

He also established the Intergenerational After-School Program and sponsors Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and an HIV AIDS Ministry that educates the community about the disease.

A former president of Paul Quinn College in Waco, Texas, Dr. Watley initiated the Adult Basic Educational Program, the St. James Bible Institute, The Christian Learning Center, New Life Ministries, Community Bible Study, Men and Women's Bible Studies and the Pastor's Bible Study. His fourteen year quest to build St. James Preparatory School, a Christian Academy, came to fruition a few years ago.

St. James is world renowned for its Wednesday "Sweet Hour of Praise" Service, which I have had the privilege of attending many times. The service in its eleventh year has grown from one worshipper to hundreds.

Dr. Watley serves as chairman of the St. James Preparatory School: A Christian Academy, St. James Social Services, and St. James Credit Union. He serves on the boards of the New Jersey Housing Mortgage Finance Agency, Horizon Mercy, Boys and Girls Clubs of Newark, United Movie Corporation, the World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches, African Methodist Episcopal Church First District and Beth Israel Medical Center.

He has authored several books and articles and is currently writing a book. He has a long and distinguished record in the areas of education, pastoral practice and youth services. Dr. Watley holds both the Doctor of Philosophy and Masters of Philosophy degrees from Columbia University in Ethics and Theology respectively. His B.A. degree is from Saint Louis University. He has also completed the Institute for Educational Management Program at Harvard University.

Dr. Watley is married to Muriel Watley and they are the proud parents of two children and a granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in extending our very best wishes to Dr. Watley and his family as they continue their dedicated service to the church and the community.

**GIVE TOM RIDGE THE AUTHORITY
TO DO HIS JOB**

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Tom Ridge's last day as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On Monday, former Governor Ridge takes on a huge assignment as Director of the Office of Homeland Security—a job critically important in fashioning our government's response to terrorism.

To be effective, he needs tools that Congress must provide. Today, my colleague from Nevada, Mr. GIBBONS, and I introduced legislation that does just that.

The bill, the Office of Homeland Security Act of 2001, creates a Cabinet-level position subject to Senate confirmation.

The Director of Homeland Security is given authority to review, certify, or reject the terrorism-related budgets of the more than 40

federal departments and agencies. This power is essential to assure coordination and integration of the many programs needed to prevent, prepare for, and respond to terrorist attacks.

The people working today to protect our nation are spread among federal, state and local agencies. They are involved in collecting and analyzing intelligence, patrolling our borders, protecting critical infrastructure, and identifying and treating health effects of various attacks on our population.

The Gibbon-Harman-LaHood-Roemer-Castle-Boehler bill assigns the Director for Homeland Security the responsibility for:

Directing the creation of a national strategy for homeland security and developing a national budget to carry out this strategy;

Certifying or rejecting agencies' budget requests;

Coordinating all federal homeland security activities, and certifying or rejecting federal agencies' budgets for the activities;

Directing the development of a comprehensive national threat assessment;

Overseeing information sharing among Federal, State, and local agencies involved in intelligence collection and law enforcement; and

Conducting a review of the legal authorities still needed to prevent and respond to terrorist threats.

Every day that Governor Ridge does not have these powers, his ability to do his job will decrease.

I urge my colleagues to join us in securing passage of this bill as quickly as possible.

**INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH
MEMORIAL TO VICTIMS
OF SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACK ON
THE PENTAGON**

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by a group of bipartisan colleagues to introduce legislation to establish a memorial in honor of the victims of the September 11 attack on the Pentagon.

This legislation would reserve a portion of land at the Navy Annex, which is situated across from the Pentagon in Arlington, to erect a memorial for this purpose.

Anyone that has visited this site knows the many personal stories and tributes left in memory of the victims of this attack. It overlooks the site of the attack on the Pentagon and has already served as a informal memorial location, marked by countless flowers, handwritten notes and candlelight vigils.

This land, which is already subject to transfer to the Secretary of the Army (under section 2881 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for FY2000, P.L. 106-65), would provide an ideal location to locate a memorial to honor the victims of the Pentagon attack.

Words do not sufficiently describe the pain and utter sadness we all feel as a result of this tragic event. Locally, we all know someone who was affected by this attack.

The establishment of a memorial at the Navy Annex is just one small way we as a country can ensure that the spirit of these individuals lives on and that our American way of life is uplifted.

These 189 victims were not only friends and neighbors, but they represent the countless American lives that have been touched by September 11. Many of them were serving their country as either soldiers or public servants.

They were parents, friends and active members of our communities. They, like other victims of the tragic events of that day, represented a cross-section of America, coming from all walks of life.

Despite the profound pain that our country has experienced, we have also witnessed an uplifting of the American spirit in the aftermath of this event through the outpouring of generosity and volunteer assistance.

