist government, and they had a tough issue that we dropped in their laps; and the parliament voted and the government tried and could not get a

majority. And the Deputy Secretary of Defense says the military was not strong enough, the military did not intervene forcefully enough the way that they traditionally have? This is appalling to have such a high-ranking American official say this, and we have already got problems in post-war Iraq.

The administration's policy is a shambles there. Mr. Wolfowitz can take some of the responsibility for that. He is one of those who scoffed when Army Chief of Staff Shinseki said we are going to need several hundred thousand troops, and now of course we are being told 150,000 troops is not enough. But we have this terrible problem in Iraq clearly now since there have not been found the kinds of weapons that the administration said there would be, certainly not in the quantity they predicted.

The justification for Iraq is the impact it will have on governments in Iraq and in the rest of the Middle East. How does it help to have our Deputy Secretary of Defense, one of the shapers of that policy, now say, by the way, when we say democracy, we mean a democracy where the military intervenes strongly, not just gives its viewpoint but intervenes strongly to make sure things come out? Things in Iraq and our credibility are in enough trouble without Paul Wolfowitz compounding it, and he ought to resign.

[From the Boston Globe, May 16, 2003]

DEMOCRACY, NEOCON STYLE

(By H.D.S. Greenway)

Neoconservatives, who have risen to great power and influence within the Bush administration, have told us of their sweeping design to transform the Middle East into a model of democracy. Skeptics have demurred, but the neocons have countered that the doubters lack vision. There have been recent events, however, that bring into question the sincerity of these grand visionaries.

Take, for example, the recent remarks of Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, perhaps the most influential of the right-wing conservatives in government. Although the State Department got most of the blame for the diplomatic debacle over Turkey's failure to allow US troops to transit en route to Iraq, it was Wolfowitz who conducted much of the negotiations.

As it was, Turkey's new, democratically elected Parliament said no, much to Washington's chagrin and to the embarrassment of the Turkish government, which had urged a "yes" vote. Turkey was not the first government in a democratic state to be rebuffed by legislators. It happens in the United States all the time.

But last week, in an interview with CNN, Wolfowitz lashed out at the Turkish military for the failure to fall into line. "I think for whatever reason, they did not play the strong leadership role that we would have expected," he said.

Consider the ramifications of this statement in the Turkish context. Democracy in Turkey is alive but fragile. Open elections began only in the 1950s. Traditionally the Turkish military has seen itself as the guardian of the secular state that Kemal Ataturk put into place following the end of the Ottoman Empire after World War I.

The Turkish generals have made it a habit to step in from time to time to dismiss governments they do not like, returning rule to

civilians only when it suits them. The last time this happened was in the late 1990s, when Prime Minister Necmettin Erbakan was chucked out of power by the military for being too anti-Western and too Islamic.

Islam is a growing force in Turkey, especially among the rural poor now flooding into cities. Turkey's armed forces and the elites are determined to keep the country secular. Recent Turkish elections swept all the establishment parties away and brought to power a new Parliament with a decided Islamic bent. Its leader, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, a former mayor of Istanbul, was at first banned from becoming prime minister because of a nationalistic poem with Islamic imagery that he had once read aloud.

But Erdogan and his party had gone out of their way to be pro-West and moderate, and the military kept to its barracks. Eventually, Erdogan was allowed to assume the prime ministry, which he deserved, but not before he had been received by President Bush in the White House.

Bush rightly decided that, far from being a threat Erdogan's clean government ticket could serve as an example of how a Middle Eastern government could be Islamic, democratic, moderate, and pro-Western all at the same time.

Erdogan and his government wanted to allow US troops to use Turkish soil to attack Iraq, and not just because of the huge bribe the United States had offered. But the government couldn't persuade enough legislators. Many Turks felt the Parliament had made a mistake, that Turkish interests had been hurt, but the Parliament didn't agree, and that was that. End of story; or so it should have been.

One might have thought that anyone interested in true democracy would have been impressed and delighted. Here was Parliament defying the government, and the military didn't intervene. An American foreign policy goal is to get the European Union to accept Turkey. One of the EU's legitimate complaints is that the EU is a grouping of democracies and that the banana republic-like actions of the Turkish military over the years indicate that Turkey's democracy is only a sometime thing. But this time around, the Turkish military was not interfering.

Then up steps Paul Wolfowitz, saying that the Turkish military had not played "the strong leadership role that we would have expected." Does that mean that, in Wolfowitz's view, there should have been a military coup? Or that the Turkish generals should have threatened the Parliament? In the Turkish context there is every reason to interpret the deputy secretary of defense's remarks in that way.

