



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2001

No. 153

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:00 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

NOVEMBER 7, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable E. CLAY SHAW, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. John S. Reist, Jr., Professor of Christianity and Literature, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan, and Pastor, Somerset Congregational Church, Somerset, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we are grateful for the Members of this House whom we have elected by Your Providence to do Your work.

We ask that You give Your wisdom to this House as they consider and debate.

We request that You grant to them, and through them, to us, the power to choose the right and the will to do the right, not only for us but for all mankind.

We pray that whether in this House or in far-off mountains and trenches or in the skies or the corridors of power, all of us might eventually and finally rejoice that we in our time and in our place will have made out of this present challenging moment a memorable passage toward Your coming kingdom of righteousness and peace.

We pray this in the name of Jesus Christ and for the sake of all humanity. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3061. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3061) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. DEWINE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### EXTENDING A WELCOME TO THE GUEST CHAPLAIN, THE REVEREND DR. JOHN S. REIST, JR.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce our guest chaplain today, and we certainly welcome today's distinguished guest chaplain, my personal pastor, Reverend John Reist, Junior.

Reverend Reist is a great American and a community leader. He has served as a veteran in the Armed Forces. He now combines his duty at the Somerset Congregational Church with his work as a professor of Christianity and literature at Hillsdale College. He has been recognized as teacher of the year, served as academic dean and is now the executive director of the Michigan Association of Scholars. He holds a Ph.D. degree in English from the University of Chicago and has been widely published.

His warmth, his devotion, his humor and understanding make him an outstanding counselor to his congregants

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7855

and his students. These qualities have led to a doubling of our congregation in the 3 years since he came to our church.

Reverend Reist is distinguished by his love for his family, his church and his college, and his ability to motivate and cultivate those around him. I am proud to welcome him here today as our guest chaplain.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

---

#### SALUTE TO THE WORLD SERIES PLAYERS, ARIZONA DIAMOND- BACKS AND NEW YORK YANKEES

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this is a trying time in our history. Questions of great moment confront this House, and yet precisely because this is a time of national need, it is entirely appropriate that we focus likewise on our national pastime because the recently completed World Series offers to millions of Americans more than just diversion and amusement. It offers again reinforcement of the positive characteristics of teamwork and rising to the task when the chips are down.

As one who is honored to represent the great State of Arizona, I come to this well today to salute the new world champion Arizona Diamondbacks. Randy Johnson, Curt Schilling, absolutely thrilling on the mound. Quite rationally and reasonably co-Most Valuable Players in the series.

I salute likewise the American League Champions New York Yankees because it is a simple notion in sports, to be the best, you have to beat the best, and that is what the Diamondbacks accomplished as a team.

So we salute the D-backs as World Champs. We salute the Yankees, and let us get back to work on behalf of the American people.

---

#### GAO EMPLOYEES EPITOMIZE PROFESSIONALISM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of all of the Members of the House. It is not every day that Members of the House and their staffs have to evacuate their congressional offices due to an unseen but potentially lethal health hazard. In fact, as all of us know, it was unprecedented.

Today, on behalf of all of my colleagues, I want to express my sincere thanks to David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States,

and all the dedicated employees of the General Accounting Office who were relocated or otherwise inconvenienced to accommodate Members and their staffs while House office buildings underwent precautionary testing for anthrax.

Those employees' graciousness and patience demonstrated their teamwork and the fact that their important work was uninterrupted when thousands, I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, thousands of us descended on GAO headquarters, is a tribute to their professionalism and to their Americanism. It also reinforced our American ethic that, working together, there is little that we cannot do.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire House, I thank David Walker, all of the employees at GAO for their cooperation, their graciousness and their facilitation of the business of America.

---

#### NATIONAL HISPANIC SCIENCE NETWORK

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the National Hispanic Science Network on Drug Abuse is holding its first annual conference on Hispanic Drug Abuse Research this weekend here in Washington, D.C.

The mission of the National Hispanic Science Network is to foster biomedical research on drug abuse among Hispanics and to facilitate its application to public health.

This conference will share its findings with prominent investigators affiliated with the universities from across the Nation. Also in attendance will be representatives from national research policy organizations and representatives from the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

The National Hispanic Science Network is working toward reducing health disparities between Hispanics and other populations. This group is committed to involving Hispanic scientists in federally supported research through mentoring, training, networking and technical assistance opportunities.

Please join me in congratulating the National Hispanic Science Network on Drug Abuse for its dedication in assisting Hispanics through research and education.

---

#### FORTRESS AMERICA

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to confront the double message we have sent the American people in the wake of the tragedy of September 11.

On one hand, we exhort Americans to travel, spend money, go out on the

town and help revive the sagging economy. On the other hand, when they come to the Nation's Capitol, they find it closed, locked and off limits.

What kind of example are we setting for America's museum of democracy? Is ours a government of by and for the people or a government that lives behind heavily guarded, closed doors?

When Americans come to Washington, D.C., they get the same dreary refrain at the White House, the FBI and the Supreme Court: Closed to the public. When they come to the House of Representatives they find their Member of Congress can no longer provide a guided tour of the storied corridors, the Capitol dome or the old Senate Chamber. Instead our visitors are sent for 10 minutes to sit by themselves in the gallery.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who say we need a Capitol littered with jersey barriers, ugly fences and awful planters so we can feel safe in our fortress, but I say we should not let security concerns rob us of the freedom to participate in and petition the government. If terrorists can wander all the way to the Capitol without being discovered, we really are in desperate straits.

Mr. Speaker, when will you give the American people back their Nation's Capitol?

---

#### HUMAN CLONING

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, time is running out for us to stop mad scientists from cloning innocent human beings.

Infamous fertility specialist Severino Antinori is working with a team of scientists right now to clone humans. He recently told the BBC radio, and I quote, I think in 3 or 4 months we will have the first pregnancy. Asked whether he would have a cloned human being by September 2002, he said, I hope and I believe.

Columnist Charles Krauthammer is one of the many calling on the Senate to pass a human cloning ban. He recently said, and I quote, "Sanity and prudence combined to produce a great victory on July 31 when the House of Representatives overwhelmingly defeated—the margin was over 100 votes—the legalization of early human embryonic cloning. But the fight is not over. The Senate needs to act as well."

Our government, Mr. Speaker, cannot sit idly by as unethical scientists play God and redefine what it means to be a human. We cannot allow this violation of human rights, this crime against humanity, to take place on our watch.

We need a cloning ban and we need it now.

---

#### AMERICA'S GREATEST PASTIME

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, baseball will eliminate two teams. Some surprise. Tickets average 50 bucks. A program is \$10; popcorn, \$5; parking, \$20. A hot dog and a beer cost about \$10 to \$12 at most stadiums. Beam me up. The umpire said, "Play ball," not "monopoly."

When a family of four needs a second mortgage to go see a baseball game in America, it does not take Dr. Ruth to explain to major league baseball what has gone wrong. I yield back what is left of America's great pastime after the greatest World Series perhaps in our history.

#### STIMULUS PACKAGE FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over in the Senate, the majority leader said of our stimulus package it is not a front-burner issue as other legislation is, particularly government spending.

On behalf of the nearly 7.7 million unemployed Americans, that is just plain wrong. These people know that bills do not stop coming just because someone stops working. These people need relief and they need it now.

We need to give our economy a much-needed boost. Giving people the kind of economic security with more money will do just that.

The House-passed tax bill will give the average family of four approximately 944 more dollars every year. That is nearly \$1,000 to pay off credit, school, charity or save for retirement. That is a car payment, insurance and gas for a month.

TOM DASCHLE was wrong. To the 700,000 who filed for unemployment last month alone, economic security is a front-burner issue. I urge the Senate majority leader to think about the 7.7 million unemployed and make economic security a front-burner issue.

□ 1015

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Members are reminded they should not mention the remarks of Members of or quote from the other body.

#### SUPPORT TRAVEL AMERICA NOW ACT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to address the devastating impact the terrorist attacks

have had on our travel and tourism industry, which is vital to America and to Rhode Island.

Last year, this industry attracted over 15 million visitors and generated over \$3.2 billion in Rhode Island and nearly \$600 billion nationwide. It employs 61,000 Rhode Islanders and more than 19 million people across the country.

The Travel America Now Act, sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), encourages Americans to resume travel and provides targeted tax relief to businesses and consumers.

We reacted quickly to help the airlines. Now Congress must do the same for the millions of businesses and people who are indirectly affected by the attacks and are in equal need of assistance. Not only will this bill strengthen the travel and tourism industry but also the American spirit.

#### SUPPORT TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the workers, farmers, and entrepreneurs of my State whose families are supported by exports from Illinois. Together, they exported more than \$32 billion in goods and services to some 208 foreign countries last year.

It is important to realize that these individuals not only are helping to keep our State's and Nation's economy rolling, they are sharing America's best with the world. Numbering more than 400,000, these workers expect their government to do everything in its power to protect their markets and new opportunities.

Unfortunately, America's trade negotiators lack the one essential tool, trade promotion authority, or TPA, that they need to make the deals that eliminate barriers to trade and open doors to new marketplaces.

Make no mistake, our foreign competitors have this authority and they use it to their advantage. Of the more than 130 free trade agreements in force today, the U.S. is party to just three. If this were the military, we would be charged as AWOL.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let our exporting companies and their workers down. Let us pass H.R. 3005.

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO PASS HATE CRIME LEGISLATION

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, since the tragedy of September 11, young children are being spit on, called names, harassed, and hurt because they are Muslim or they look like they might be Muslim.

State governments and local police need the tools to fight and prosecute these hate crimes. We must elevate the status of hate crimes within Federal law to ensure that the punishment fits the seriousness of the crime.

We must set an example for young people that we do not tolerate hate; that they are protected; and that they can feel safe and they will be secure. Now is the time to pass hate crime legislation.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD BAN CLONING

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a month ago, a Dr. Zavos of Cyprus announced that he expected to be able to create a cloned human being within 3 or 4 months. That means 2 or 3 months from now.

Mr. Speaker, cloning human beings is wrong. Cloning human beings is immoral. Any scientist who intends to clone a human being should be stopped. The scientific community says so, the American people say so, and earlier this year, the House of Representatives said so.

The few scientists who promote cloning call it progress. Well, I want to remind my colleagues that years ago Adolf Hitler employed the science of eugenics and also called it progress. The Nazis wanted to create a race of German supermen, the way dog breeders try to breed championship dogs. That was wrong. It was stopped, and it has not been tried again.

Now we have a few rogue scientists trying to clone human beings. We cannot stop Dr. Zavos, only the Government of Cyprus can do that, but we can stop the scientists in this country who are trying to do the same thing.

The other body needs to bring this bill up for a vote before it is too late.

#### ECOTERRORISM

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the ongoing war that America is waging against terrorism in Afghanistan, we continue to face ecological terrorist attacks right here at home.

Just last month, ecoterrorists used timed fire bombs to attack and destroy a Federal facility near the California-Nevada border in order to protest Federal efforts to round up and control excess wild horses.

Ecoterrorism, Mr. Speaker, continues to grow as Web sites teach disciples how to manufacture and use these fire bombs. These deadly terrorist attacks, like Ted Kaczynski's, have already killed or wounded American citizens and destroyed millions of dollars of public and private property.

Although the national media has virtually ignored this issue, the American

people are forced to deal with its very real consequences. We must prove by our actions that we know how to deal with this deadly terrorism; and we must show that regardless of its source, target, or motive, it will be eliminated.

As the President has said, we must eliminate all terrorist cells at home and abroad by exposing them and those who harbor and support them until our Nation is rid of this growing evil.

#### TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, leadership is only proven through action. And time after time in its history, the United States has proven itself a leader. But as we lead the world in an effort to eradicate terrorism, we risk advocating our position of leadership in an area that is just as vital to America's well-being: international trade. Or spelled another way: jobs.

National security and economic security are not mutually exclusively. With more than 130 preferential trade agreements in the world today, shockingly, shockingly, the United States is a party to only three.

This disparity has real consequences for us at home. American workers, manufacturers, and producers are losing markets for their products and income for their families. For their sake, we must take action to turn this around.

Fortunately, Congress does have a chance to pick up the mantle of leadership once again by passing trade promotion authority. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting America's leadership role in the world by supporting TPA.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD BAN CLONING

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, science is a wonderful thing. Who would have thought a couple of generations ago that a man would go to the Moon, or we would have a vaccine for polio. The work our scientists do in labs have brought great things into the world. But we have also learned that just because something is possible does not mean we should do it. Science has to be governed by morality.

The cloning of human beings is a case in point. Just because we can clone a human being, does not mean we should. Experimenting with human life is wrong. Cloning human lives, whether for experiments or reproduction, is a line we simply should not cross.

Earlier this year, the House voted overwhelmingly to make it illegal; but until the other body brings it up for a vote, that ban cannot become law. We

are in a race with time. Our colleagues in the other body must bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible.

We need to get this bill to the President's desk before it is too late.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD BAN CLONING

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, after decades of Christian education and religious study, there are two things that I know for sure: number one, there is a God; and number two, I am not Him. The entire debate over human cloning flies in the face of these two great truths.

Many Americans learned, after this institution banned human cloning earlier this year, that we are truly close to this moral horror, a horror that uses bad science, science that went through 277 deeply mutilated animals before Dolly the sheep was conceived and birthed successfully.

It is unthinkable that we would not act on this House's call to ban human cloning; that we would not respond to the President's thoughtful message to the world in August that we must think deeply, we must legislate thoughtfully along the fault lines of religion, morality, and technology.

I urge our colleagues in the other body to move and to move now on banning human cloning in the United States of America.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are instructed not to urge action through the other body.

#### BAN HUMAN CLONING

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we stand at the threshold of discovery. However, there is a line that science must not cross.

Human cloning threatens the physical identity of people, it violates their rights, and it demeans their unique individuality. In fact, even most scientists admit that most attempts to clone would end in failure. By allowing this practice, we are condoning mass creation and the destruction of human life.

The truth is, we do not know what all the consequences of cloning a person really are. But we do know that cloning raises serious ethical and moral questions. The excuse of advancing science is not really worth the risk in this case.

Time is of the essence. Scientists say that cloned human babies could be born next year. Earlier this year, the

House passed a vote to ban human cloning in the United States. I urge my colleagues in the other body to follow along and to vote to ban human cloning.

We must respect life or risk reaching a moral point of no return.

#### HONOR FALLEN HEROES OF NEW YORK

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 2001, firefighters from around the world will gather in New York City to honor the memories of the 344 emergency service personnel who lost their lives on September 11.

I am proud to note that my hometown of Spokane, Washington, will be represented by more than 50 firefighters who will pay their own way to stand with their brethren at this memorial service. To put New York's loss in perspective, the city lost as many firefighters in a day as Spokane has in its entire department.

As we honor those who have passed, we may also look to those who have survived. We in the House unanimously passed a Victims Tax Relief Act, the HEROS Act, which provides relief from Federal education loans to surviving families, and legislation expediting Federal payments to the survivors of public safety officers. We should also honor the fallen heroes of New York by strengthening our public safety programs.

As a member of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, which has done so much to educate Members on these issues, I support legislation introduced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) which would allow Good Samaritans to donate equipment to fire departments.

Federal resources are also important. Last year, we provided \$100 million in grant equipment, and I support additional funding this year. I commend the service of firefighters and am proud to acknowledge the efforts of those serving the Spokane community and all of eastern Washington.

#### SUPPORT ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, last week we passed an economic stimulus bill to bolster our economy and stop the hemorrhaging of jobs that is going on around our Nation. Thousands of residents of North Carolina's eighth district have lost their jobs, especially in textiles and other manufacturing plants.

Given the current state of the economy, one would think passing this legislation would be one of the top priorities of Congress. But, Mr. Speaker, we

read that the Senate majority leader thinks that a bill to save jobs is not a front-burner issue.

□ 1030

Needless to say, we have different priorities. Getting Americans back to work and creating more jobs is a front-burner issue with me, and I hope it is a front-burner issue with a majority of Members of Congress. It is imperative that we act now so the President can sign this bill and we can get our economy moving forward once again.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2506, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002**

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2506) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KOLBE, CALLAHAN, KNOLLENBERG, KINGSTON, LEWIS of California, WICKER, BONILLA, SUNUNU, YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACKSON of ILLINOIS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciated the indulgence of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year when we considered this appropriation on the House floor. We engaged then in a colloquy regarding the importance of funding for the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Environment and Urban Programs.

I believe this is one of the important non-military components of the war on terrorism. When Secretary of State Powell appeared before our International Relations Committee late last month, he and I shared an exchange regarding the importance of investing in infrastructure, human capital, and entry-level industries in the urbanized regions of the developing world. As someone whose public service has focused on livable communities in the United States, I've been increasingly concerned about the urgent international implications.

The cities of our world are already overwhelmed by human needs and economic instability. Today, 30 percent of urban residents throughout the world lack access to safe drinking water; waterborne disease kills 5–12 million people each year; 50 per cent do not have adequate sanitation facilities. These conditions are getting worse by the day. Within the next 25 years, 2.5 billion more people will move to cities throughout the world; 95 percent of this movement will occur in developing nations. Here, the poverty, malnutrition, and

chronic diseases of rural areas will become focused in new "mega-cities" of 10–20 million people, creating an even greater strain on natural resources, human health, economic well-being—and the stability—of these nations and the entire world.

This dangerous trend has not gone unnoticed. In its Outlook 2015 Report, the CIA ranked rapid urbanization as one of its top seven security concerns. "The explosive growth of cities in the developing countries," the report concludes, "will test the capacity of governments to stimulate the investment required to generate jobs, and provide the services, infrastructure, and social supports necessary to sustain livable and stable environments. Cities will be sources of crime and instability as ethnic and religious differences exacerbate the competition for ever scarcer jobs and resources."