We must not forget how powerful our country is when we come together and work toward a common goal and purpose. I think this memorial should also serve as a reminder of what makes our country and its people persevere in the face of adversity.

Already we have seen an outpouring of generosity and interest from members of the public in establishing the Navy Annex as an official site for such a memorial.

The New York and Pennsylvania delegations are planning to establish memorials to the victims who died in those attack sites. It is only fitting that we establish a site here that will enable the general public to pay tribute to the 189 Americans who died in the September 11 attack at the Pentagon.

I would note that this legislation complies with the established standards for memorials and commemorative works. It leave the process of siting, design, and construction of the memorial to the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capitol Monuments Commission and the Fine Arts Commission.

I am confident that the collective expertise of these commissions will yield an appropriate design and message for such a memorial.

I look forward to working with Members of Congress and the administration to swiftly enact this legislation establishing a memorial to properly honor the victims of the September 11 attack on the Pentagon.

THE AGONY OF THE LEFT

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who might have missed it, I would commend to the attention of my colleagues a piece by Andrew Sullivan from today's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Sullivan skillfully delineates the egregious errors of many on the radical left who would dare to blame the recent terrorist attacks on our nation's policies—even as other liberal groups recognize and properly condemn the atrocities of Osama bin Laden and the Taliban regime that supports him.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 4, 2001]

THE AGONY OF THE LEFT

(By Andrew Sullivan)

One of the most telling things I have seen since the Sept. 11 massacre was an early "peace movement" e-mail. It listed three major demands: stop the war; stop racism; stop ethnic scapegoating. A liberal friend had appended a sardonic comment to the bottom. "Any chance we could come out against terrorism as well?"

One of the overlooked aspects of the war we are now fighting is the awakening it has spawned on the left. In one atrocity, Osama bin Laden may have accomplished what a generation of conservative writers have failed to do: convince mainstream liberals of the illogic and nihilism of the powerful postmodern left. For the first time in a very long while, many liberals are reassessing—quietly for the most part—their alliance with the anti-American, anti-capitalist forces they have long appeased, ignored or supported.

COLLECTIVE KNEE

Of course the initial response of left-wing intellectuals to Sept. 11 was one jerking of the collective knee. This was America's fault. From Susan Sontag to Michael Moore, from Noam Chomsky to Edward Said, there was no question that, however awful the attack on the World Trade Center, it was vital to keep attention fixed on the real culprit: the United States. Of the massacre, a Rutgers professor summed up the consensus by informing her students that "We should be aware that, whatever its proximate cause, its ultimate cause is the fascism of U.S. foreign policy over the past many decades." Or as a poster at the demonstration in Washington last weekend put it, "Amerika, Get A Clue."

Less noticed was the reasoned stance of liberal groups like the National Organization for Women. President Kim Candy stated that "The Taliban government of Afghanistan, believed to be harboring suspect Osama bin Laden, subjugates women and girls, and deprives them of the most basic human rights—including education, medicine and jobs. The smoldering remains of the World Trade Center are a stark reminder that when such extremism is allowed to flourish anywhere in the world, none of us is safe." The NAACP issued an equally forceful "message of resolve," declaring, "These tragedies and these acts of evil must not go unpunished. Justice must be served."

Left-wing dissident Christopher Hitchens, meanwhile, assailed his comrades as "soft on crime and soft on fascism." After an initial spasm of equivocation, the American Prospect magazine ran a column this week accusing the pre-emptive peace movement of "a truly vile form of moral equivalency" in equating President Bush with terrorists. Not a hard cell, but daring for a magazine that rarely has even a civil word for the right.

Most moving was Salman Rushdie's early call in the New York Times to "be clear about why this bien-pensant anti-American onslaught is such appalling rubbish. Terrorism is the murder of the innocent; this time, it was mass murder. To excuse such an atrocity by blaming U.S. government policies is to deny the basic idea of all morality: that individuals are responsible for their actions." Whatever else is going on, the liberal-left alliance has taken as big a hit as the conservative-fundamentalist alliance after the blame-America remarks of Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson.

It's not hard to see why. Unlike previous Cold War battles, this one is against an enemy with no pretense at any universal, secular ideology that could appeal to Western liberals. However, repulsive, the communist arguments of, say, Ho Chi Minh or Fidel Castro still appealed to a secular, Western ideology. American leftist could delude themselves that they shared the same struggle.

But with Osama bin Laden, and the Islamo-fascism of the Taliban, no such delusions are possible. The American liberal mind has long believed that their prime enemy in America is the religious right, what does that make the Taliban? They sub-

jugate women with a brutality rare even in the Muslim world; they despite Jews; they execute homosexuals by throwing them from very high buildings or crushing them underneath stone walls. There is literally nothing that the left can credibly cling to in rationalizing support for these hate-filled fanatics.