The Turks are perfectly aware of the Pentagon's creeping takeover of US foreign policy. There will be some who consider Wolfowitz's remarks as encouragement to boot out Erdogan as they did Erbakan. Americans have a right to ask: Do the neocons really want democracy, or do they simply want to bully the Middle East into a semblance of democracy that will toe the American line and further neoconservative imperial fantasies?

MAY 6, 2003.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WOLFOWITZ
INTERVIEW WITH CNN TURK
(Interview Cengiz Candar and M. Ali Birand
of CNN Turk)

On the web: <http://dod.mil/transcripts/2003/tr20030506-depsecdef0156.html>

CNN Turk. Welcome Mr. Secretary with Cengiz it's been a bit tight you can imagine to come over to Washington you know to see for 36 hours so if jetlag I think we can manage that but thank you for giving your time.

Wolfowitz. Thank you to have the two distinguished journalists like you here it's a great privilege for us.

CNN Turk. That's great but let me fire the first shot. We've had, we know how keen you are around Turkish American relations. We've had a wonderful relationship starting Korea and the Cold War, Afghanistan whatever you name it. But something went wrong, dreadfully went wrong. We started with strategic alliance with strategic relationship. Strategy is gone the relationship I don't know how it's going, and in the meantime we are having two different versions, one version from Pentagon and one version from State department, but yeah we've had a bit of trouble but it's no problem. We want to have your view on those relations. Where are we standing? Is it the crisis or what happened?

Wolfowitz. I think we had a big disappointment. But it remains the case that this has been a strong alliance over many years. I think it will continue to be a strong alliance and it remains the case that Turkey is a very important country in this era because it's a country with a Muslim majority that has a strong democratic tradition and I think it remains the case that Turkey can be an important model for that part of the world that we are trying to move in a more positive direction. But I don't think if we want to sustain this strong alliance and indeed strengthen it in the future then we ought to understand what went wrong, we ought to understand the nature of that disappointment and some of it has to do with, if you like, the U.S.-Turkish bilateral piece of it. But I think it's more helpful to think of the disappointment in terms of the failure to understand what was going on in Iraq. From a U.S. Turkish point of view there is good news and bad news. The good news is that a majority of the parliament did vote to support us in the things that we asked for. The bad news is that because of the procedural issues that wasn't a big enough majority to get it done and that many of the institutions in Turkey that we think of as the traditional strong support is the alliance were not as forceful in leading in that direction.

CNN Turk. Which traditional alliance are you talking about?

Wolfowitz. Well I think you know which ones I mean but I think particularly the military. I think for whatever reason they did not play the strong leadership role on that issue that we would have expected.

But I think the bigger disappointment has to do with the general failure of the Turkish public reflected also in the government, about what the stakes were in Iraq and that here you have a neighbor with an overwhelmingly Muslim population where the people were suffering under the worst dictators in the world. And one would have thought that Muslim solidarity would have led people to say let's help the Americans liberate these people and that isn't what happened.

Okay, that's past. We are now in the present and future. The present and future is there's a spectacular opportunity in Iraq to help these newly liberated people achieve their real potential and I think that's what we need to work on together, Turkey and United States and I think what Turkey needs to do is look into its democratic soul and say, yes we believe in democracy, we believe in democracy for Muslims and Arabs. There's an opportunity now, whatever happened in the last few months, there's an opportunity now to work with the Americans to build that in Iraq. Let's seize that opportunity and do everything we can as Turks to support it.

CNN Turk. But if you make a prognosis of what went wrong earlier, since you mentioned for example the military the tradi-

tional institution which had strong connections to the United States did not play a leadership role, so for the future to repair the relationship and bring it back to its original level that means that you have to need a leadership role to be played by those who haven't played it. What kind of a role the military might have because after all the military is not working in Turkey's parliament political parties (inaudible)?

CNN Turk. And they have been criticized by getting involved in politics.

Wolfowitz: I'm not suggesting you get involved in politics at all. I mean, I think, all I'm saying is that when you had a issue of Turkey's national interest and national strategy I think it's perfectly appropriate, especially in your system, for the military to say it was in Turkey's interest to support the United States in that effort.

CNN Turk. Didn't they say that?

Wolfowitz: I don't know. My impression is they didn't say it with the kind of strength that would have made a difference. But look let's not dwell too much on the past.

CNN Turk. Let's stick to the past.

(Laughter)

Wolfowitz: No.

Voice. Were you surprised that when you heard that the Turkish Parliament rejected it?

Wolfowitz. They didn't reject.