Foreign assistance programs are critically important if cities in developing nations are to meet the demands of their rapidly growing populations. We need to help them build the capacity to provide basic infrastructure needs, promote economic growth, reduce environmental degradation, and improve health services for their residents. Programs that focus on not only the symptoms but also the causes of growing poverty and social unrest are our best defense against increasing human misery and global instability.

It is clear that we need additional resources to enable the U.S. Agency for International Development to address these challenges. Last year, its Office of Environment and Urban Programs operated on a budget of \$4 million—the cost of four cruise missiles—down from an \$8 million budget in 1993. This steady pattern of disinvestment, which continues into this fiscal year, is dangerously eroding our ability to address urban problems just as they are becoming more critical to our own national security.

Increased funding for the Office of Environment and Urban Programs would permit AID to build on its past successes and would encourage and strengthen the involvement of our public and private sector partners in these critical activities.

I have asked Secretary Powell to provide information from AID identifying the role cities will play in economic, security, and social development issues and its intended response to the growing urban crises, including a description of current funding and staffing levels as well as projected future needs.

I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman KOLBE's Subcommittee, and with my own Committee, the House International Relations Committee to strengthen funding for this vital purpose. AID allocates resources internally to its Office of Environment and Urban Programs. I hope its funding will be considerably higher for FY02 than the \$4 million it was given in FY01.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put two of the questions on which further proceedings were postponed yesterday in the following order:

H.R. 2998 by the yeas and nays, and  
H.R. 852 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote in this series.

**RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN ACT OF 2001**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2998, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2998, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Cooksey	Graves
Ackerman	Costello	Green (TX)
Aderholt	Cox	Green (WI)
Akin	Coyne	Greenwood
Allen	Cramer	Grucci
Andrews	Crenshaw	Gutierrez
Armey	Crowley	Gutknecht
Baca	Culberson	Hall (OH)
Bachus	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Baird	Cunningham	Hansen
Baker	Davis (CA)	Harman
Baldacci	Davis (FL)	Hart
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Barrett	Deal	Hayworth
Bartlett	DeFazio	Hefley
Bass	DeGette	Heger
Becerra	Delahunt	Hill
Bentsen	DeLauro	Hilleary
Bereuter	DeMint	Hilliard
Berkley	Deutsch	Hinchee
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Berry	Dicks	Hobson
Biggert	Dingell	Hoefel
Billirakis	Doggett	Hoekstra
Bishop	Dooley	Holden
Blagojevich	Doolittle	Holt
Blumenuaich	Doyle	Honda
Blunt	Dreier	Hoolley
Boehlert	Duncan	Horn
Boehner	Dunn	Hostettler
Bonilla	Edwards	Houghton
Bonior	Ehlers	Hoyer
Bono	Emerson	Hulshof
Borski	English	Hunter
Boswell	Eshoo	Hyde
Boucher	Etheridge	Inslee
Boyd	Evans	Isakson
Brady (PA)	Everett	Israel
Brady (TX)	Farr	Issa
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Istook
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Jackson (IL)
Bryant	Filner	Jefferson
Burr	Flake	Jenkins
Buyer	Foley	John
Callahan	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Ford	Johnson (IL)
Camp	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Cannon	Frank	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Jones (NC)
Capito	Frost	Kaptur
Capps	Gallegly	Keller
Capuano	Ganske	Kelly
Cardin	Gekas	Kennedy (MN)
Carson (IN)	Gephardt	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (OK)	Gibbons	Kerns
Castle	Gilchrest	Kildee
Chabot	Gillmor	Kind (WI)
Chambliss	Gilman	King (NY)
Clay	Gonzalez	Kingston
Clayton	Goode	Kirk
Clement	Goodlatte	Kleczka
Clyburn	Gordon	Knollenberg
Coble	Goss	Kolbe
Combest	Graham	Kucinich
Condit	Granger	LaFalce

LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver

## NAYS—2

Collins

Paul

## NOT VOTING—25

Ballenger  
Barton  
Brown (OH)  
Burton  
Conyers  
Crane  
Cubin  
DeLay  
Ehrlich

Engel  
Fletcher  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kilpatrick  
Lofgren  
Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)  
Moran (VA)  
Pallone  
Roybal-Allard  
Sessions  
Strickland  
Sweeney  
Young (AK)

□ 1055

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, due to a scheduling conflict on the morning of November 7, I was not present for rollcall vote

429, on H.R. 2998, to authorize the establishment of Radio Free Afghanistan. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 429, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed rollcall vote No. 429. If I had not missed rollcall vote No. 429, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on this next question.

NATHANIEL R. JONES AND FRANK  
J. BATTISTI FEDERAL BUILDING  
AND UNITED STATES COURT-  
HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 852.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 852, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (SC)

Bryant  
Burr  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette

Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dingert  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez

Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lowey

Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (CA)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema

Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster

Schiff  
Schroder  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—22

Ballenger  
Brown (OH)  
Burton  
Conyers

Cubin  
DeLay  
Engel  
Fletcher

Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jones (OH)  
Kilpatrick

Lofgren  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)

Moran (VA)  
Myrick  
Pallone  
Sessions

Strickland  
Sweeney  
Young (AK)

□ 1105

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 430, I was unavoidably detained in my District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 429 and 430, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both measures.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 278) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 278

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts, to rank after Mr. Clay of Missouri; and

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts, to rank after Mr. Rodriguez of Texas; and Ms. Davis of California, to rank after Mr. Udall of New Mexico.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3167, GERALD B. H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 277 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of

debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; (2) a further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII, if offered by Representative Lantos of California or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a modified closed rule for consideration of the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule provides for consideration of only the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial rule for a noncontroversial, but important, bill. The Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act endorses the work of President Bush and President Clinton to expand NATO into Eastern Europe. It also authorizes military assistance to seven potential NATO members.

Mr. Speaker, during its markup of this measure, the Committee on International Relations passed one amendment, an amendment to name H.R. 3167 after our former Committee on Rules chairman, Gerald Solomon. Chairman Solomon, who passed away the week before last, was a dear friend to all of us on the Committee on Rules, and he and Mr. Moakley, who, unfortunately, passed away earlier this year, were quite a pair together. They disagreed often, but they always did it as gentlemen and they always did it with a great deal of humor, and quite frankly, all of us miss them a lot.

While he was a Member, Chairman Solomon was also a strong advocate for

NATO. Indeed, during his last year on the Hill, he even published a book about NATO expansion. It is fitting, therefore, that we honor Mr. Solomon with this bill today.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified closed rule. It will allow for the consideration of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

As my colleague from North Carolina has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. This rule will permit a Democratic substitute, if offered by the committee's ranking minority member. No other amendments may be offered from the House floor.

The bill expresses the support of Congress for expanding the number of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It recognizes the importance of admitting seven specific nations in Central and Eastern Europe. This legislation is in keeping with the vision expressed by both President Clinton and President Bush.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sadness at the loss of former House Member and Committee on Rules chairman Jerry Solomon, who died last month of heart failure. Jerry and I often found ourselves on different sides of the issue, but we were fully united in our respect for the House of Representatives and our role in leading the Nation.

Jerry was a man of honor and integrity. He spoke his heart and he stood up for his beliefs without hesitation. It is fitting that this bill is named in his memory.

With that, I urge the adoption of the rule and of the underlying.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Charlotte for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate her, as well as I see my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) here, the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is in the Chamber. I wanted to congratulate them.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his statement. I see the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERREUTER) is here. I tried to mention just about everybody in the Chamber. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is right behind him.

I do not want to see any other Members, so I can make my points here.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. Both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) made it clear it is a fitting tribute to my predecessor, Jerry Solomon. We continue to mourn his passing and extend our condolences to Freda and his wonderful family.

We know that Jerry Solomon was, as was stated so eloquently in the tributes that were given at his funeral last week, a real fighter, and I considered him to be a fighter with a heart, because he was one who stood firmly for principle, but had a great warmth and kindness to him as well.

□ 1115

He fought as hard as anyone to expand the cause of freedom throughout the world. I should say parenthetically that I had the privilege of joining my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), for a delegation that observed one of the freest and fairest elections that I have had the opportunity to observe in the many years that I have been able to serve here in the Congress and visit elections around the world; and this election took place in Nicaragua just this past weekend. We saw the people of Nicaragua overwhelmingly state their preference, and I should say that I am very gratified that they came out on the side of freedom and self-determination, and it is something that would have made Jerry Solomon very proud. That was in this hemisphere.

The legislation that we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker, is focused on the very important North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance which, as we all know, has been critically important to many of the national security and foreign policy successes that we have had around the world.

Mr. Solomon wrote a very thoughtful volume on the importance of NATO expansion, and I believe that that is one of the major reasons that his name is very appropriately tied to this legislation. As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) said, the prospect of the expansion of these seven countries into the NATO alliance is something that I believe is on the horizon, and I believe that we need to encourage it. I should say that President Bush is a strong proponent of NATO expansion and has made that clear in more than a few addresses and in his policy proposals.

So I think that we have done the right thing here in paying tribute to our dear friend, Jerry Solomon. I will continue to miss him every day. I am

happy to say that there is a spectacular portrait of Mr. Solomon that is in the Committee on Rules and, I would invite any of our colleagues who would like to come by and take a look at that portrait if you have not testified before the Committee on Rules lately to come and visit us there and to know that when we overwhelmingly pass this rule and the legislation itself, it will be a great tribute that we can provide to this wonderful man.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at this time. I could have some requests, so I would ask the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) to go ahead with her speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time and for her service, of course, on the Committee on Rules as well.

Mr. Speaker, as we continue to defend democracy and freedom, which is what this Nation is about today, and the battle in the war against terrorism within our own borders, it is important to remember that we are not alone. We are not the only country that upholds the ideals that we are fighting for. Our friends and allies in the NATO alliance have helped us to defend democracy across the Atlantic and beyond in so many ways and for so many years during the Cold War. We now have the opportunity to expand our NATO alliance and allow new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and other areas to join in the defense of freedom, something we all care greatly about.

This legislation outlines and reaffirms congressional support for further enlargement of NATO as expressed in statements by President Bush and former President Clinton. It does not call for the admission of any specific country to NATO, but is supported by the candidates of all contenders which meet the criteria outlined by the current NATO members. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Baltics, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania are keenly interested, I know from personal experience, and there are others.

In addition, the Solomon Act authorizes funding for military assistance for each candidate in accordance with administration requests for 2002. In other words, we are together on this here on the Hill and downtown. The modest cost of this assistance is a very small price to pay for the potential of gaining long-term allies in a formalized way in this critical region of the world. As a member of the House of Representatives delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I have been privileged to see firsthand how the expansion of NATO is a lot more than about just the falling of the last rem-

nants of ice from the old Cold War. The fact is, just a dozen or so years ago, many of these nations we are talking about were part of a Warsaw Pact that was pledged to destroy NATO. Think about that. Now, these nations are vying for a relationship of mutual protection with the West.

As we move through these uncertain times, it is of great importance, of course, that we cultivate the strongest ties possible with all of the nations of Europe. NATO expansion, under membership guidelines and procedures already agreed upon, will help the United States achieve this very, very important goal.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly count the number of hours, meetings, trips, speeches, reports, or personnel we have talked to and invested in the question of NATO expansion. In all of this, Jerry Solomon, his vision, his leadership, showed the way; and he made the case very forcefully. He even made the case in Moscow that someday Russia will join NATO, and I have no doubt to believe that.

This legislation will send a strong and welcome signal. People do pay attention to what this Congress does, and now is the time to gear up for the expansion in NATO that will be discussed one year from now in Prague. I urge support for this legislation. It really does matter.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). As chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, we rely on him a lot for his expertise in this area, and it is quite evident that he has been involved in this for many, many years. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, but in opposition to the underlying legislation. Let me take a moment to salute Jerry Solomon, who was a dear friend. We will miss Jerry Solomon. It is a pain in our hearts that we will have as someone who meant so much to us and he is no longer with us. I worked so many hours on so many issues over the years with Jerry that I think that no doubt, on both sides of the aisle, he will be dearly missed.

Now let us talk about NATO. NATO will not be missed. NATO has done its job. NATO deserves to pass on, because NATO accomplished its mission and now it deserves to dissolve.

We called on this organization, we created this organization back when there was a major Soviet threat to invade Western Europe. Thus we created NATO in order to deter war, not to waste money, because that money was necessary at the time. But instead, to deter a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. It did its job, and it did its job well.

During the Cold War, it served to stand guard and to deter attack and that attack was deterred; and it saved lives and it helped us come to the end of the Cold War. But the Cold War is over. The price we paid for NATO in the tens of billions of dollars was worth it back then. It is not worth it now.

In fact, what NATO today is is nothing more than a subsidy for the defense of Western Europe and in Europe as a whole. They can afford, our European friends can afford to pay for their own defense now. When NATO was first created, they were coming out of World War II, their economies were in a shambles; and yes, we stepped forward to protect the world against communism, just as we stepped forward to protect the world against Japanese militarism and Nazism. We can be proud of that, and we can be proud of the role NATO played. But today, the purpose NATO was created for has passed away, and the Europeans can afford to pay for their own defense. By staying in NATO, we are going to continually be involved in missions like those in Kosovo and Bosnia, right in our European friends' backyard, and we end up paying a major portion of that battle in Kosovo and Bosnia. That makes no sense.

Our European friends are richer than we are. The European governments have many, many more services for their people than we have for our own people, because we are spending that money trying to police the world. By keeping NATO going, it just reinforces that policy that the United States is going to be the policeman of the world.

Furthermore, by expanding NATO the way this bill is proposing, we are slapping Russia in the face. Come on. Come on, now. NATO was established to counter the Soviet Union, and now the Russians have done what we always wanted them to do: cast off this dictatorship. And what do we do? We try to expand this military alliance right into their front yard. That is wrong.

Russia has disbanded the Warsaw Pact; it is trying to be democratic. President Putin is making efforts. In fact, he was the first one to call President Bush to offer his help when America was attacked on September 11. We should not be putting that type of pressure on a democratic Russia. We should, instead, be reinforcing that we are their friends and no longer consider Russia a threat. If Russia ever goes back to its old ways, we can reconfigure that. I would just say NATO is not helping us as much as they should in this current crisis, so why should we continue subsidizing our European friends.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we have here a satellite photograph of a section of the Euro mountains in Russia called Yamantau

Mountain. Here is Yamantau Mountain. Just south of Yamantau Mountain are two cities, two closed cities, by the way; and they house about 60,000 people that do nothing but work on Yamantau Mountain.

Now, Yamantau Mountain is the largest, deepest, nuclear secure facility in the world. The Soviets and now the Russians have spent about \$6 billion on Yamantau Mountain. We have had two defectors from Yamantau Mountain; and with what they have told us, we know roughly what is down there. It is enormous, about the size of inside our Beltway with railroad tracks running in opposite directions and enormous rooms carved out of the rock.

Again, it is the most nuclear secure facility in the world. The Russians will not tell us why they are doing it. They have just ramped up activity there. They have built accoutrements there that they do not have in their other cities, tennis courts and so forth. They cannot pay their military. They cannot afford \$200 million for the service module of the space station, but this is important enough to them that they keep pouring millions and millions and millions of dollars into it, \$6 billion currently. Its only use is either during or postnuclear war.

Now, I ask my colleagues, why would Russia do this? When they have all of these needs in their society, why would they pour all of this money into Yamantau Mountain? What I am told is, they are paranoid. They do not believe we are their friends. They are planning for a nuclear war. They apparently believe that it is inevitable and winnable, and they are going to win it with this kind of preparation. We have no idea what they are going to do there, but we know that they are building and spending a lot of money on it.

Now, my question is, why at this time in history would we want to feed Russia's paranoia? Why would we want to enlarge NATO right up to their borders? NATO they perceive as a threat to them. For the first time in its history, we used them as an aggressive power in Kosovo.

□ 1130

If we want a friendship society, a goodwill society, in Europe, please, Mr. Speaker, call it something else. Do not call it NATO. NATO is very threatening to the Russians. It was set up to counter the Warsaw Pact. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) said it did its job. It was very successful. The Warsaw Pact does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very unwise political move. I cannot understand how we could perceive that it is in our national security interest to enlarge NATO and feed the paranoia of the Russians when they continue to pour money into things like Yamantau Mountain.

This is not a good bill. I support the rule; I vigorously oppose the underlying bill.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. The rule is noncontroversial, but the bill itself, the bill to expand NATO and the foreign aid involved in it, is controversial from my viewpoint. It may not be controversial here in Washington, but if we go outside of Washington and talk to the people who pay the bills and the people who have to send the troops, they find this controversial. They think we are taken for saps as we go over and extend our sphere of influence throughout the world, and now extending into Eastern Europe.

I, too, was a friend of Jerry Solomon. We came into the Congress together in 1978. One thing for sure that Jerry understood very clearly was the care that we must give to expanding our influence as well as sacrificing our sovereignty, because he was strongly opposed to the United Nations.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, he would permit my amendment to come up and at least debate the effectiveness of belonging to the United Nations, so I have fond memories of Jerry, especially in his support of my efforts to try to diminish the United Nations' influence and the taking away of our sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, this is one reason why I do oppose NATO. I believe that it has a bad influence on what we do. We want to extend our control over Eastern Europe, and as has been pointed out, this can be seen as a threat to the Russians.

NATO does not have a good record since the fall of the Soviets. Take a look at what we were doing in Serbia. Serbia has been our friend. They are a Christian nation. We allied ourselves with the KLA, the Kosovo Muslims, who have been friends with Osama bin Laden. We went in there and illegally, NATO illegally, against their own rules of NATO, incessantly bombed Serbia. They had not attacked another country. They had a civil war going on, yet we supported that with our money and our bombs and our troops, and now we are nation-building over there. We may be over there for another 20 years because of the bad policy of NATO that we went along with.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop and think about this, and instead of expanding NATO, instead of getting ready to send another \$55 million that we are authorizing today to the Eastern European countries, we ought to ask: Has it really served the interests of the United States?