This is therefore an excruciating moment for the postmodern, post-colonial left. They may actually have come across an enemy that even they cannot argue is morally superior to the West. You see this discomfort in the silence of the protestors in Washington, who simply never raised the issue of bin Laden's ideology. You see it is Barbara Ehrenreich's sad plea in the *Village Voice*: "What is so heart-breaking to me as a feminist is that the strongest response to corporate globalization and U.S. military domination is based on such a violent and misogynist ideology."

You see it in the words of Fredric Jameson, a revered postmodernist at Duke University, arguing in the *London Review of Books* that the roots of the conflict are to be found "in the wholesale massacres of the Left systematically encouraged and directed by the Americans in an even earlier period It is, however, only now that the results are working their way out into actuality, for the resultant absence of any Left alternative means that popular revolt and resistance in the Third World have nowhere to go but into religious and 'fundamentalist' forms." The only adequate description of this argument is desperate. And, of course, it ducks the hard question. What does the left do now that these forces are indeed fundamentalist?

The other rhetorical trope that is fast disintegrating is the anti-racist argument. The doctrine of "post-colonialism" which now dominates many American humanities departments invariably sides with Third World regimes against the accumulated evil of the West. So the emergence of the Taliban is a body-blow. If dark-skinned peoples are inherently better than light-skinned peoples, then how does a dark-skinned culture come up with an ideology that is clearly a function of bigotry, misogyny and homophobia?

One immediate response is to argue that the U.S. itself created Osama bin Laden in its war against Soviet communism. This isn't true—but even if it were, doesn't this fact, as Mr. Hitchens has argued, actually increase the West's responsibility to retaliate against him?

WHAT SUPPRESSION?

It may be, in fact, that one of the silver linings of these awful times is that the far left's bluff has been finally called. War focuses issues in ways peace cannot.

Leftists would like to pretend that any criticism of their views raises the spectre of domestic repression. But in a country with a First Amendment, no suppression from government is likely, and in the citadels of the media and the academy, the far left is actually vastly over-represented. The real issue, as pointed out this week by Britain's Labour prime minister, is that some on the left have expressed "a hatred of America that shames those that feel it."

The left's howls of anguish are therefore essentially phony—and they stem from a growing realization that this crisis has largely destroyed the credibility of the far left. Forced to choose between the West and the Taliban, the hard left simply cannot decide. Far from concealing this ideological bankruptcy, we need to expose it and condemn it as widely and as irrevocably as we can. Many liberals are already listening and watching—and the tectonic plates of politics are shifting as they do.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COBRA COVERAGE ACT OF 2001

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of a piece of legislation that I believe is an essential component of our efforts to help those affected by the attacks of September 11th. My bill, the COBRA Coverage Act of 2001, will provide a 50 percent tax credit toward COBRA coverage for laid-off workers. I believe this is the best way for us to ensure that the thousands of Americans recently laid-off do not go without health insurance.

Under current law, commonly referred to as COBRA, workers who are laid off are allowed to remain in their employer-based health insurance plan for up to 18 months, provided they pay the full premium for the plan (their share plus the employer share) plus a small administrative fee. The problem is, the full premium for employment-based coverage averages almost \$2,500 per year for self-only coverage and about \$6,500 per year for family coverage.

Since COBRA coverage is very expensive, many laid-off workers let their insurance lapse, gambling that they won't get sick or injured before they find another job. We cannot continue to allow so many hard-working Americans and their families to go uninsured. We must find a way to make COBRA coverage more affordable for the thousands of laid-off workers trying to recover from the September 11th attacks.

And my bill does exactly that. The COBRA Coverage Act of 2001 provides continuing health care coverage for laid-off workers at half the price. Under this legislation, laid-off workers would be eligible for a tax credit for 50 percent toward the COBRA coverage premium. The credit would be limited to a maximum of \$110 for an individual and \$290 for a family per month, and would be administered by the employer. This way, workers can receive an immediate benefit and would not have to wait until the end of the year to claim tax credit.

Now, more than ever, we must ensure that American families can afford to remain insured in case of sickness or injury. We must take the lead in ensuring that the thousands of hard-working Americans who have fallen victim to the effects of the September 11th attacks are not set back even further by the lack of health insurance. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to make COBRA coverage more affordable for our laid-off workers.

THE FARM SECURITY ACT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, my office has been contacted by dozens of groups expressing concerns about the Farm Security Act (H.R. 2646). I submit the following letter on their behalf.

OCTOBER 2, 2001.

Dear Representative: The one hundred forty-eight (148) groups listed below, from