CNN Turk. Passed through?

Wolfowitz: They didn't pass through. In fact lets, I don't know many Americans are going to watch this program but let's not keep mis-educating people that Turkey's parliament rejected it. They did not get the majority that was needed and it's true we did not get the full support that was needed.

CNN Turk. Thanks to the Turkish constitution.

Wolfowitz. And I think at the end of the day, I think Turkey has paid a bigger price for that than we have. I think for one thing the whole economic package could have been something much more substantial. But I also believe we would've achieved more rapidly the kind of stability in Northern Iraq that is as much in Turkey's interest as it is in ours. But we are where we are today and achieving stability in Northern Iraq remains in Turkey's interest, it's very much in our interest, we need to work together to make sure that that's achieved. I think it can be achieved. We've been saying repeatedly and very emphatically, starting with my trip in Ankara back in July, that we oppose an independent Kurdish state in Northern Iraq, that we strongly support maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq. I think it's very interesting and positive that today both of the key Kurdish Barzani and Talabani are in Baghdad trying to become major forces in a future integrated Iraq. That's a positive development, which we all ought to welcome. We need to work together to make that happen. We need to work together, although it's mainly going to be our responsibility, but to make sure that the very difficult property claims that people are making in the north get resolved peacefully and not through force. There are going to be a lot difficult problems in the period going forward. And I just, you know every so often I hear some people suggesting, well the right reaction for Turkey to this bump in our relationship is, well we should make more friends with Iran and more friends with Syria. Excuse me, that's absolutely the wrong way to go. The right way to go, as I say, is to think about where the real democrats, where does democracy need to be supported. It's going to be a huge boon to Turkey when the sanctions are lifted from Iraq when trade can move easily across the borders and when Iraq begins to realize it's real potential as a democratic neighbor of Turkey.

CNN Turk. This is also a matter of debate within Turkey itself but whenever an argument is brought it is not the time to have a close relations with Iran and with Syria at juncture of history. Some come up and say that they are our neighbors, when I mean some, they are officials following Islam, they are our neighbors it's very natural that we would have these kinds of relationships. And look the American Secretary of State goes to visit Syria and historically the American Secretary of States like they are one of them, Warren Christopher visited 22 times, never stepping his foot in Turkey. So if this kind of an argument comes, we and Turkey feel that there are different signals coming from Washington. Which kind of signal we have to be the recipient more than the other?

Wolfowitz. I'm sorry I think there's one signal with respect to Syria. This Secretary of State—I'm not going to talk about previous ones—this Secretary of State went to Syria and delivered a very tough message about how Syria needs to shape up and stop supporting terrorism and stop interfering with Iraq. That's the message that ought to come through and I think anything, that Turkey does what Syria or does with Iran should fit into an overall policy with us, of getting those countries to change their bad behavior. In the meantime, it seems to me, I know this an American view but, if I were Turk I'd believe I would say in spite of whatever has gone wrong in the last year, Turkey's strongest friend in the world is the United States. Turkey's real interests lie with the United States and when we look at our neighbor to the south this newly liberated country called Iraq, we have the same interest the Americans do in keeping it a unified country and making it a democratic country and helping to change the economy from this sort of Stalinist structure that the Iraqis have lived under for 30 years, into the kind of free enterprise economy that's going to be a huge boon to Turkey and all the neighbors.

CNN Turk. So in a way, you are not against Turkey's having relations with Syria and Iran but you want the same message to go to those (inaudible).

Wolfowitz. Absolutely, I mean of course they are your neighbors. But you want them to behave as neighbors. You don't want to suggest that well they can ignore the message of the Secretary of State of the United States because our powerful Turkish friend is ignoring it also. I think it's very important that we be coordinated.

CNN Turk. We need to discuss some misunderstanding as well for the time being and for the future of Iraq between two countries, two allies, Turkey and the United States and they are recently. We have two different interpretations about an incident that took place in Northern Iraq near Kirkuk between the American forces and the Turkish Special Forces. According to the American media the Turkish Special Forces were trying to bring weapons into (inaudible) Kirkuk they were intercepted by the American military there and then escorted back to Turkish frontier. Why would Turkish Foreign Minister say it was an humanitarian aid convoy which was assisted by some security personnel so they were there to secure the free travel of the Humanitarian aid convey. So what's the interpretation since we are speaking here in the Pentagon? What happened?