Now that is old-fashioned, to talk about the interests of the United States. We are supposed to only talk about the interests of internationalism, globalism, one-world government. To talk about the interests of

the United States in this city is seen as being very negative, but I would say if we talk about U.S. security, security of the United States of America and our defense around the country, it is very popular.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Seventh District of Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), our deputy whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the bill, and I particularly appreciate the fact that this bill has been designated to honor our good friend, Jerry Solomon, who represented us so well in the association of NATO parliamentarians and who had made so many friends for America around the world, and particularly with our NATO allies.

There is no question that NATO has been the most successful alliance in history. I would not want to revisit all of the issues of our policies in Eastern Europe today, but I think if we look back at who was following whose lead in what we did the last couple of years, it might not have been us following NATO as much as NATO following us on policies that were vigorously debated here on this floor.

That is not what this bill is about. This bill is about whether we continue to open the doors of NATO to nations that meet the standards that NATO set, nations that add to the common defense of NATO, nations that so much want to be on this side of the curtain of freedom, if the curtain of freedom ever comes down again.

Recently, at the NATO parliament meeting in Lithuania, those of us who represented the House of Representatives there saw people come out who remembered clearly not only what it had been like to live under the Soviet Union, but remembered what it had been like to be dominated by the Nazis; people who did not want to have that ever happen again; people who were desperate, because if they had not been in a concentration camp or sent out of the country, they knew somebody in their family that had.

Person after person, group after group, came chanting NATO, NATO, NATO, with a sense of desperation; that if the line of freedom is ever drawn again, they know which side of that line of freedom they want to be on.

This does not mean that the line of freedom has to end at the Russian border. In fact, meeting the right circumstance, the line of freedom can extend, but it does mean that those countries that are striving to meet the standards that NATO set, those countries that are striving to meet the standards that NATO set for membership that can add to the common defense, that are democracies today and want to ensure that democracy can best ensure that democracy by joining this family of nations and being part of

NATO, by being part of the NATO parliament, by being part of the NATO defense structure.

This is hugely important to the countries mentioned. All of them are not included in NATO as a result of anything we do, but we are just making the point again that that door is open to peace-loving people, freedom-loving people, people who honor democracy, and these countries are among those.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for his historical perspective on what has happened with NATO over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the author of this legislation.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to follow the articulate statement offered by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). He spelled out, I think in some detail, why NATO continues to be very important to the democracies of Western Europe and to the United States and Canada, as well.

Indeed, in Lithuania, we saw graphic examples and heard from people on the streets, at high levels of government and the people in the booths selling things to us why NATO was so important, why they do not want to come under totalitarianism again.

In fact, I think there is strong bipartisan support for the continuation of NATO. The dissident voices we heard here today are certainly appropriate in a democracy, but I think they do not reflect the bipartisan recognition that NATO has been important, it is important today, and it will be important in the future.

There are probably two critical institutions in Europe today which help ensure that this security umbrella will be over the nations of the former Warsaw Pact in Central and Eastern Europe and that they will be able to continue their movement towards democracy and a full array of human rights. They are, first and foremost, NATO; and secondly, the European Union.

As the countries, seven of which are identified for authorization, or reauthorization, in this legislation move towards, or hope to successfully gain, membership in NATO, they are making a number of changes. They are embracing a full array of the features of democracy to meet the criteria for NATO membership, they are providing for transparency in their military budgets, they are providing for civilian control of their military, and they are providing for the kind of interoperability of their defense systems with those of the 19 countries of NATO.

It is on the basis of NATO that we were able to form a coalition that performed so well in the Persian Gulf,

that was brought to bear after we had some failures from the United Nations in certain parts of the Balkans, and which today underlie the coalition which President Bush and the United States have built in our war against terrorism.

It is not by accident that it was the other countries of NATO which provided the first meaningful response to a coalition against terrorism when they invoked Article 5, that meant that when there is an attack on one of its members, in this case from a foreign source on the United States, they said by invoking Article 5, that it is an attack on all of us. So this defensive alliance, 52 years of age, has taken on some new responsibilities for Western democracies and for the United States, in this case in the war against terrorism. It is a critical institution.

As we see the other countries of Eastern and Central Europe attempt to secure EU membership and NATO membership, we should also note that NATO has created the Partnership for Peace program to permit not just these seven countries, but a wider array of countries, even into the former Soviet Union, with an opportunity to eventually move towards full integration with Western institutions and Western democracy through NATO membership.

Indeed, the door is not shut to Russia. In fact, we have provided, through the North Atlantic Council, a special opportunity for Russia to have input into the deliberations of NATO; not anything approaching a veto, for certainly something we would not want to give them.

Mr. Speaker, If we did not have NATO today we would have to create something like it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I not only urge support of the rule, but since time is limited on the debate on the bill itself, I thought it was appropriate to make these remarks here today with respect to the importance of NATO today and into the future.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill appears to be in very good shape. The rule is certainly acceptable to us.

I think it is fitting that we call this bill the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. Mr. Solomon was chairman of the Committee on Rules for the few years in which I served under him. As a Democrat, and he was a Republican, he was tough, he was difficult, but he was a fair man. He never lied. He was a man of integrity. He was a good Representative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for his kind comments about Chairman Solomon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002**

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-273) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**GERALD B. H. SOLOMON FREEDOM CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 2001**

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 277, I call up the bill (H.R. 3167) to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 3167 is as follows:

H.R. 3167

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .".

(2) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to NATO, and declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting

Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance".

(3) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO" and that "Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date".

(4) At the Madrid Summit of the NATO Alliance in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance in the first round of NATO enlargement, and the NATO heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "[t]he Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration".

(5) At the Washington Summit of the NATO Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state and government issued a communique declaring "[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .".

(6) In late 2002, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, the Czech Republic, at which it will decide which additional emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to invite to join the Alliance in the next round of NATO enlargement.

(7) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the next round of NATO enlargement, that the realization of NATO membership by one or more of these countries would be a success for all, and that eventual NATO membership for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and NATO.

(8) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated "[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom".

(9) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated "NATO's doors will not close

behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not re-emerge in Europe".

**SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.**

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the NATO Alliance contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, and the European Security Act of 1998;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the NATO Alliance expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Declaration of 1997 and its Washington Summit Communiqué of 1999; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our NATO allies to work with the United States to realize this vision at the Prague Summit in 2002.

**SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SLOVAKIA TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Slovakia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of Slovakia pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2002 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763)—

(1) \$6,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Estonia;

(2) \$7,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Latvia;

(3) \$7,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Lithuania;

(4) \$8,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovakia;

(5) \$4,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovenia;

(6) \$10,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Bulgaria; and

(7) \$11,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Romania.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 515 of the Security Assistance

Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-280) is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (5), (6), (7), and (8) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (9) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment printed in the bill is considered adopted.

The text of H.R. 3167, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3167

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area should be invited to become full NATO members in accordance with Article 10 of such Treaty at an early date . . .".

(2) In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia to NATO, and declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine . . . the process of enlarging NATO to include emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe should not be limited to consideration of admitting Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia as full members of the NATO Alliance".

(3) In the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), Congress declared that "Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic should not be the last emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe invited to join NATO" and that "Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria . . . would make an outstanding contribution to furthering the goals of NATO and enhancing stability, freedom, and peace in Europe should they become NATO members [and] upon complete satisfaction of all relevant criteria should be invited to become full NATO members at the earliest possible date".

(4) At the Madrid Summit of the NATO Alliance in July 1997, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic were invited to join the Alliance in the first round of NATO enlargement, and the NATO heads of state and government issued a declaration stating "[t]he Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the [North Atlantic] Treaty will be excluded from consideration".

(5) At the Washington Summit of the NATO Alliance in April 1999, the NATO heads of state and government issued a communique declaring "[w]e pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the [North Atlantic] Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area . . . [t]he three new members will not be the last . . . [n]o European democratic country whose admission would fulfill the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location . . .".

(6) In late 2002, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, the Czech Republic, at which it will decide which additional emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe to invite to join the Alliance in the next round of NATO enlargement.

(7) In May 2000 in Vilnius, Lithuania, the foreign ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a statement (later joined by Croatia) declaring that their countries will cooperate in jointly seeking NATO membership in the next round of NATO enlargement, that the realization of NATO membership by one or more of these countries would be a success for all, and that eventual NATO membership for all of these countries would be a success for Europe and NATO.

(8) On June 15, 2001, in a speech in Warsaw, Poland, President George W. Bush stated "[a]ll of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom—and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe—as Europe's old democracies have . . . I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings . . . [a]s we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others . . . [w]e will not trade away the fate of free European peoples . . . [n]o more Munichs . . . [n]o more Yaltas . . . [a]s we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom".

(9) On October 22, 1996, in a speech in Detroit, Michigan, former President William J. Clinton stated "NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members . . . NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership . . . [n]o nation will be automatically excluded . . . [n]o country outside NATO will have a veto . . . [a] gray zone of insecurity must not reemerge in Europe".

**SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.**

Congress—

(1) reaffirms its previous expressions of support for continued enlargement of the NATO Alliance contained in the NATO Participation Act of 1994, the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, and the European Security Act of 1998;

(2) supports the commitment to further enlargement of the NATO Alliance expressed by the Alliance in its Madrid Declaration of 1997 and its Washington Summit Communique of 1999; and

(3) endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and urges our NATO allies to work with the United States to realize this vision at the Prague Summit in 2002.

**SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SLOVAKIA TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Slovakia is designated as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 (title II of Public Law 103-447; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and shall be deemed to have been so designated pursuant to section 203(d)(1) of such Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The designation of Slovakia pursuant to subsection (a) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994—

(1) is in addition to the designation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia pursuant to section 606 of the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996 (title VI of section 101(c) of title I of division A of Public Law 104-208; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) and the designation of Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria pursuant to section 2703(b) of the European Security Act of 1998 (title XXVII of division G of Public Law 105-277; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note) as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994; and

(2) shall not preclude the designation by the President of other emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe pursuant to section 203(d)(2) of the NATO Participation Act of 1994 as eligible to receive assistance under the program established under section 203(a) of such Act.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR COUNTRIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE NATO PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1994.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2002 under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763)—

(1) \$6,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Estonia;

(2) \$7,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Latvia;

(3) \$7,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Lithuania;

(4) \$8,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovakia;

(5) \$4,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Slovenia;

(6) \$10,000,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Bulgaria; and

(7) \$11,500,000 is authorized to be available on a grant basis for Romania.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 515 of the Security Assistance Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-280) is amended by striking paragraphs (1), (5), (6), (7), and (8) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (9) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House of Representatives delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, this Member rises in strong support for H.R. 3167, the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

Indeed, this legislation enjoys the support of Members from the elected leadership on both sides of the aisle, including the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); the House majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR); and the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Additionally, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the ranking minority member of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the chairman emeritus of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); and the chairman of the subcommittee on Europe, the gentleman

from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), are cosponsors of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is also pleased to note that among the cosponsors are many Members of the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, including the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS); the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY); the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER); the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS); the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON); the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Also, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), not a member of the delegation, who has been very active in NATO expansion issue is a cosponsor, as would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), if we had had their names in time.

□ 1145

The measure before this body today outlines and reaffirms congressional support for further expansion of NATO. In addition, the legislation endorses the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance as expressed in statements by former President Bill Clinton and by President George W. Bush.

Further, the bill specifically designates Slovakia to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994, and the President is authorized to designate, as he deems appropriate, other countries as eligible for the assistance under the same program.

Finally, this legislation authorizes foreign military financing for the following leading NATO alliances aspirants. These are not all of the aspirants, but these are the ones that the administration has requested authorization levels for: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania and now Slovakia. These levels that are in the legislation reflect exactly the administration's request.

I think it is important to note that H.R. 3167 does not specifically endorse the candidacies of any countries. It simply endorses expansion, hopefully at the Prague Summit in the year 2002, for those countries which meet the criteria outlined by current NATO members, and they are substantial criteria, not easy to meet. I identified a few of them a few minutes ago in discussing the rule.

On November 1 of this year, the Committee on International Relations considered and passed this legislation, as amended, by voice vote. This Member and the dean of the New York Republican delegation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), offered the sole amendment to the measure during

the committee markup, which redesignated the title as the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act. This amendment was approved, of course, by voice vote in Committee and approved unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, this Member can think of few more fitting legislative memorials to our former distinguished colleague who, through his service in this body and as a long-time member of the House NATO Parliamentary Assembly delegation, consistently championed efforts to strengthen and expand NATO. Indeed, Congressman Solomon wrote a book on it.

I would say also that Members should know that he played a very active role in the Assembly. He served as the chairman of one of the five working committees of the Assembly, the Political Committee, the one that dealt with the most controversial and most comprehensive list of subjects. He also served as the vice president of the Assembly for the maximum 2-year term, and he was proud to be a member of a small delegation that President Clinton took to the Madrid Summit when decisions were made about NATO enlargement to include the countries of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.

Congressman Solomon was unwavering in his belief that the former Warsaw Pact countries, if they meet the NATO criteria, plus others, including some of the new nations springing from the disintegration of Yugoslavia and nations farther to the southeast, should have the opportunity to join the NATO security alliance. He recognized that NATO membership for those countries would be critical in maintaining stability and prosperity for the entire continent and particularly for Eastern Europe. This Member believes that Congressman Solomon would be pleased to know that his vision for an expanded NATO continues to enjoy overwhelming support from this body.

Mr. Speaker, this Member, who once again led a House delegation to the NATO PA spring meeting in Vilnius, Lithuania, this year, was impressed with the grassroots support in Lithuania for NATO membership. In fact, during that trip, this Member asked a street vendor why he displayed a pro-NATO sticker on his cart. The vendor explained that he would never forget how a family member of his had been taken to Siberia by the Soviets and had never returned. Therefore, because of this and very similar incidents affecting thousands of citizens of the three Baltic nations in the early stages of World War II, this vendor said, That is why I am for NATO expansion—so it can never happen again.

He is joined by so many people of the former Warsaw Pact countries who viewed NATO membership, or the prospect for it, as very important to the stability of future freedoms for their citizens.

Without a doubt, NATO has been the most effective collective defense alli-

ance in the history of the world. It has provided collective security to the member nations of Western Europe. Therefore, it is no surprise that many members of the former Warsaw Pact now aspire to such membership. For NATO to continue its expansion is entirely appropriate at this time, as is congressional support for expansion, but of course, expansion only when appropriate criteria are met, when these countries can make a proper contribution to the NATO collective security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3167.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office on H.R. 3167 for printing in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
November 5, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,  
*Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3167, the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Joseph C. Whitehill, who can be reached at 226-2840.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN,  
*Director.*

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE  
H.R. 3167—Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001

H.R. 3167 would reaffirm Congressional support for the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and would increase the amounts of foreign military financing (FMF) earmarked in 2002 for seven Central and Eastern European countries that are potential candidates for NATO membership. The FMF spending is subject to appropriation action. The bill would not increase the total amount authorized for FMF in 2002 under Public Law 106-280, the Security Assistance Act of 2000; therefore, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would not significantly affect discretionary spending. Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 3167 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Joseph C. Whitehill, who can be reached at 226-2840. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset identify myself with all the comments made by my colleagues concerning our late friend, Jerry Solomon. Jerry Solomon was a most distinguished Member of this body and his leadership on the NATO issue simply cannot be overstated.

Let me also commend my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERUTER) whose leadership of the congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly has been extraordinary. He has earned our respect

as the leader of our NATO delegation, and I want to pay public tribute to him.

I also want to acknowledge the contributions to NATO and our participation of the chairman emeritus of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), our current chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has consistently led the way in supporting NATO enlargement and for a strong and robust role for NATO in Europe. One of the most memorable moments in my congressional service was to fly with our former Secretary of State Madeline Albright to Independence, Missouri, with the foreign ministers of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic when we moved to include those three former Communist states, having cleansed themselves of their past as full members of NATO.

NATO is the longest surviving alliance of all time, and it has endured because it is an alliance of free and democratic nations. No country was ever forced to join the alliance by a larger and stronger power, in sharp contrast to the Warsaw Pact where every single member was forced into that pact by the power and might of the Soviet Union. There can be no better endorsement of NATO's success and achievements than the desire of the newly emerging countries of Central and Eastern Europe to join this alliance.

Now, the post-September 11 era, Mr. Speaker, has brought us new realities, and one of them is the critical role that NATO can play in the fight against international terrorism. As a matter of fact, although we did not plan it this way, my friend, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, yesterday in an op-ed in the Washington Post states correctly that NATO has found its new mission, and that mission is to lead the way along with the United States in the global war against international terrorism.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and I were managing the legislation, giving our President whatever powers he needs to wage this war. And while we were here in this Chamber, our NATO allies invoked Article 5 of the NATO Treaty stating, in essence, that the attack on one NATO member is an attack on all members of NATO, and they have given us and will continue to give us their support in every conceivable form.

In this context today, I want to acknowledge the Government of Germany for yesterday making the historic decision of committing German troops to the war in Afghanistan, a historic first for that country.

NATO members, Mr. Speaker, have also responded immediately and willingly to the call by President Bush to cut terrorist financing. In this context, let me just mention parenthetically that NATO members stand in sharp contrast to the arrogant governmental action of Lebanon, which is refusing to

give us cooperation in cracking down on the financial capabilities of international terrorist organizations like Hezbollah. Our NATO allies share intelligence with the United States regarding both Osama bin Laden and the entire al-Qaeda network.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, President Bush spoke via satellite to the Warsaw Conference on combatting terrorism, where all of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe who wish to join NATO were represented.

Although the war on terrorism is now our top national priority, we must remain engaged with our allies on a wide spectrum of issues, including NATO enlargement. The next NATO summit in Prague in 2002 will be the first opportunity for the applicant countries to formally present their bids for membership in NATO. Our bill demonstrates our strong belief that this process must not be and will not be sidelined.

The 10 countries which are hoping to become members of NATO, and I will read them in alphabetical order, Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Rumania, Slovakia and Slovenia, are all seeking membership in this great peace-loving alliance.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) indicated, they will have to meet some very tough yardsticks to be judged worthy of joining NATO. They relate not only to having achieved a certain degree of economic success and having made a contribution to their own defense and the collective defense, but they must demonstrate that they are practicing a respect for human rights, religious rights, minority rights and press freedom. They have to demonstrate that they are free and open democratic societies.

I want to underscore, Mr. Speaker, that the upcoming summit in Prague, where we will be looking at the new applicants for membership in NATO, is the first and not the last of such meetings. The Prague Summit is part of a measured and carefully managed process of including more and more of our European friends in NATO. Invitations will be extended to the applicants consistent with their compliance with the NATO membership action plan.

As do all of my colleagues in this Congress, I support a Europe whole and free. And I strongly endorse the statements of the 10 applicant countries that eventual NATO membership for all of them will be a success for the United States, for Europe and for NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about Russia. Following the events of September 11, Mr. Speaker, clearly a new relationship is evolving between the United States and Russia. Next week we are looking forward to welcoming the Russian President, Mr. Putin, in Washington, who then will go on for a more intimate meeting with the President in Crawford, Texas.

There is a whole new flavor to the Russian/U.S. relationship, and it is apparent in a dozen different ways.

□ 1200

We are modifying our previous position of just a few months ago with respect to the ABM Treaty to missile testing. The Russians are asking that we put an end to Jackson-Vanik, which was historic human rights legislation but which has served its purpose.

I look forward to the day when a democratic Russia will be able to explore the possibility of joining NATO; and I think it is important to underscore, in dealing with the expansion of NATO, that this is in no sense directed at Russia. Russia is no longer our enemy, and we are looking forward to the day when it will be our ally.

I, for one, welcome President Putin's new attitude towards NATO enlargement and his statement that he would not rule out NATO membership for Russia. Let me say we also do not rule out that possibility. This represents an important change, a historic change in Russian perceptions of the NATO alliance, a sentiment that we should continue to encourage strongly. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to just compliment the gentleman from California on his articulate statement, and I appreciate his kind remarks regarding this Member. His comments about President Putin, I think, are certainly appropriate.

We have seen very moderate and positive statements on NATO expansion, on missile defense, coming from President Putin since the tragic events of September 11th. And I think it is very interesting, as I conclude these comments, to note that NATO assets, AWACS planes, are sent from Europe to the United States today to help our fighter aircraft patrol our cities since American AWACS aircraft are deployed for operations related to Northern Watch over Iraq, in the Persian Gulf regions, and in operations related to Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the dean of the delegation and the person who helped me offer the amendment to name this Gerald B.H. Solomon legislation.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to commend our former vice chairman of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for introducing this bill, which I am pleased to cosponsor with him, and for his strong consistent support for NATO enlargement. He has been a true leader in NATO for our Congress.

I thank our committee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his support not only for this bill but for NATO's enlargement throughout the years.

Under the aegis of NATO, the past decade has shown a remarkable expansion of freedom in Europe without firing a single shot. It is ironic that our NATO allies have invoked the, and I quote, "attack on one is an attack on all" clause of NATO's treaty in the recent terrorist attacks on our own Nation from abroad. We have special reasons, therefore, to value the contributions that NATO has made in our own defense.

Accordingly, it is in our own national interests that we need to bring as many democratic, stable and capable European nations as possible into NATO alliance. This bill makes it clear that the door to NATO membership remains open to other nations; and it is fitting, therefore, for Congress to ask the President to sign this measure into law, a NATO expansion policy declaration. It was in our interest in the opening of the East, which laid the groundwork for the eventual accession of the Czech Republic, of Hungary, and Poland into NATO in the last decade, which, with many of my colleagues, I strongly supported.

I was pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), in making one change to this bill, naming it after our close friend and former colleague on our Committee on International Relations, and former chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the late gentleman from New York, Mr. Solomon. Mr. Solomon was an outstanding, dedicated public servant, a Congressman who deeply carried about our national security and how we came to depend on NATO alliance. Accordingly, it is altogether fitting that we name this NATO expansion legislation the Gerald B.H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act.

It was in 1998 that Jerry Solomon authored a book entitled "The NATO Enlargement Debate: 1990-1997: The blessings of Liberty." In that book he concluded, and I quote from the final paragraph of his book: "In the final analysis, a wider alliance is but a means to the end of building confidence and security toward which all of NATO's directions are aimed. In an era of profound transformation in transatlantic and European security, there can be no guarantees that the values and strategic outlook of the alliance can form the foundation for all of Europe. Nevertheless, we do know that the NATO experience has much to offer as we return to the original broad ambition of NATO and embrace a wider community of free peoples."

The distinguished chairman of the full Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), has enthusiastically supported this bill in our committee; and I very much appreciate the expeditious consideration of the bill in committee and

the efforts to obtain early floor consideration. I thank House leadership for making certain that this bill was considered in an appropriate and timely manner. It is an appropriate tribute to a great patriot, Mr. Jerry Solomon.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a valued and thoughtful member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his courtesy in letting me to speak on this measure.

I have some real concerns about the legislation before us today. It certainly is not a lack of respect for the spokespeople on both sides of the aisle, two of the most respected Members of Congress in this arena, for whom I am deeply gratified for being able to learn about international affairs; and it certainly is not any reservations about NATO itself. As has been pointed out, NATO, for 52 years, has performed an invaluable service for providing peace and stability on the European continent. It has been especially critical for the first 42 of those 52 years.

But I think the real question is whether it is time for us to take a step back and look at some of the underlying assumptions, much like my friend from California mentioned a moment ago, in terms of framing the question about how we are going to deal with Russia. I think that is one of the most critical points that we need to focus on.

I think it fascinating that the first call from a head of state that our President received after the disaster, the terrorist attacks on September 11, was from President Putin. It signaled, I think, a part of this new era that we are seeing. And before we deal with an expansion of NATO or something else, I think it is critical that we take a step back, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has said, and take a look at the role of NATO.

In early October, Secretary General Lord George Robertson met with President Putin; and neither seemed to see any reason why Russia, at some point, should not be a member of NATO. Indeed, as we look at the list of countries that we are bringing forward as potential members, certainly Russia would appear to be at least as well qualified as these would-be member states in terms of its effort to develop its economy and its democracy.

In this context, I think we should ask ourselves why we are moving ahead with our expansion plans that could look to those elements in the Soviet Union that it is not necessarily consistent with this emerging new agenda. It looks certainly like a continuation of Cold War encirclement, as we are expanding a military alliance that does, for the time being, exclude them, but will extend almost to their eastern border. Is there not a more constructive and effective way to show our support

for democratization in Central and Eastern Europe than continuing to build an alliance that looks as though it is arrayed against them?

I must also point out that the continued expansion of NATO is an exceedingly expensive endeavor. The weak economies of the new members and what appears to me to be lukewarm support for implementing and financing the expansion of the alliance by some of our European members is going to force the United States to assume more of the funding burden.

A CBO study found that the cost of expansion simply to Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia would be in the neighborhood of \$60 billion to \$125 billion over a 15-year period ending in 2010. The United States' portion of this tab was expected to run between \$5 billion and \$19 billion. A study conducted concurrently by the RAND Corporation found that the total cost of this expansion could be in a similar range, up to \$110 billion.

These estimates, I fear, are misleading because they assume that both new member states and other NATO members will be willing and able to pay for their costs of expansion. I think at a time when we are facing severe economic crisis at home, it is highly improbable that they are going to assume their share of the burden, and we are going to have to make some very real trade-offs in terms of our domestic economy and other higher priorities that we have in this war against terrorism.

Finally, I think we need to be asking ourselves whether the continued expansion of NATO is the most effective way to encourage the development of free markets and democracy in Eastern Europe. It is a military alliance that was critical for its time, it still plays an important role; but I am wondering if it needs to be supplemented.

I strongly urge that this body deal with some of the questions that my colleague from California, the ranking member of the committee, dealt with, and that we not continue with more legislation dealing with the expansion of NATO until we come back and deal with the hard realities of the role of Russia and the costs that are associated to it. I think the American public deserves that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who followed European and NATO issues long before he became chairman.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this bill calls upon the NATO alliance to agree to a robust second round of enlargement at its summit meeting in Prague late next year. The bill does not call for the admission of any specific country to NATO, but is broadly supportive

of all seven leading contenders for admission in the next round: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania.

I will not dwell on the qualifications of the individual countries, other than to say each has made great progress in the difficult transition from the prison house of communism to the promise of democracy in the free market. Forcibly separated from the West for decades, each is now reclaiming its rightful place in the Western community of nations. It would be shameful, as well as stupid, for us to ignore their pleas to become members of the Atlantic alliance.

For over half a century, NATO has been the foundation upon which the security of the West has rested. NATO's continuing importance to the United States was most recently demonstrated in this unified response to the terrorist attacks of September 11 when article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that an attack on one member of NATO shall be considered an attack upon them all, was invoked for the first time in the alliance's history.

It is my hope that this next phase of NATO's enlargement will see an end to Russia's opposition to NATO, an opposition needlessly inherited from the Soviet Union and inconsistent with Russia's own desire to become a part of the West. For this reason, I commend President Putin for his recent remarks indicating his government will not object to further enlargement of NATO.

A robust second round of NATO enlargement will not end our task. Many vocal aspirants will still remain outside of the alliance's pacifying embrace. And in a speech earlier this year in Warsaw, President Bush spoke of a future in which all of the states between the Baltic and Black Seas would be welcomed into the Western community of nations. I certainly share that vision.

Thus, even as we admit additional countries to NATO, we must remember this is but the latest step toward our goal of creating a Europe whole and free, and of bringing lasting peace to that ancient and long-suffering continent.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), in the spirit of collegiality and bipartisanship, knowing full well he will be taking the side which is opposed to my position.

□ 1215

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am shortly going to display a couple of visuals here. The first will be in Russian, and I wanted to present it in Russian because I did not want Members to think that I was telling the Russians something they did not know about our vulnerability.

The first of these will show a page from a Russian journal which shows an

EMP attack on our country. What Members will see is Russian language, and they will see something which looks like the sun with some rays coming from it, and then Members will see what it does.

What it does is disrupt our communication system and disrupt our power system. See the one on the right is in Russian. What it does is melt all of our microelectronics, including our computers. If we think about our power grid and communications grid, if we melt down the computers, we do not have a power and communications grid. This is our translation of it here.

All that needs to be done is to detonate a nuclear weapon high above the atmosphere, and what is produced is something equivalent to a simultaneous lightning strike everywhere in the country, or enormous static electricity. We see a miniature of this every time there is a solar storm. This is many, many times as powerful as the pulses we get from that solar storm.

If the chart would be put out that shows Yamantau Mountain, and these two are connected, Members will see these are two closed cities of 60,000 people. What is a closed city? A closed city is so remote it does not have tourists. Nobody visits. They have a single mission; 60,000 people live there and they have a single mission, and that mission is working on Yamantau Mountain.

If the Russians are going to do an EMP attack on us, they had better have Yamantau Mountain because we are going to respond.

I showed this in Russia. I am not giving them any ideas. They knew this before we did. We knew it from the Starfish explosion in 1962. The Russians had done more testing and explosions, and they knew it before we did. They know more about it than we know about it.

If they are anticipating an EMP attack on us, and it would be almost certainly the first way they would use a weapon because there is no way they could do as much harm to our economy and infrastructure with ground level explosions as they could do with an explosion above the atmosphere, producing electromagnetic pulse.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it makes sense to feed Russia's paranoia. I have been told that the reason they spent \$6 billion on Yamantau Mountain is because they are paranoid, because they do not think that we are their friends, when we are enlarging NATO right up to their border. And they do not think NATO is friendly because for years it was the counter of the Warsaw Pact, and they cannot get it out of their head that this is their enemy.

I have no idea why we think it is productive in terms of our national security to enlarge NATO right up to their borders. I am all for a European friendship society. I just do not want one that slaps Russia in the face.

We are making great strides. Putin was the first foreign leader to call our President after the terrorist attacks on

September 11. Why would we want to do this to the Russian people? For the first time in many years, and I went to Russia recently and I saw the mountains of flowers at our embassy, it was a very moving experience, here are people moving in our direction. Why would we want to move them in the other direction?

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to enlarge NATO, let us have Russia as a member. If we do not have Russia as a member, let us not enlarge it. It is threatening to our national security and it is not in our long-term national security interest.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the vice chairman of the Defense Security Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and as vice chairman of the Defense and Security Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly, I stand in strong support of this Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001.

I think it is appropriate that we would name this after Jerry Solomon. It has been said before, and I will not belabor it, but Jerry believed so strongly that when democratic free societies worked together in a security alliance, the world is a safer place to be. He promoted this idea. Not that he wanted to enlarge NATO just to be enlarging NATO, just to have more numbers, but that every NATO member must bring something to the table, something not only for their own security, but for the security of the NATO alliance.

It is difficult to depart from the memories of September 11. Almost everything we do in this Chamber now is viewed through the scope of terrorism. Just like the threat of communism, the catalyst for NATO, current threat reaffirmed the need of a strong transatlantic alliance for the protection of free societies all around the world. By endorsing expansion, we are sending a message to those who decry democracy and freedom.

As the response to September 11 has shown, an attack on one is an attack on all. It is very relevant in our redefined geopolitical world. We could easily conclude in this body that NATO has more of a purpose against terrorism than it did against communism. With a time-tested formula and victories under our belt, we would be foolish to turn our backs on those who aspire to join the greatest alliance history has ever known.

A little more than a month ago in Ottawa, Canada, I had the privilege of speaking to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's Defense Committee, and in my remarks I spoke about how we, being NATO, must look forward and come together as a family of nations.

The worst of times, as we have seen, separate the civilized world from the uncivilized. As nations that respect and honor freedom, democracy and decency, we must join together and form an unbreakable bond against terrorism.

Terrorism has been a plague on our world for far too long. Every nation in the alliance has been on the receiving end of terrorist attacks, ranging from the brutal to the barbaric. We have watched airplane hijackers negotiate with guns, we have seen truck bombs explode on embassy grounds, we have seen extremists raid an Olympic village, plane wreckage in Lockerbie, Scotland, car bombs on the streets of London and Belfast, and a gaping hole in the hull of an American warship.

When I finished my speech, there was overwhelming support from not only the NATO nations represented there but from the observers as well; from the French who oftentimes do not agree with us on things, and the second one to speak after I had spoken was a Russian observer who pledged strong support to this effort.

We need NATO now maybe more than ever. I think we need to support the further enlargement of the NATO Alliance. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who in this last year has joined the delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly, and has done an outstanding job and has had a personal outreach program to Lithuania and to the Baltic states for some period of time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3167, the Gerald Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation which memorializes congressional support for further NATO expansion that is set to take place at the 2002 Prague Summit.

This is in line with the President's intent stated on his trip to Warsaw, Poland, and I quote, "I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibility that NATO brings. As we plan the next NATO Summit in 2002, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."

He also stated that he envisioned a NATO that extends from the Baltic to the Black Sea, a NATO whole, free and secure.

As chairman of the Baltic Caucus and a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am a strong supporter of the NATO enlargement, especially for the Baltic states. In the wake of September 11, I believe that enlisting the talents of the Baltics and others who are eager to make contributions to NATO will be instrumental to defeating terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, let me share a few photos. This is a photo of the border when I served in West Germany, the border between West Germany and

Czechoslovakia. This is the old world. As many of my colleagues have said, in the spring of this year, we attended the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Lithuania. This is a new vision of Europe, and these are photos of citizens with signs saying NATO, Lithuania, okay, good; The victims of the gulags are calling for justice; The pact of Molotov-Ribentrop is our past. NATO is our future. And the youth were present in these signs of public display in support of NATO.

Another thing that we learned on our trips is that the countries who are recently now members, countries like Poland, have a better relationship with Russia now since they are under the NATO Alliance. And they have better relations and better trade, and it has helped the stability of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and the Committee on International Relations for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to commend the committee for naming this act after our recently passed colleague, Jerry Solomon. This is fitting since Congressman Solomon was one of the first in Congress to recognize that NATO membership for former Warsaw Pact countries was essential for maintaining stability in Eastern Europe.

On our Statue of Liberty it says, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." With NATO expansion, the countries that are yearning to breathe free can do this under the NATO Alliance. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3167.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who has been very much interested in NATO membership for a number of countries of Eastern and Central Europe, and has played a special role in outreach to Slovakia.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3167. I am especially pleased that this legislation includes a provision to recommend Slovakia for full NATO membership.

As the grandson of Slovak-American immigrants, I have carefully followed the Slovak Republic's difficult transition from the former Soviet bloc to a free and independent nation. The dramatic changes from a socialistic government and a managed economy to an open democracy and free market enterprise system have been a challenge for this new nation.

Since January of 1993, the Slovaks have made great progress in joining the European and Western family of nations. Slovakia has been recognized for its economic and political progress by admission last September to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development.

The Slovak Republic is also a leading contender today for future membership in the European Union. While international economic integration is vital to Slovakia's future, it is critical that

this strategically located Central European nation be a part of NATO.

While in the past I have urged leaders of the new Slovak Republic to primarily focus on issues and admissions to organizations related to international economic cooperation, I did so coming from a nation and background that always felt secure from the standpoint of national security. At times in the past I could not understand the preoccupation with membership in NATO by Slovak leaders.

As I learned more over the years of the history of the Slovak people and their domination and suppression, I realized why they were so concerned and so dedicated to a security relationship with NATO.