Wolfowitz. Well I don't think I want to get into it. You want to do history I want to do the future. What happened shouldn't have happened. And it was clearly something that was done ignoring everything that we have said. But it was fixed. I don't think it'll happen again, I think Secretary Powell and Foreign Minister Gul had a very good clear dis-

ussion about it and hopefully we are on a better track now. But that's a good example I think, of where, whatever Turkey does in the north, and we understand Turkey has important interest in the north. It's got to be coordinated now through the coalition, through General Franks. We can't any longer have unilateral action in Northern Iraq.

CNN Turk. Why the question for the future then? On the same issue there is a small Turkish military presence in Northern Iraq.

They had to record it with the coalition forces you are saying right?

Wolfowitz. Well as long as they are there, yes.

CNN Turk. And the short coming future?

Wolfowitz. The goal ought to be, they shouldn't be needed in the long run. But let's in the meantime . . .

CNN Turk. That's what I'm after, I mean now there's a Kurdish authority—kind of a self-rule in Northern Iraq. Who happened to become America's close allies in the last war effort there? So in the coming future if they come up and say that we don't need anymore, the Turkish military presence despite it's small (inaudible) military personnel. In such a case, by being the real leader to the element in the area, in Northern Iraq what (inaudible)?

Wolfowitz. The real military elements in Northern Iraq are the coalition forces. We now have very substantial heavy American forces up north and that is the real military element and everybody better listen to the instructions of General Franks including any armed groups, any Kurdish groups. But I think the goal has got to be a free and democratic Iraq where Northern Iraq is never again a sanctuary for terrorists to be attacking Turkey. We've got to find a way to make sure that doesn't happen again. When we are confident about it then there is absolutely no reason for any Turkish presence. But if there's going to be a presence as long as it's there it clearly has got to be under the direction and control of the coalition. . . .

□ 1245

STEMMING THE SPREAD OF CARGO THEFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a problem that has been below the Federal radar screen for far too long. Every year tens of billions of dollars are lost to cargo theft. This epidemic has plagued the United States for over 30 years, with little being done to stem its spread. With the prevalence of cargo theft today, insurance companies have placed a heavy burden on the trucking industry. The costs associated with investigation and insurance payments are only exacerbating what is already an industry crisis.

Typical targets for cargo theft often include shipments of clothing, prescription drugs, computers and jewelry. A truckload of computer and microprocessors can be worth millions. A truckload of cigarettes, another common target, can be worth up to \$2 million. The high value to volume ratio of high-tech goods has encouraged criminals previously involved in drug deal-

ing to move into this area of activity where they run less risk of detection and suffer less severe penalties if caught.

The National Cargo Security Council wants to see an increase in criminal penalties for cargo theft as well as employment of more trained cargo theft task forces. The Council reported that cargo worth \$12 billion is stolen in the United States every year, and yet the penalties for cargo theft are lower than that for selling drugs.

Cargo thieves employ creative means to prey upon cargo carriers and have managed to stay one step ahead of the authorities. Thieves know what they want and where they can find it. Striking cargo containers at ports, at trains and 18-wheelers, hijackers pry open the doors, remove the goods and replace them with bags of sand so that there is no change in weight. They will then proceed to put new pins in the hinges so the crime is not noticed until the containers are opened upon arrival.

This manner of theft is known as "leakage," in that thieves attack intermodal containers by defeating the integrity of the security seal. This practice often confounds investigators, since they have no idea at what point the cargo was stolen.

Eighteen-wheeler cargo carriers now experience approximately 85 percent of theft. Thieves will either roll the dice, stealing containers with unknown contents, or they will go as far as camping outside of distribution centers. This method, called "full-load truck theft," involves monitoring shipments out of distribution centers that are known for putting out expensive goods. The thieves will then follow the trucks in rental cars, waiting for the right time to pounce. This will often occur at truck rest stops where the driver leaves the vehicle. The process can amazingly take but a few minutes. These professional criminals are usually licensed truck drivers who can hotwire a truck quickly and efficiently.

Once goods are successfully stolen, they will be moved to port warehouses where they will wait to be exported. Depending upon where the goods are to be shipped, they will most likely be shipped to ports in Miami, Los Angeles or New York. The stolen cargo changes hands several times in what is a form of cargo laundering. By the time the cargo is ready for export, it is most likely to be seen as a legal shipment. Authorities have found it difficult to track outgoing cargo since outbound shipments are not checked, due to the fact that they are not subject to U.S. tariff laws.

Mr. Speaker, Members in this Chamber need to be aware of this problem. It is time that we got aggressive and made our highways again safe for commerce. This country is in dire need of harsher criminal penalties, and this need can be proven by the fact that criminals are turning to cargo theft in hordes. Many criminals are abandoning