□ 1230

Slovakia had lost its freedom and independence and security in the past. They did not want to risk that possibility in the future. The events of September 11 made me recognize why Slovakia and its people were so right. Nothing is more vital than national security. The other countries under this bill also, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria, also seek entry into NATO for exactly the same reason. In the interest of our United States national security, in the interest of those who have lost and regained their independence and also regained their national identity, and in the interest of world security, I urge the passage of this legislation.

I again commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and also honor the memory of our departed colleague, Jerry Solomon.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time. I, unfortunately, am going to say some words about this legislation that are not quite consistent with the views that have been heard on the floor.

I am in opposition to this bill. I certainly want to honor the memory of our departed colleague, Congressman Solomon; but I am opposed to the expansion of NATO. I was opposed under President Clinton, and I continue to oppose expansion under President Bush. The countries named in this bill for NATO candidacy have made incredible progress since the fall of the Soviet Union toward Western ideals and economics, but it should not make them automatically superior candidates for NATO.

First of all, NATO is founded on the premise of collective defense. These countries are still undergoing major political and economic changes, and I do not think we should be promising to go to war on behalf of countries when we do not know what kind of conflicts we may be drawn into.

Second, NATO was created to defend against the Soviet Union, a threat that

obviously no longer exists. If at this critical time the U.S. is seeking cooperation from Russia, it is counterproductive in my opinion to take actions that Russia would perceive to be aggressive. In this legislation that is before us today, we are talking about admitting into NATO countries that would bring NATO right next to the border with Russia.

Thirdly, the expansion would put the strategic advantage of the alliance at risk. NATO was created for rapid Allied response to a threat. Its tactical strength will be compromised when the inclusion countries with inexperienced militaries make it more difficult to mobilize. The high cost of NATO expansion would also divert U.S. defense investment to militaries of foreign countries at a time when we should be focusing on our own. And there are other institutions that are more valuable to the Eastern European countries than NATO, the European Union, the World Trade Organization, and other international institutions that will help promote their economic and democratic development. NATO expansion will drain their treasuries toward massive military expenditures to come up to NATO's standards.

The bottom line is that NATO expansion is more of a liability than an opportunity for the United States and for the countries this bill seeks to add to the alliance. For that reason, I will oppose the legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the fact that I have brought together bipartisanship here and got time from both sides. I deeply appreciate that, especially since I am taking the opposition to this bill. I do rise in opposition to expanding NATO. I do not think it is in the best interests of the United States. The one thing that I would concede, though, is that everyone in this Chamber, I believe, every Member agrees that our country should be strong; that we should have a strong national defense; and that we should do everything conceivable to make our country safe and secure. I certainly endorse those views. It just happens that I believe that membership in organizations like NATO tends to do the opposite, tends to weaken us and also makes us more vulnerable. But that is a matter of opinion, and we have to debate the merits of the issue and find out what is best for our country.

I think the bill is motivated for two reasons. One is to increase the sphere of influence into Eastern Europe, who will be the greatest influence on the

commercial aspects of Eastern Europe, and so there is a commercial interest there, as well as in this bill there is \$55 million of foreign aid which I think a lot of Americans would challenge under these circumstances whether or not we should be sending another \$55 million overseas.

We have this debate now mainly because we have had the demise of the Soviet system, and there is a question on what the role of NATO should be and what the role of NATO really is. It seems that NATO is out in search of a dragon to slay. It appeared that way during the Kosovo and Serbian crisis, where it was decided that NATO would go in and start the bombing in order to help the Kosovars and to undermine the Government of Serbia. But our own rules under NATO say that we should never attack a country that has not attacked a member nation. So this was sort of stretching it by a long shot in order to get us involved. I think that does have unintended consequences, because it turns out that we supported Muslims, the KLA, in Kosovo who were actually allies of Osama bin Laden. These things in some ways come back to haunt us, and I see this as an unintended consequence that we should be very much aware of.

But overall I oppose this because I support a position of a foreign policy of noninterventionism, foreign noninterventionism out of interest of the United States. I know the other side of the argument, that United States interests are best protected by foreign intervention and many, many entangling alliances. I disagree with that because I think what eventually happens is that a country like ours gets spread too thin and finally we get too poor. I think we are starting to see signs of this. We have 250,000 troops around the world in 241 different countries. When the crisis hit with the New York disaster, it turned out that our planes were so spread out around the world that it was necessary for our allies to come in and help us. This is used by those who disagree with me as a positive, to say, "See, it works. NATO is wonderful. They'll even come and help us out." I see it as sad and tragic that we spent last year, I think it was over \$325 billion for national defense, and we did not even have an AWACS plane to protect us.

During that time when we had our tragedy in New York, we probably had cities that we paid to protect better than our own cities. If planes went awry or astray in Korea or Haiti or wherever, I think that they probably would have been shot down. I see this as a tragedy.

I hope we will all give some consideration for noninterventionism.

Mr. Speaker, more than a decade ago one of history's great ideological and military conflicts abruptly ended. To the great surprise of many, including more than a few in own government, the communist world and its chief military arm, the Warsaw Pact, imploded. The Cold War, which claimed thousands of lives

and uncountable treasure, was over and the Western Alliance had prevailed.

With this victory, however, NATO's *raison d'être* was destroyed. The alliance was created to defend against a Soviet system that as of 1991 had entirely ceased to exist. Rather than disbanding, though, NATO bureaucrats and the governments behind them reinvented the alliance and protected its existence by creating new dragons to slay. No longer was NATO to be an entirely defensive alliance. Rather, this "new" NATO began to occupy itself with a myriad of non-defense related issues like economic development and human rights. This was all codified at the Washington Summit of 1999, where the organization declared that it would concern itself with "economic, social and political difficulties . . . ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states." The new name of the NATO game was "interventionism"; defense was now *passé*.

Nowhere was this "new NATO" more starkly in evidence than in Yugoslavia. There, in 1999, NATO became an aggressive military force, acting explicitly in violation of its own charter. By bombing Yugoslavia, a country that neither attacked nor threatened a NATO member state, NATO both turned its back on its stated purpose and relinquished the moral high ground it had for so long enjoyed. NATO intervention in the Balkan civil wars has not even produced the promised result: UN troops will be forced to remain in the Balkans indefinitely in an ultimately futile attempt to build nations against the will of those who will live in them.

Mr. Speaker, we are now called on to endorse the further expansion of a purposeless alliance and to grant \$55.5 million dollars to former Soviet Bloc countries that have expressed an interest in joining it. While expanding NATO membership may be profitable for those companies that will be charged with upgrading the militaries of prospective members, this taxpayer subsidy of foreign governments and big business is not in the interest of the American people. It is past time for the Europeans to take responsibility for their own affairs, including their military affairs.

According to the Department of Defense's latest available figures, there are more than 250,000 U.S. military personnel deployed overseas on six continents in 141 nations. It is little wonder, then, that when a crisis hit our own shores—the treacherous attacks of September 11—we were forced to call on foreign countries to defend American airspace! Our military is spread so thin meddling in every corner of the globe, that defense of our own homeland is being carried out by foreigners.

Rather than offer our blessings and open our pocketbooks for the further expansion of NATO, the United States should get out of this outdated and interventionist organization. American foreign policy has been most successful when it focuses on the simple principles of friendship and trade with all countries and entangling alliances with none.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to express a couple of concerns that I have

about this measure that is before us this afternoon. It has been said a number of times on the floor here today that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been the most successful military alliance in history. I think that that is indisputable. It was created in the aftermath of the Second World War to deal with a set of geopolitical circumstances that presented themselves to the world at that time. Over the course of the succeeding 55 years, NATO has served Europe, the United States, Canada and indeed the world very, very well. It prevented a third world war. And ultimately it was NATO and other factors that resulted in a very definitive change within the Soviet Union.

But now we are faced with a different set of circumstances. The geopolitical world in which we live today is in no way similar to that which confronted the West and other nations at the close of the Second World War. We ought not to be thinking about expanding an entity that was created for a different need and a different purpose at a different time. We ought to be thinking more about the circumstances in which we find ourselves today. And while one might argue that expanding NATO in the way that we have done recently and may do again in the context of this suggestion here, this proposal, might not do any harm, the fact of the matter is that at the very least it diminishes our likelihood to think of the world in different ways, and that is really what we ought to do.

NATO served us. We ought to now begin to put it behind us and begin to think about the world we live in in ways in which are necessary to confront the circumstances that we have to deal with today. We ought not to be doing things, for example, that are insulting or might be taken as an insult by Russia, because they are now in a different relationship with the United States.

So I am concerned about this for those reasons, but primarily because it will prevent us from thinking about the world in ways in which we ought to be thinking of it in order to address the different circumstances that confront us at this moment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This debate is really why we need NATO. The reason for creating NATO is to preserve free and open societies. The reason to have NATO is so that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and others who spoke against NATO expansion should have the opportunity to speak freely and openly, not just in the United States but throughout Europe, throughout an expanding and open and democratic Europe. We are creating NATO so people in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia and elsewhere should have the same opportunities we have here. There has never been more need for a military alliance dedicated to preserving and ex-

panding democratic free and open societies which was more palpable than today.

We have heard a great deal about building a coalition against international terrorism. The majority of those so-called coalition members are police states and dictatorships. They will not fight for free and open and democratic societies. They may oppose Osama bin Laden, they may oppose specific terrorist acts; but they are not in favor of what we are in favor of, a free and open and democratic society. And the top guarantee of that is the expansion of NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman on his comments in closing debate on his side of the aisle today. I would say that the gentleman from Texas who made remarks in the well certainly makes his comments from a very principled point of view. His philosophy is exemplified entirely by his comments here. I respect his point of view on this issue although I disagree with it. To the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the concerns he raises I think are legitimate concerns, but I would say in response to them, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and this gentleman have both said in the past, the criteria for NATO membership, set out by the 19 existing members, are very tough. They insist on economic progress, on substantial movements towards democracy, on transparency in defense budgets, on civilian control of the military, and on interoperability.

Some of these countries, even some of the seven listed for authorization for assistance, are, frankly, some distance away, undoubtedly, from meeting all of the initial criteria. But the prospect for membership in the EU, the prospect for membership in the NATO alliance itself have been important incentives that are held out there for membership to bring about change in these societies.

□ 1245

I think the House should be proud of its leadership in suggesting expansion at the previous round of decisions on NATO expansion made in Madrid. The House of Representatives was really the first entity in the world to suggest it was appropriate to consider expansion of NATO. And as we looked at the Visegrad Four, we found and encouraged very specifically membership for the countries of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, that had made the necessary commitments and that met the criteria set forth. It was only a disappointment to both the other body and this House that Slovenia, a newly independent country, was not also included in the first round, because we felt that they as well had met the criteria for membership.

Mr. Speaker, I would think as we look for the next year to come before the summit in Prague, we may well consider giving our view as a Congress on which additional countries seem to have met most adequately the criteria for NATO expansion at that summit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the legislation before us today makes a major contribution. Its authorization levels are consistent with those the administration has requested.

Finally I would just close my remarks by citing two quotations from President William Clinton and President George W. Bush that are actually cited in the legislation itself.

President Clinton said in a speech in Detroit in 1996, "NATO's doors will not close behind its first new members. NATO should remain open to all of Europe's emerging democracies who are ready to shoulder the responsibilities of membership. No Nation will be automatically excluded. No country outside NATO will have a veto. A gray zone of insecurity must not reemerge in Europe."

Then, in June of this year, President George W. Bush at Warsaw said, "All of Europe's new democracies, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and all that lie between, should have the same chance for security and freedom and the same chance to join the institutions of Europe as Europe's old democracies have. I believe in NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that seek it and are ready to share the responsibilities that NATO brings. As we plan to enlarge NATO, no nation should be used as a pawn in the agenda of others. We will not trade away the fate of free European peoples. No more Munichs, no more Yaltas. As we plan the Prague Summit, we should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being down here during the entire debate. I am the Chair of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science. We have a big discussion on the Space Station, which is another international effort.

Let me say, I certainly support cooperative efforts like the International Space Station, and I supported NATO when it was necessary. NATO served its purpose. It protected us against the Soviet invasion of Western Europe. Now the Cold War is over. The best thing we can do now is to try to promote democracy in Russia, and expanding NATO goes in exactly the opposite direction. It slaps the Russians in the face.

I believe the Europeans can now defend themselves. We no longer should be subsidizing their defense. Expanding NATO just puts us more into the position of subsidizing people's defense far

away who can manage their own defense. It also takes away from our ability to cope with the real challenge to world freedom and peace today, which we will find in Asia in the form of an expansionary and belligerent Communist China.

Lastly, let us note that we are engaged in a war right now, a war against terrorism and a war in Central Asia. Being part of NATO has not really helped us. In fact, the billions of dollars we spend in NATO can be used by our own troops in that battle, and only a limited amount of support has come from our NATO allies, the British and Italians, who would be giving it to us anyway. They would be with us anyway, without us having to spend tens of billions of dollars a year on NATO.

While I respect my colleagues, especially Jerry Solomon and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), I would suggest that expanding NATO is not a good idea.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today we debated H.R. 3167 on the House floor, legislation to encourage further expansion of the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include Eastern European countries such as Romania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria. I want to share with my colleagues an opinion piece that ran recently in the Washington Post which raises what I feel are some of the critical issues regarding continued expansion of the NATO alliance. Written by Jonathan Newhouse, a senior advisor at the Center for Defense Information, this article emphasizes that the key issue is not the future of NATO, but the importance of including Russia in future collective security arrangements in Europe. I found his thoughts helpful and I encourage my colleagues to review this.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 2001]  
A NEW ALLIANCE COULD NUDGE ASIDE THE  
OLD

(By John Newhouse)

The terrorist threat laid bare on Sept. 11 is transforming global security arrangements. Already, it is pushing Washington and other major capitals toward a historic makeover of the security system the United States and its European allies have relied upon for half a century. And much of the energy for that push is coming from an improbable source: Russia—or, more precisely, its president, Vladimir Putin.

Putin's broad purpose—to link his ailing, self-absorbed country to the United States while moving it into the European mainstream—has been gathering force for some time. Even before Sept. 11, he was taking a more accommodating line on President Bush's foremost priorities—missile defense, modification of the ABM Treaty, and further enlargement of NATO, the Western security alliance. Since the attacks, the Russian's tone has become even more acquiescent, enough to raise concerns in Western capitals that he has maneuvered himself far in front of his national security apparatus and political base. When he meets with Bush in Washington and Crawford, Tex., later this month, the two men can be expected to start a process aimed at moving their countries into a shifting strategic environment. And that move could edge NATO, the centerpiece of America's security relationship with Europe, to the sidelines.

Well, before Sept. 11, NATO was the object of some tough questions: Did it still have a

purpose? Was there a role in it for Russia, and if so, how central a role? A few Western leaders, starting with Britain's Tony Blair, had in one degree or another concluded that Western and Russian strategic interests had converged, and that collective security arrangements that lacked Russian participation no longer made sense. But if anyone was shuffling the new deck after Sept. 11, it was Putin. He was the first to call Bush after the attacks. He agreed not to oppose the use of bases in Uzbekistan and elsewhere in Central attacks. He agreed not to oppose the use of bases in Uzbekistan and elsewhere in Central Asia for strikes against the Taliban. He visited German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and wowed the Bundestag with a speech delivered in fluent German, studded with quotations from Goethe and Schiller, that portrayed Russia as rooted in European values.

On Oct. 3 Putin had a long private meeting in Brussels with NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson, with whom he enjoys discussing security issues. Soon thereafter, I was shown an official account of what the two men said. The conversation pointed up Putin's resolve to anchor Russia to the West, and the intensity of his hatred of the Taliban and radical Islam.

In the meeting, Putin cited nuclear proliferation as the main threat confronting the world. He said there was a plot afoot to kill Pakistan's president, Gen. Pervez Musharraf. If that happened, he wondered, who would control Pakistan's nuclear weapons? And he answered his own question in stark, if peculiar, terms: Osama bin Laden, he said, calling the terrorist leader "the defense minister." As for the Taliban, he said it would be a great mistake to remove the leaders but leave the Taliban in power. The Taliban is Afghanistan, he declared, and proposed a conference to bring together all the anti-Taliban forces in Afghanistan.

But Topic A was the Russian link to NATO. Neither man saw any reason Russia shouldn't be a member. Noting that Robertson was the first to understand that Russia poses no threat to the alliance, Putin said his country should be a primary NATO ally. But he said that Russia would have to be consulted on common security issues, or it would be isolated on the periphery of security, which would be in no one's interest. He wasn't asking for membership as such, but rather a central political involvement.

Putin declared that Russia would not stand in the queue to be admitted into the alliance, like countries on whose membership nothing depends. Robertson replied that he understood this, but he was no reason Moscow shouldn't apply. Both sides, he said, needed to stop the diplomatic sword dance over Russian membership. Putin restated his reluctance to wait in line, but said he did want a full-fledged, mature relationship with NATO. He wondered if Robertson and Russian experts could work jointly on the question.

The Russian president tried to highlight the opportunity he was offering the West by telling Robertson that he expected to be in office only four years at most. All his values, he said, were Western. But he warned that his successors may have a different view of European security—thereby underlining up the developing gap between him and other key players in Moscow.

Robertson noted that the two sides could focus on a few specific areas of cooperation—terrorism, air-sea rescue, Kosovo and Bosnia. He also raised the idea of a conference on military responses to terrorism jointly sponsored by NATO and Russia, an idea Putin liked. The conversation ended with Putin, perhaps revealingly, asking Robertson to pass on his regards to Bush, whose name had not arisen.

We should hear loud echoes of this meeting in Texas. There, Putin can safely agree to enlarging NATO yet again. Before Sept. 11, he deplored this idea, especially the prospect of admitting the Baltic nations, because he and his advisers saw it as bringing NATO into space that Russians are accustomed to influencing, if not controlling. But this concern becomes moot as he moves to acquire a serious role in revised Western security arrangements and to segue into Europe on his own.

Moreover, a bloated alliance operating by consensus will not be close to the center of political action. More and more, the center will lie wherever the key players, notably the United States and Russia, locate it. Today's security threats are not military, and NATO is not equipped to help much in the struggle against terrorism and weapons proliferation. Counterterrorism, for example, is much more of an intelligence and police function than a military one, and Washington will be increasingly reluctant to rely on NATO for other than peacekeeping tasks. NATO itself could become absorbed in solving problems between its members.

Although Putin won't be deflected, he will have to show critics at home some return on his bold move toward the West. Embedding Russia in the world economy is probably his first priority. But accomplishing this will require Russian membership in the World Trade Organization, even though well-positioned Russians see the organization as a conspiracy of multinational companies to exploit Russian assets. Putin also wants and probably needs a trade agreement with the European Union. Members are sympathetic, but unlikely to grant one unless and until Putin has maneuvered WTO membership. They need to see Russia establishing itself as a serious player and fully capable of living up to commitments.

The meeting with Bush could help anchor Russia to the West, politically and probably economically. Putin may expect Washington to advance his WTO prospects by asking EU governments to join in pushing to relax the standards for Russian membership.

Putin may not object—at least not strongly—to the Bush plan for a national missile defense if he convinces himself that the project may eventually fall of its own weight. Agreeing to kill the ABM Treaty, as distinct from amending it, would be very tough for him. While the treaty is about arms control, it is also seen in Moscow as an agreement between great powers and, as such, of great political value. If he and Bush were to produce a new and verifiable bilateral agreement dealing with steep reductions of strategic weapons, it would play very well in Moscow. Prospects for an agreement of that kind are good, although just how binding it might be is unclear, and the importance Russians attach to locking the United States into a formal agreement cannot be overstated.

The shell of the egg won't be filled overnight. Putin's romancing of major Western capitals will have to be accompanied by internal reforms, including democratic ones. And he will have to hold up the Russian end of any bargain, especially by helping to discourage the proliferation of truly frightful weapons and playing a full part in interconnected programs aimed at curbing organized crime, drug trafficking and money laundering, etc. Also, in most Western capitals, including London, there are senior bureaucrats who resist major change, especially change that benefits Russia and appears to weaken NATO. France, for one, may have mixed feelings about NATO, but it will see stronger Russian involvement as accelerating movement of the center of political gravity eastward, a shift that has been underway since German unification.

Change is nonetheless underway, as Secretary of State Colin Powell made clear in Shanghai last month, when he ventured the lapidary phrase: "Not only is the Cold War over, the post-Cold War period is also over." (John Newhouse is a senior fellow at the Center for Defense Information.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of the Gerald B. H. Solomon Freedom Consolidation Act of 2001, a bill appropriately named after my good friend Jerry Solomon, who passed away last month. Jerry was a fine man who truly cared about NATO and the leading contenders for NATO admission. I support this bill, because I support the further enlargement of NATO alliance, as well as the inclusion of those seven countries that are candidates for NATO admission. If these democracies are willing to meet their responsibility of membership, I see no reason why they should not be able to enter this defensive alliance, and join their fellow members in preserving peace, freedom and democracy. These seven worthy nations are our friends, and I look forward to the day we can welcome them as members. I would now like to introduce a speech I made in March to the Lithuanian Parliament, in which I made the case for Lithuania's inclusion into NATO.

SPEAKER J. DENNIS HASTERT ADDRESSES  
LITHUANIAN PARLIAMENT, MARCH 2001

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Seimas, distinguished guests:

I am deeply honored to be here today.

Two years ago, just a few months after I became the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, you were kind enough to invite me to address this Parliament. The opportunity to speak to you was one of the first honors given to me by another government. What made it even more special was the fact that it was an invitation from you, the representatives of the People of Lithuania, a people, like my own countrymen, who love freedom and know its heavy price.

Last month I was traveling in the State of Virginia—a part of my country that was the home of some of America's most famous "Founding Fathers." One was a man named Patrick Henry. The school children in the United States are taught a famous line from one of Patrick Henry's fiery speeches which he gave during our War of Independence. In just six simple but passionate words he summed up the resolve of a people struggling to be free when he said: "Give me liberty, or give me death!" Patrick Henry's Comrades in Arms, went on to sign a Declaration of Independence where they pledged to each other, "our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

Most of us who serve in the Congress of the United States, and many of you who serve here, have never had to risk our lives to preserve our liberty. But many men and women, on whose shoulders we stand, have done so, on battlefields around the world and even in the streets of our own capitals.

Once again today, while entering this Parliament Building, I passed the spot where some of you literally manned the barricades and stood your ground to defend the right of the Lithuanian people to govern themselves.

As Speaker, I often ask my members to make difficult decisions and cast difficult votes. But I have never had to ask them to risk their very lives as some of you have done. To those of you were served in this body during those dark and difficult days, let me thank you on behalf of freedom loving men and women everywhere, for your courage and your example.

Some things have changed since I was last here. Your "new" President is now a success-

ful veteran and you have held Parliamentary elections. The political landscape in the United States, too, has changed. We now have a "new" President and a new Congress.

But one thing has not changed. The bond of friendship between the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States remains strong. Our admiration of Lithuania's struggle for freedom and democracy remains constant. You can count on America's lasting friendship.

As our new President develops his legislative agenda and as the new Congress works to implement it, there are significant differences between the political parties, differences we debate peacefully, but with great passion.

For example, my party, the Republicans, believe in a smaller federal government, leaving more power to the States and local Governments and most importantly to the people themselves. We support a tax policy that leaves more money in the pockets of the people who earned it so they can spend it as they see fit, rather than government collecting it and then spending it. Our worthy opponents, the Democratic Party, have a somewhat different view. We respect our differences because the struggle of ideas is the heart of a true democracy.

But one place where we do not disagree—where our Congress is united—is on the subject of NATO expansion. Democrats and Republicans alike believe in the "open door" policy of NATO enlargement and both strongly endorsed the process begun at the 50th NATO Summit held in Washington. Candidate Bush, now President Bush, supports the idea that another round of invitations for membership be issued at the Prague Summit in 2002. He made that clear in a letter to President Adamkus last May.

No democracy in Europe that is prepared to meet the responsibilities of membership should be denied full participation in NATO. And no nation should fear the expansion of a defensive alliance which has done so much to encourage freedom and democracy and preserve the peace on this continent.

That is why it is worth remembering that the Helsinki Act of 1975—a document heralded as a cornerstone for European security and cooperation—declares that "the participating states . . . have the right . . . to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multi-lateral treaties, including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance." Our friends in Russia, who are signatories to the Helsinki Act, should not fear Lithuania's membership in a defensive alliance like those sanctioned by the accord.

I pledge to you that if Lithuania invests the resources necessary to meet the requirements of NATO membership, I will do all in my power to bring Lithuania into the alliance in 2002.

I intend to work side-by-side with President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and Secretaries Powell and Rumsfeld to make this a reality.

Lithuania has further to go to achieve NATO membership, but we must not forget how far Lithuania has come in 10 short years. This nation has already taken essential steps on the road to full NATO participation. Lithuania continues to be a reliable member in the Partnership for Peace, an important testing ground for compatibility with NATO forces; Lithuania has employed the NATO Membership Action Plan to focus defense resources and establish military priorities; And Lithuania played a pivotal role in making the "Vilnius-9" process one of cooperation, rather than competition.

In addition, you are to be commended on your commitment to national defense spending. Your Prime Minister's reaffirmation of the government's plan to dedicate 2 percent

of Gross Domestic Product on defense by 2002 is a critical benchmark.

Now, the members of this body must make the difficult choices to ensure your national budget reflects this priority. And while budget choices are never easy, the longterm benefits of today's national security expenditures will certainly pay off for years to come.

On regional security questions, too, Lithuania has shown a high level of commitment.

Your efforts to seek common ground with Russia regarding Kaliningrad and your relationship with Belarus continues to be handled with great finesse. You and Poland have built a strong partnership. And Lithuania's continued good relations with Baltic and Nordic nations are vital.

Some are too quick to forget the tortured years Lithuania endured as a captive nation. For five decades, the shackles of totalitarianism bound Lithuania. But you never gave up.

And for those 50 years, America steadfastly refused to acknowledge this illegal and immoral Soviet action. It would be equally wrong now, for NATO to fail to embrace the wishes of freedom loving Lithuanians.

During my last visit to Lithuania, I had the opportunity to visit your KGB museum. I must tell you it was a very moving experience to see firsthand the brutal methods employed by the Soviet secret police and the sinister tactics designed to strip this nation of its unique identity and proud history.

We all pray that this terrible period in European history has been relegated to museums and history books along with the fall of Soviet communism.

But, sadly, as we witnessed in the Balkans, Europe was not rid entirely of the cancer of aggression. Today in the southern Balkans, as ethnic tensions simmer, Lithuanian troops stand shoulder-to-shoulder with US forces, keeping the peace. Clearly this is another example that Lithuania already is supporting the collective security of all Europe.

But the American-Lithuanian relationship is not—and should not be—based solely on the traditional definition of mutual security. Our growing economic bond is critical to our continued good relations.

And with Lithuania's economic reorientation toward the West—helping to slash inflation from 1,163 percent in 1992 to less than one percent in 1999—there is no doubt that more U.S. investment will follow. Lithuania rightly looks toward America and Europe, while not disregarding Russia, for its increased economic integration.

Further, Lithuania's entry in the World Trade Organization and progress toward European Union membership—which I support—are critical steps in your efforts to broaden trade relations. I read recently that the joint Wall Street Journal-Heritage Foundation Index for Economic Freedom called the Lithuanian economy "the most improved economy in the history of the index". With a record like that, I have no doubt that Lithuania can achieve every economic goal she sets for herself.

The people of Lithuania and the people of the United States are bound by a love of freedom, by a desire to defend democracy, and by a faith in the free-market system.

We are also bound together by the one million Lithuanians who now call America home. Many of the Lithuanian-Americans live in my home state of Illinois, in the great city of Chicago. In fact, it was in Chicago where I first met many of your political leaders, including your President, Val Adamkus.

Earlier today, I was honored by President Adamkus as he awarded me the Order of the Grand Duke Gediminas (pronounced GET-A-ME-NAS).

Later today, I will be presented the title of Honorary Citizen of Vilnius. One of America's most beloved Presidents, Ronald

Reagan, a fellow native of Illinois, was the first recipient of this title. In 1984 President Reagan said, and it is still true today, "We live in a time of challenges to peace, but also of opportunities to peace. Through times of difficulty and frustration, America's highest aspiration has never wavered. We have and we will continue to struggle for a lasting peace that enhances dignity for men and women everywhere."

Both of these honors I accept on behalf of the many Lithuanian-Americans who have contributed so much to my country, and who keep the great nation of Lithuania in their hearts and in their prayers.

Our sixth American President, John Adams said: "whenever the standard of freedom and independence has been unfurled, there will be America's heart, her benedictions and her prayers." Lithuania has unfurled the standard of freedom. May God bless you and all the people of Lithuania as He has blessed the United States of America. Thank you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3167 and in strong support of the goal of NATO expansion.

I thank the Chairman of the International Relations Committee for expediting consideration of the bill and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have served as an active Member of the U.S. House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—the legislative arm of this vital organization—for nearly a decade. Over those years, we have engaged in active discussions of matters relating to trade, financial services, labor policy and engaged our European partners in important discussions regarding the role of NATO in such regional conflicts as that in the Balkans.

These vigorous discussions, led for years by our late Colleague Jerry Solomon, and now by our distinguished colleague—the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER—have enhanced communication among our governments and thereby strengthened our national security. I must make specific and sincere recognition of Jerry Solomon. He was an international leader and it is most appropriate that he be identified in this legislation.

In the last dozen years, various administrations—Democrat and Republican alike—and Congresses—Democratic-controlled and Republican-controlled—have supported expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include newly democratic states in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

In the NATO Participation Act of 1994, Congress declared that full and active participants in the Partnership for Peace program (which provides U.S. military assistance to former Warsaw Pact nations) should be invited to become full NATO members.

In the NATO Enlargement Facilitation Act of 1996, Congress called for the prompt admission of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovenia to NATO. It also declared that "in order to promote economic stability and security in Slovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Moldova, and Ukraine. And Congress signaled that we should not just be considering the emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. But we also should consider the candidacies of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovenia.

These sentiments were reaffirmed by Congress in the European Security Act of 1998.

Late next year, NATO will hold a summit in Prague, at which it will decide which additional

emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe it will invite to join during the next round of NATO enlargement.

A few weeks ago, Russian President Putin declared that Moscow is prepared to reconsider its opposition to NATO expansion into states of the former Soviet Union as part of its changing security relationship with the West since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11.

Mr. Speaker, a word about our current NATO allies is in order today as we approach the two-month anniversary of the murderous attacks on America on September 11.

Americans were enormously grateful and reassured by the decision of our NATO allies, in unprecedented action, to invoke Article 5 of the NATO Charter. At the time, this was a most important signal that the international community will stand beside the United States in our fight against terrorism.

Today, NATO nations are cooperating with our war against terrorism on many different levels and through many different activities. This should go a long way toward silencing the critics who claim that the U.S.—NATO relationship is a one-way street. Here is a concrete example of NATO providing important support to America in America's time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for H.R. 3167.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 277, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 262 and on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 46, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—372

Abercrombie	Biggart	Camp	Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Pomeroy
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Cantor	Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Portman
Aderholt	Bishop	Capito	Cunningham	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Allen	Blagojevich	Capps	Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pryce (OH)
Andrews	Blunt	Capuano	Davis (FL)	Keller	Putnam
Armey	Boehler	Cardin	Davis (IL)	Kelly	Quinn
Baca	Boehner	Carson (IN)	Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Radanovich
Bachus	Bonilla	Castle	DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Baird	Bonior	Chabot	DeLauro	Kildee	Ramstad
Baker	Bono	Chambliss	DeMint	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Baldacci	Borski	Clay	Deutsch	King (NY)	Regula
Baldwin	Boswell	Clayton	Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Rehberg
Ballenger	Boucher	Clement	Dicks	Kirk	Reyes
Barcia	Boyd	Clyburn	Dingell	Kleczka	Reynolds
Barrett	Brady (PA)	Combest	Dooley	Knollenberg	Riley
Barton	Brady (TX)	Cooksey	Doolittle	Kolbe	Rivers
Bass	Brown (FL)	Costello	Doyle	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Cox	Dreier	LaFalce	Roemer
Bentsen	Brown (SC)	Coyne	Dunn	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Bereuter	Bryant	Cramer	Edwards	Lampson	Rogers (MI)
Berkley	Burr	Crane	Ehlers	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Berman	Callahan	Crenshaw	Ehrlich	Lantos	Ross
Berry	Calvert	Crowley	Emerson	Largent	Rothman
			Engel	Larsen (WA)	Roukema
			English	Latham	Roybal-Allard
			Eshoo	LaTourrette	Royce
			Etheridge	Leach	Rush
			Evans	Levin	Ryan (WI)
			Farr	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (KS)
			Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
			Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez
			Filner	Linder	Sandlin
			Fletcher	Lipinski	Sawyer
			Foley	LoBiondo	Saxton
			Forbes	Lowey	Schaffer
			Ford	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
			Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Schrock
			Frelinghuysen	Luther	Scott
			Frost	Lynch	Serrano
			Gallely	Maloney (CT)	Sessions
			Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Shadegg
			Gephardt	Manzullo	Shaw
			Gibbons	Markey	Shays
			Gilchrest	Mascara	Sherwood
			Gillmor	Matheson	Shimkus
			Gilman	Matsui	Shows
			Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Shuster
			Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Simmons
			Gordon	McCollum	Simpson
			Goss	McCrery	Skeen
			Graham	McDermott	Skelton
			Granger	McGovern	Smith (MI)
			Graves	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
			Green (TX)	McInnis	Smith (TX)
			Green (WI)	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
			Greenwood	McKeon	Solis
			Grucci	McNulty	Souder
			Gutierrez	Meehan	Spratt
			Gutknecht	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
			Hall (OH)	Menendez	Strickland
			Hall (TX)	Mica	Stupak
			Hansen	Millender	Sununu
			Hart	McDonald	Tanner
			Hastings (FL)	Miller, Dan	Tauscher
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Tauzin
			Hayes	Miller, Jeff	Taylor (MS)
			Hayworth	Mink	Taylor (NC)
			Hefley	Mollohan	Terry
			Heger	Moore	Thomas
			Hill	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
			Hilleary	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
			Hilliard	Morella	Thornberry
			Hinojosa	Murtha	Thune
			Hobson	Myrick	Thurman
			Hoeffel	Napolitano	Tiahrt
			Hoekstra	Neal	Tiberi
			Holden	Nethercutt	Toomey
			Honda	Ney	Towns
			Hooley	Northup	Trafficant
			Horn	Norwood	Turner
			Hostettler	Nussle	Udall (CO)
			Houghton	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
			Hoyer	Olver	Upton
			Hulshof	Ortiz	Velazquez
			Hunter	Osborne	Vislosky
			Hyde	Ose	Vitter
			Inslee	Owens	Walden
			Isakson	Oxley	Walsh
			Israel	Pallone	Wamp
			Issa	Pascrell	Waters
			Istook	Pastor	Watkins (OK)
			Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Watson (CA)
			Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)	Watts (OK)
				Peterson (PA)	Weiner
				Petri	Weldon (FL)
				Phelps	Weldon (PA)
				Pickering	Weller
				Pitts	Wexler
				Platts	Whitfield

Wicker Woolsey Young (AK)  
Wilson Wu Young (FL)  
Wolf Wynn

NAYS—46

Akin Frank Pence  
Barr Goode Pombo  
Bartlett Harman Rohrabacher  
Blumenauer Hinchey Sanders  
Cannon Holt Sensenbrenner  
Carson (OK) Johnson, Sam Sherman  
Coble Jones (NC) Slaughter  
Collins Kerns Snyder  
Condit Lee Stark  
Davis, Jo Ann McKinney Stump  
Deal Miller, George Tancredo  
DeFazio Nadler Tierney  
Doggett Obey Watt (NC)  
Duncan Otter Waxman  
Everett Paul  
Flake Payne

NOT VOTING—14

Burton Ganske Meeks (NY)  
Buyer Jones (OH) Schakowsky  
Conyers Kilpatrick Stearns  
Cubin Larson (CT) Sweeney  
DeLay Lofgren

□ 1314

Messrs. STUMP, JONES of North Carolina, CARSON of Oklahoma, PENCE, KERNS, AKIN and OTTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SESSIONS and Mrs. CLAYTON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431, I was detained on legislative business. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 431, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

□ 1315

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WTO ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS IN DOHA, QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 262.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 262, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie Andrews Baker  
Ackerman Army Baldacci  
Aderholt Baca Baldwin  
Akin Bachus Ballenger  
Allen Baird Barcia

Barr Ferguson Leach  
Barrett Filner Lee  
Bartlett Fletcher Levin  
Barton Foley Lewis (CA)  
Bass Forbes Lewis (GA)  
Becerra Ford Lewis (KY)  
Bentsen Possella Linder  
Bereuter Frank Lipinski  
Berkley Frelinghuysen LoBiondo  
Berman Lowey  
Berry Gallegly Lucas (KY)  
Biggert Gekas Lucas (OK)  
Bilirakis Gephardt Luther  
Bishop Gibbons Lynch  
Blagojevich Gillmor Maloney (CT)  
Blumenauer Gilman Maloney (NY)  
Blunt Gonzalez Manzullo  
Boehlert Goode Markey  
Boehner Goodlatte Mascara  
Bonilla Gordon Matheson  
Bonior Goss Matsui  
Bono Graham McCarthy (MO)  
Borski Granger McCarthy (NY)  
Boswell Graves McCollum  
Boucher Green (TX) McCreery  
Boyd Green (WI) McDermott  
Brady (PA) Greenwood McGovern  
Brady (TX) Grucci McHugh  
Brown (FL) Gutierrez McInnis  
Brown (OH) Gutknecht McIntyre  
Brown (SC) Hall (OH) McKeon  
Bryant Hall (TX) McKinney  
Burr Hansen McNulty  
Callahan Harman Meehan  
Calvert Hart Meek (FL)  
Camp Hastings (FL) Menendez  
Cannon Hastings (WA) Mica  
Cantor Hayes Millender-  
Capito Hayworth McDonald  
Capps Hefley Miller, Dan  
Capuano Herger Miller, Gary  
Cardin Hill Miller, George  
Carson (IN) Hilleary Miller, Jeff  
Carson (OK) Hilliard Mink  
Castle Hinchey Mollohan  
Chabot Hinojosa Moore  
Chambliss Hobson Moran (KS)  
Clay Hoeffel Moran (VA)  
Clayton Hoekstra Morella  
Clement Holden Murtha  
Clyburn Holt Myrick  
Coble Honda Nadler  
Collins Hooley Napolitano  
Combest Horn Neal  
Condit Hostettler Nethercutt  
Cooksey Houghton Ney  
Costello Hoyer Northup  
Cox Hulshof Norwood  
Coyne Hyde Nussle  
Cramer Inslee Oberstar  
Crane Isakson Obey  
Crenshaw Israel Olver  
Crowley Issa Osborne  
Culberson Istook  
Cummings Jackson (IL) Ose  
Cunningham Jackson-Lee Otter  
Davis (CA) (TX) Owens  
Davis (FL) Jefferson Oxley  
Davis (IL) Jenkins Pallone  
Davis, Jo Ann John Pascrell  
Davis, Tom Johnson (CT) Pastor  
Deal Johnson (IL) Paul  
DeFazio Johnson, E. B. Payne  
DeGette Johnson, Sam Pelosi  
Delahunt Jones (NC) Pence  
DeLauro Kanjorski Peterson (PA)  
DeMint Kaptur Petri  
Deutsch Keller Phelps  
Diaz-Balart Kelly Pickering  
Dicks Kennedy (MN) Pitts  
Dingell Kennedy (RI) Platts  
Doggett Kerns Pombo  
Dooley Kildee Pomeroy  
Doolittle Kind (WI) Portman  
Doyle King (NY) Price (NC)  
Duncan Kingston Pryce (OH)  
Dunn Kirk Putnam  
Edwards Kleczka Radanovich  
Ehlers Knollenberg Rahall  
Ehrlich Kucinich Ramstad  
Emerson LaHood Rangel  
Engel Lampson Regula  
English Langevin Rehberg  
Eshoo Lantos Reyes  
Etheridge Largent Reynolds  
Evans Larsen (WA) Riley  
Everett Larson (CT) Rivers  
Farr Latham Rodriguez  
Fattah LaTourette Roemer

Rogers (KY) Simpson Toomey  
Rogers (MI) Skeen Towns  
Rohrabacher Skelton Traficant  
Ros-Lehtinen Slaughter Turner  
Ross Smith (MI) Udall (CO)  
Rothman Smith (NJ) Udall (NM)  
Roukema Smith (TX) Upton  
Roybal-Allard Smith (WA) Velazquez  
Royce Snyder Vislosky  
Rush Solis Vitter  
Ryan (WI) Souder Walden  
Ryun (KS) Spratt Walsh  
Sabo Stark Wamp  
Sanchez Stearns Watkins (OK)  
Sanders Stenholm Watson (CA)  
Sandlin Strickland Watt (NC)  
Sawyer Stupak Watts (OK)  
Saxton Sununu Waxman  
Schaffer Tancredo Weiner  
Schiff Tanner Weldon (FL)  
Schrock Tauscher Weldon (PA)  
Scott Tauzin Weller  
Sensenbrenner Taylor (MS) Wexler  
Serrano Taylor (NC) Whitfield  
Sessions Terry Wicker  
Shadegg Thomas Wilson  
Shaw Thompson (CA) Wolf  
Shays Thompson (MS) Woolsey  
Sherman Thornberry Wu  
Sherwood Thune Wynn  
Shimkus Thurman Young (AK)  
Shows Tiahrt Young (FL)  
Shuster Tiberi  
Simmons Tierney

NAYS—4

Dreier Kolbe  
Flake Waters

NOT VOTING—18

Burton Gilchrest Meeks (NY)  
Buyer Hunter Peterson (MN)  
Conyers Jones (OH) Quinn  
Cubin Kilpatrick Schakowsky  
DeLay LaFalce Stump  
Ganske Lofgren Sweeney

□ 1324

Mrs. BIGGERT changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of the last day’s proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2149

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2149.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2180

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from cosponsorship of H.R. 2180.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce it will entertain 1-minute and 5-minute special orders until 2 o'clock today.

**COMMENDING THE WORLD CHAMPION ARIZONA DIAMONDBACKS**

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the world champion Arizona Diamondbacks.

On Sunday night, the Arizona Diamondbacks engaged New York in what will truly go down as one of history's greatest baseball games ever.

The game capped one of the most exciting and thrilling World Series that baseball has ever seen.

In the end, the world champion Arizona Diamondbacks emerged victorious, and in doing so, they became the first sports franchise in Arizona's long history to earn the right to call themselves the best in the world.

They also became the fastest baseball franchise to win a World Series, doing so in just their fourth year of existence.

The Arizona Diamondbacks take a lot of criticism sometimes for relying heavily on their aces, Curt Schilling and Randy Johnson, but this victory shows that they are truly a complete team from top to bottom. This is not to mention their rookie manager, Bob Brenly, who did a fantastic job, and the fantastic front office, led by Jerry Colangelo.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my pleasure not only for what the Arizona Diamondbacks did, but the manner in which they did it. They did it with a great deal of class, integrity, and respect, which is a real reflection on the great State of Arizona.

On behalf of all Arizonans and Americans, I want to thank the world champion Arizona Diamondbacks for providing the country and the world with an exhilarating World Series, which reminds us why baseball is America's favorite pastime.

**PAYING RESPECTS TO RAYMOND T. BUTLER OF SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to a friend of mine who passed away this past Saturday. Raymond T. Butler was an icon in the Sacramento community. I know my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), also knew him very well.

Ray was involved in virtually every aspect of community life in Sacramento. He was by profession an insurance man, but he was also involved in banks and the cable TV industry. He was a longtime volunteer in numerous civic organizations.

Our community benefited from Ray Butler's involvement in it for many, many years. Our hearts go out to his wife and family in this time of loss.

Mr. Speaker, Sacramento has lost a champion, a lion of its community. We were the better for his presence and we are the lesser for his passing.

□ 1330

**SPECIAL ORDERS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

**DISAPPOINTMENT IN FORMER  
LEBANESE OFFICIAL'S REMARKS**

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to express deep disappointment in an article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times with regard to Lebanon.

We lost American men and women at the American Embassy in 1983. We lost 241 Marines who went there to help the Lebanese people and to help the Lebanese Government.

There was an article whereby the former Prime Minister, Selim al-Hoss, said the following: "The United States is consequently a terrorist partner, which makes the U.S. unfit to lead the world."

Mr. Speaker, we need in this region reconciliation; we need peace. We do not need inflammatory statements like this from the leadership and former leadership of the Lebanese Government. We should be bringing people together, not dividing people.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article I referred to.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 6, 2001]

**LEBANON TO RESIST U.S. SANCTIONS ON  
HEZBOLLAH**

(By John Kifner)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The Lebanese government is indignant over American pressure to freeze the assets of Hezbollah, the Shiite Muslim organization bitterly opposed to Israel.

It is a request the Lebanese are likely to reject, according to officials and accounts in newspapers here including the daily owned by Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri, which is presumed to reflect his views.

"The government is headed for a refusal to freeze Hezbollah money or to interfere with the resistance," that newspaper, Al Mustaqbal, reported today.

The apparent impasse once again spotlights the difficulties the Bush administration has in cobbling together its inter-

national coalition against terrorism in the face of overriding, passionately held views on local issues, particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Hezbollah, whose name is Arabic for Party of God, was listed by the State Department on Friday, along with 21 other groups—a number of them Palestinian supporters opposed to the faltering Middle East peace efforts—as a terrorist organization whose financial resources should be cut off.

Those groups join the list that already includes groups under the control of or with ties to Osama bin Laden, who is suspected of being behind the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The American action on Friday imposed stringent financial sanctions on the 22 groups. The government seized any assets of Hezbollah in the United States long ago, but the latest move is seen as putting pressure on Arab governments to crack down on the fund-raising activities of Hezbollah and other groups on the list.

The widespread Lebanese outrage over the American demand reflects the distance Hezbollah has traveled since it rose from the Shiite Muslim slums on the southern fringe of Beirut in the early 1980's as a shadowy, brutal band of kidnappers, suicide bombers and airplane hijackers.

Now it is a part of the Lebanese establishment, with members in Parliament, an important social service network and a television station whose news programs are avidly watched by many Lebanese.

Hezbollah has enjoyed the support of Syria and Iran. Syria dominates Lebanon's political affairs.

Indeed, Hezbollah members are officially regarded as national heroes—"the resistance"—for their role as guerrillas who opposed the 22-year-long Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon.

The American ambassador here, Vincent Battle, presented the American position at an emergency meeting he requested on Friday with the Lebanese foreign minister, Mahmud Hammud.

The foreign minister was apparently unimpressed.

"The Lebanese resistance has expelled Israel's occupation army from south Lebanon last year," Mr. Hammud said. "We are proud of it."

"We view the resistance as a legitimate means to liberate our land from Israeli occupation, and we hold fast to it, with the support of Syria and the rest of the Arab world."

Perhaps the most striking reaction came from an unexpected quarter, the elder statesman Selim al-Hoss, a soft-spoken academic and a Sunni Muslim who was the long-suffering prime minister through many years of civil war. He is widely respected for his personal integrity, though as a leader he was rendered powerless by religious militia factions in a land then corrupt beyond imagination.

"America supports the world's most brutal terrorist state and the deadliest ever terrorist who leads it," Mr. Hoss said, referring to Israel and its prime minister, Ariel Sharon. "The United States is consequently a terrorist partner, which makes the U.S. unfit to lead the world."

Indeed, it was widely assumed here that Israel was behind the new list, particularly after the influential Israeli lobby in Washington, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, applauded it.

To Hezbollah the condemnation was a badge of honor.

"We feel proud we have been taken as an enemy that should be blacklisted as terrorist by the Great Satan who heads the greatest pyramid of tyranny, repression and arrogance of modern times," Sheik Hassan Nasrullah, the group's leader, said at a rally.

"It is natural for the American administration to blacklist Hezbollah and the other struggling Palestinian factions."

Sheik Nasrullah issued a prohibition against any form of assistance to the American operation in Afghanistan, calling it, "a war against every Muslim who refuses to bow or kneel to the United States."

In southern Lebanon, Sheik Nabil Qaook, the strategist of the guerrilla campaign against Israel, said in a speech during the weekend: "The U.S. lists don't bother us the slightest. When America accuses Hezbollah, we take it as proof of the credibility of our goals."

"In the past, America didn't shout so loud. When it is in a dominating position and when the rules of the international game are in its favor, we don't hear accusations of terrorism. But when the balance of power leans the other way, we hear them scream."

#### REINSTATEMENT OF MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

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. Mr. Speaker, the service in the Armed Forces for all American men has been an experience that has I think unified us in this country. It has been a common experience of getting up early in the morning, eating mediocre food, but mostly understanding how the military works and understanding the importance of patriotism in this country.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to realize that within a few years there will be nobody in this Chamber that has served in the military. In a few years, there will be nobody in State legislatures that has served in the military except, possibly, for maybe a few heroes that have come back and had the name ID that allows them to run for political office.

I think that is a great danger in terms of the understanding of legislative bodies here in the U.S. House of Representatives, over in the U.S. Senate and certainly in all our legislative bodies, the State legislatures, as well as municipal jurisdictions. That experience of serving in the military has unified us.

I have been working on legislation for the past 5 years that would reinstate military conscription in a process that is both voluntary and mandatory. It would direct the Secretary of the Army and the President to reinstate a conscription between 6 months and 1 year where those individuals would go through a kind of orientation of boot camp, but also the learning of international relations, the learning of terrorism and how terrorists work and where they come from, a better understanding of the different goals of the countries around the world, and then after, but also the military discipline of that kind of basic boot camp orientation.

After that there would be a discretion. If they do not want to continue to serve in that kind of military combat training role for the rest of that 6-

month period or for the rest of that year period discretionarily, they would have the option of working in community service or going into AmeriCorps or going into some other service for the government. They would receive modest pay but exceptional training to bring back that kind of unity of experience that is so important, I think, as we conduct business that involves, more and more, the rest of the world.

An understanding of international relations has been so obvious since the September 11 attack on this country. I would encourage my colleagues to call me or my office to get a copy of this draft legislation, to look into the possibility of renewing military conscription in both a mandatory and a voluntary way that they could earn credits with the GI Bill of Rights provisions for the time that they serve their country.

It would give those individuals the kind of experience, but more than that, it would be a binding force of common experience that would hold this country together.

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

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

#### WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEETING IN QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to yesterday's New York Times, the front page. There are some stories there that bear an interrelationship that is important.

There was a major story about the World Trade Organization's upcoming meeting in Qatar in the Middle East, the first meeting that the WTO will be holding since Seattle; and the story talks about the World Trade Organization and some of the difficulties that it has been having in gaining broad-based public support for its activities and deliberations; and in fact, the story implies that if these meetings in Qatar are not successful, it might spell the demise of the WTO and the type of globalization initiatives that have ensued since this Congress passed GATT just a few years ago when the WTO was set up.

One of the reasons it says that these talks are having difficulty is because of the fact that the world trade system has resulted in widening disparities between the very rich and the very poor, and it is very interesting that the meeting is being held in a part of the world which demonstrates the wide disparity in incomes between the very rich and the very poor.

On the same front page there was a story about the rumblings in South Africa that have come since independence was granted, and what does it talk about? It talks about the growing disparity in South Africa between the very rich and the very poor and the fact that thousands and thousands of people are having their electricity shut off, are not able to earn a living, rising unemployment levels and that globalization without a social contract, and those are my words, not the words of the New York Times, creates a rising poverty and rising wealth for only the few, and that our globe is being affected by these forces, these powerful economic forces in all regions.

Recently, this week, Secretary Powell has met with the top leaders of Bangladesh. Bangladesh, one of the poorest nations in the world, which has a \$2 billion trade deficit with the United States.

How do these stories connect? These stories connect because in Bangladesh over 3,500 contract shops operate, producing over a billion garments for the world, half of which come here to the United States.

Women in that country make caps that are worn by athletic teams at all of our major universities, for example. They are forced to sew 320 caps per hour if they want to keep their job, and their bosses want them to increase it to 370 caps per hour. For each cap, they are paid a penny and a half. Those caps arrive in our country for a total of \$1 for total costs of production and shipment, material, labor and transportation. And then they are sold, on average, inside this economy for \$17 to \$19 a cap.

Now, the foreign minister of Bangladesh wants us to remove further tariffs on these items coming to our country. And what I am thinking is, even if we remove the tariffs, what guarantees are there that the women of that country would get a living wage? There is absolutely no guarantee.

The trading system that this globalization regimen has put in place has put a downward pressure on workers across this world; and they are rising up in South Africa, in the Middle East, in South America. We saw their faces in Seattle. Somebody had better pay attention to what is wrong with this global trading system. It works to the benefit of the few at the cost of the many.

I am for trade. I have a trading district, but I am for the dignity of the working person whether they work on the farm or whether they work in the factory, wherever in the world they exist. This world trading system must have a social contract, and without that we are going to have political tremors across this world, the likes of which the free nations have never experienced before.

I would say that you must have free trade among free people. And that trade regimen that is put in place by the laws we pass and by the institutions like the World Bank and the

International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank, if they do not give credence to democratic rights and freedoms then, my goodness, what are we doing?

So I would commend to my colleagues, take a look at the New York Times. Think about the connection between WTO and Qatar this week and what is going on in South Africa, and what is going on in Mexico where wages have been cut in half, and what went on in Seattle when people did not earn enough for the work they do.

What kind of system is this country promoting?

#### CREATING SAFER AIRLINE TRAVEL

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I do not come often to the well of the House, but today I feel it is essential that I address both my fellow colleagues here today and the American people because we are now in the process of considering airport security. And the debate, in my opinion, has degenerated to do we, in fact, hire Federal workers or do we hire non-Federal workers when, in fact, the House of Representatives and the Senate clearly agree on two things that are existing today.

One is that we need to up and improve the standards; secondly, that the existing contractors who are doing the job today, that is supposed to result in our safety in the air, are not doing their job properly.

Only yesterday when Chicago was proven to be a hopeless sieve, and other cities when it was shown that these workers, many of them, most of them not citizens, operated by a foreign corporation that does not even ensure that the background checks are done, even after paying a huge fine, they continue to not do the background checks. They continue to not meet the requirements that will lead to America's safety.

I get on an airplane virtually every week. I have over 100,000 miles this year alone going back and forth to my district. I as much as any other member of this great Nation have a vested interest in airline safety, as do all of my colleagues here today and on the other side of the House.

There is no question that we must act and act immediately. From this body we do not call on the administration to specific action, but I call on all of us in government to immediately fire these contractors who have failed to protect us, those contractors who continue to violate the laws. Do not fine them; fire them. I believe that while we are deciding who can protect us better, I would feel much safer having my county sheriff standing there, having my California National Guard and every other State's National

Guard. And I know that those men and women with minimal supervision on Day One will be U.S. citizens, will speak, read, write English, will understand better what behavior that is not consistent with a normal passenger would be, and they will be motivated for airline safety. Pay them what they need to have. Get them there today.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait until our law is passed, until it is conferred, until it is signed, until it is enacted. Mr. Speaker, we, in the Federal Government before Monday morning comes, before we fly on Veterans' Day, we must have better airline safety. I call on all of us to act and act immediately to bring the kind of safety to our airports that we can bring only by replacing these proven criminal corporations and getting their questionable employees off the system, off the payroll and bringing in loyal Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for this to be enacted and enacted before our great holiday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CHARITABLE DONATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACK VICTIMS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection had a hearing where we listened to the new chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Tim Muris, and we talked about a lot of issues that are under his control. On the previous day, we had a hearing of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations in which the chairman did an excellent job dealing with questions of the charities that have been created as a result of the September 11 catastrophe.

The outpouring of support from Americans is truly magnanimous since this tragedy. But we have to be sure that the contributions that are made expressly for the purpose of aiding fellow Americans in the wake of these attacks are used for the right purpose. In my home State we had Hurricane Andrew, which was a major catastrophe, a calamity; and we had the same type of outpouring of contributions that were given to help the victims of that hurricane, and, likewise, since September 11 we have had the same thing occur here in this country.

Americans regularly give to charities. A recent study in the Washington Times indicates that the average household gives about \$1,600 or 3.2 per-

cent of their income to charities. In addition, about \$1 billion has been donated for relief efforts. The outpouring of donations since the attack provides further evidence of the desire and instinct of Americans to help their fellow man.

□ 1345

That is a given.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is a lot of these charities are keeping these monies, they are not distributing it, and there are roughly 50,000 people that are unemployed up in New York because of the September 11 calamity. And with the 5,000 people killed, there are roughly 7,000 children without parents. So we need these charities to step forward and to go ahead and distribute this money as quickly as possible.

Earlier this year, and recognizing the vital roles of charity, especially charitable foundations, I introduced legislation to abolish an antiquated excise tax that not-for-profit foundations pay on their net investment income. I am hopeful my colleagues will support this and it will be part of the stimulus package, because if we do not have this antiquated excise tax on the not-for-profit foundations, they will have more money to distribute.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, Americans are very generous in their donations, and yet we hear stories of people saying they went to ground zero and went to the various charitable organizations and lo and behold they could not get money. A few did, but for the most part they got very little money. So I am here this afternoon to encourage the charities to distribute the money and realize that in the end the money that they collected is for those 50,000 people unemployed who cannot make mortgages and those roughly 7,000 children that are without fathers and mothers.

Let me conclude by saying that the FTC, in the hearing we had today, indicated in testimony that their findings are that fraud cases are few and far between. So while there has been some talk about these charitable organizations as scam activities, from what the FTC chairman has seen, these frauds are few and far between. And I am heartened and pleased to hear the agency is aggressively monitoring and investigating any attempts of fraud within charities to take advantage of the September 11 occurrence.

We need to highlight here in the House and the Senate how important it is that we show confidence in these charities, but at the same time the charities need to show and demonstrate that they are helping by distributing the money.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monohan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill

(S. 1447) "An Act to improve aviation security, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Ms. SNOWE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN WILL HELP WIN HEARTS AND MINDS OF YOUNG AFGHANS

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am here to applaud this Chamber for passing the Radio Free Afghanistan bill, because the battle we are in right now is not just to win this war militarily, but we have to win the hearts and minds of those young boys and girls playing out in the street or playing in the dirt and thinking about what are they going to be when they grow up.

We cannot have them saying they want to grow up to be a bin Laden; that they want to grow up to be a terrorist. We need to have them thinking about wanting to grow up to be a farmer, to be a teacher, to be a truck driver, a doctor, and get the ideas in their head of the freedom that we enjoy here and have them yearning for that freedom.

So this is a country that has spread our way of life and our philosophy throughout many parts of the world. We need to make sure they in Afghanistan know that we hold out our hearts and prayers to them; that there is a better life waiting for them. We need to inspire their young, and all the people of Afghanistan, for the future.

#### FAST TRACK AND THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the League of Conservation Voters circulated a letter urging Members to oppose the Presidential trade negotiating authority known as Fast Track, or trade promotion authority. League of Conservation Voters warned it would consider including the trade bill on its annual scorecard.

The league has stated Fast Track would threaten hard-won environmental and public health laws and regulations. The bill would do nothing, nothing, to prevent countries from lowering their environmental standards to gain unfair economic and trade advantages over Western democracies.

Environmental provisions must be included, Mr. Speaker, in the core text of these trade agreements. Though

Fast Track supporters have repeatedly refused, these provisions must be enforced by sanctions. Simply look at how environmental and labor standards evolved in the United States. Creation of these standards did not come about because corporations wanted them. To the contrary. They arose because concerned citizens demanded change to prevent companies from abusing workers, from polluting our air and from dumping waste into our waters.

Through free speech and the democratic process, the U.S. developed laws to protect workers and the environment. But many in the developing world do not have these privileges. In the developing world, decisions are typically made by three groups: government leaders, usually not elected; factory owners, who are often one of the same with government leaders; and Western companies.

Would authoritarian government leaders be in favor of cleaning up the environment or expanding worker rights? I do not think so. Would local factory owners be in favor of tougher greenhouse gas emission standards? I do not think so. Would Western corporations be in favor of rules to reduce the dumping of toxic chemicals? I do not think so.

How can the free trade lobby assume that labor and environmental standards will expand in the developing world when those who can improve the situation are the ones who profit from its abuse? Changes will only occur if there is an incentive to change, and the trend in corporate globalization, these trade agreements, provides very few incentives to do the right thing.

If we fail to include these important provisions in trade agreements, multinational corporations will continue to see these improvements as an unnecessary expense. We cannot allow the administration to push forward on these trade agreements, such as NAFTA, that value foreign investment more than they value the American worker. We cannot give corporations the green light to disregard human rights, to disregard labor standards, to disregard environmental laws. We cannot reward nations for abusing the ideals and the values that we in this country hold dear.

The greatest abuse of our principles is not really what is being left out but what has been put in these trade agreements: something called the investor-to-state relationship establishing chapter 11 of NAFTA. Through chapter 11, private corporations, for the first time ever, can sue a foreign government and overturn health and safety laws passed by a democracy.

Now, U.S. Trade Representative Bob Zoellick has committed to including that same chapter 11 in Fast Track. Not only can laws be overturned, but taxpayers in that nation are also liable for damages if a NAFTA tribunal rules a law or regulation causes an unfair barrier to trade. Understand this point: corporate trade lawyers can effectively

repeal a nation's public health or an environmental law that was enacted through a democratic process behind closed doors.

Corporations have been quick to capitalize on chapter 11. We have seen it in Canada, we have seen it in the United States, we have seen it with Mexican, American and Canadian corporations. As power shifts from democratically elected governments to corporations, many more corporations will attempt to strike down environmental laws, to weaken food safety laws, to eliminate consumer-protection statutes.

Chapter 11's provisions suggest that when one country's public health laws collide with a foreign corporation's profits, then public health usually loses, time after time after time. Every single time in the World Trade Organization and almost every single time under NAFTA.

Americans need to know whether the Bush administration believes that corporations deserve to trample on laws that protect our health and protect our environment. Congress should not allow chapter 11 to be incorporated into Fast Track. We need to protect the laws that we in this democratic body, and State legislatures in their democratic bodies, and city councils in their democratic bodies have created.

More and more Members of Congress are joining the ranks calling for trade agreements that are not rammed down the public's throats and that in fact respond to true social and economic ramifications across the globe. We need to press for U.S. trade policy with provisions that do, indeed, protect the environment, not weaken environment and public health laws. We need to press for provisions that promote the advancement of stronger environmental standards. We need to press for provisions that can be effectively enforced. Fast Track, Mr. Speaker, is not the answer.

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1636

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER) at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

#### PROFILING AND MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a little time this afternoon and have an in-depth discussion on a couple of different issues that I think are very important with the current matters that we have facing us. The first matter I would like to discuss at some length would be profiling and the need for profiling for the national security of this country. I have some experience in security. I used to be a police officer. I have a pretty good idea of what we need to do to look out for suspects and how we can help and assist all citizens of this country, regardless of their background, in being sure that they are secure and safe as they walk the

streets of this country, or as they go up into a building.

The second thing I want to discuss at length this afternoon is missile defense. It is absolutely critical at this juncture in our Nation's history that we prepare, that we prepare a missile defense system for this Nation. Anything that falls short of a complete missile defense system for this Nation, in my opinion, would demonstrate dereliction of the duties that we have, the responsibilities that we accepted when we were sworn in to represent the people of this Nation.

Let me start with profiling. I have seen, and I have been very disappointed and discouraged recently, about some people playing what I would call the race card against profiling. We have to talk in a very serious tone and with thoughts of the consequences of doing things and not doing things, about tools of enforcement that we can utilize within the borders of our country and outside the borders of our country and for the people that want to cross the borders of our country and for the people that want to leave the borders of our country, tools that we can use to help secure the national security. One of those tools is profiling.

Now, let me distinguish at the very beginning the difference between what I describe and what I define as racial profiling, which most people in this country, including myself, are justified in opposing, and utilizing race as one of the components of a threat profile. We will see on this chart to my left, again, how do I define racial profiling. My colleagues will see I have obviously a red circle through racial profiling.

Racial profiling is where that is the only determinant factor that one utilizes in one's profile construction. Now, obviously, if race is one's only determinant factor, the only factor considered, it raises a balloon for a very legitimate argument that one is creating or causing discrimination.

Now, there are some cases where one may not have any other factors other than the person's ethnic background; and in that case, for example, one puts out a description only using the ethnic background because that is all the information one has. Let me give an example. One is called to the scene of a bank robbery and the witnesses at the bank robbery, within moments after the bank robbery is committed, when you arrive at the bank, all they can tell you is I do not know what size they were, I did not see their face, but it was a white man. It was a white male. Then, one is justified in saying, in immediately putting out an alert, look, we know that the suspect was a white male. That is all we have at this point in time. All units be advised, there is a white male that just committed a bank robbery.

I do not know anybody that says that is not a legitimate purpose or a legitimate means. But where one would run into problems and where one sees discrimination is if, for example, an Irish

person is getting ready to get on a plane or an Arab is getting on a plane and simply because of the fact that their ethnic background is Muslim or Arab you pull them aside and question them, simply because, and the only determining factor in making that decision is their nationality or their ethnic background. That is not enough to justify it under our Constitution, in my opinion. I think it is discrimination, but we have to weigh out these situations.

Now, I can tell my colleagues that my stand in utilizing ethnic, or not excluding, that is perhaps a better way to put it, my position is that we should not exclude ethnic background any more than we should exclude age or religion when we build a profile with a number of components.

Now, some of the people who have opposed this frankly are taking examples, extreme examples of abuse by law enforcement where, in fact, they may be right, the people, the critics may be right, that in those particular cases, ethnic or what we would call racial profiling took place and there was a clear demonstration of discrimination. But let me tell my colleagues, for example, the other day in my debate I said, look, we have bad arrests in this country. We have a cop who makes a bad arrest, poor judgment. We have a lot of good police officers out there; but every once in a while, a bad police officer or a good police officer even makes a bad judgment call. If we have a bad arrest, should you immediately jump from the conclusion that you have had one bad arrest and therefore, logically, you should have no more arrests so that we avoid all future bad arrests? Of course we would not draw that kind of conclusion. That is exactly the type of conclusion that my critics are attempting to draw when I speak of national security and a profiling system that will help us protect our national security.

What my critics try to do is they try to come out and say, look, here is a case. This person was detained as they wanted to board an airplane, only because of the fact that they were Arabic background. They are Arabs. That is the only reason they were detained. It is a clear case of discrimination. They go through all of these facts that of course make the case seem horrible. And maybe it was a bad, bad case. But that is not the situation that is occurring out there. I have said to people before, look, I realize that with the millions and millions of travelers that we have in this country every day, that there are going to be some select, some very select situations of discrimination. But it is very easy to overstate that number. It is very easy to criticize law enforcement. It is very easy to criticize airport security on this profile.

What I have said to my critics is, produce the numbers. Show us case by case, and if we have a case where we have bad performance by law enforcement or bad performance by airport

personnel or whatever personnel were involved in this, there ought to be discipline. Because we should have zero tolerance; zero tolerance for discrimination in this country.

But let us not confuse who are the victims here. Who are the victims in this situation? Think about September 11. We have to quit being politically correct. What has happened is we have moved from being constitutionally correct to politically correct. I am telling my colleagues, there are law enforcement personnel, there are airport security personnel who are afraid to question certain individuals because they are afraid those particular individuals will complain that they are being discriminated against.

□ 1645

That seems the easiest get-out-of-jail-free card one could use. If they are detaining a person in the airport and one has any kind of ethnic leverage, they could just complain they are being discriminated against: Why are you searching me? You are discriminating against me.

I have yet to meet one traveler, and I fly a lot, as my colleagues do, I have yet to meet one of our constituents or one traveler out there that is not willing to go through what is necessary, to search their baggage and their fellow passengers' baggage, so they know when they get on that aircraft that that aircraft has been secured and is safe to fly.

Part of doing those kinds of checks, until we are able to put into place our computerized system which, through technology, will check every passenger that gets on that aircraft, their background, et cetera, through either eye scanning or other devices, will check every piece of cargo that goes underneath that aircraft, will check every bag that goes on that aircraft, whether it is a carry-on bag, whether it is a purse that somebody has over their shoulder, or whether it is checked-in baggage, until we get to that point, there is a certain amount of random selection that needs to take place.

That, at this point, until we get that in there, is the best alternative we have. We have no other alternative. We have to maximize immediately the safety of travel within this Nation and the safety of the citizens of this Nation, our national security.

So how do we build a profile? What kind of profile am I talking about? I think, for example, ethnic background is a legitimate component of it. Take a look. Here is typical of what I call "threat profiling." That is what I am advocating here, threat profiling. Who is it we are up against?

We have some people out there that want to do very terrible things. We have obviously seen firsthand what they have wanted to do, as a result of what happened at the Pentagon and in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members, do not let people try and back us down by say-

ing that the politically correct thing is to not question anybody who might be offended by questioning; do not dare approach anybody who could claim discrimination; do not infringe on anybody's right to board an aircraft simply because we are interested in a number of components for a profile.

I actually have some constituents out there, Mr. Speaker, that think profiling, period, regardless of how we construct the profile, is not legitimate. I find that pretty interesting, because think about it, think about this: we find profiling in every avenue of our life. Think about it.

Our schools, for example, our schools profile. Our schools profile which students are getting poor scores. Our schools profile neighborhoods: gosh, people from this side of the city are getting poorer scores than people from this side of the city. They profile by race; they profile by, okay, the white students in this age bracket at this grade are at this reading level, the black students are at this reading level, the Hispanic students are at this reading level, the Vietnamese are at this reading level.

The colleges do it; they profile their top engineering students. We use it in education every day.

We use it in marketing. We use it to assess risks. That is another area, in insurance and in marketing.

The media, take a look at any newspaper or any television station that criticizes through editorials, or any radio station, and take a look at what they do. They profile every day of the week. They profile who their listeners are, who their viewers are, who is most likely to buy the products that they are trying to sell over their medium of communication. Of course they profile.

Hospitals profile. Traffic is profiled. In fact, I challenge my colleagues to name one aspect, one aspect of our life that is not profiling. We profile. Our political parties profile. Frankly, the political parties also profile based solely on race, in some cases, based solely on ethnic background.

For example, they might say, hey, this is a black district. Let us go in, because the blacks tend to vote Democrat, so let us not profile anything other than how many blacks in there are registered. They profile strictly on one factor, and the Republicans do the same thing with contingencies of, let us say in a particular community it may be that the Irish in that community support the Republicans in bloc form. They go and they profile, too.

What I am saying here is, for God's sakes, if we allow profiling for marketing purposes, if we allow profiling out there in our schools, if we allow profiling in every step of our lives, why do we not or why are we resistant at all to profiling to protect the national security of the United States of America?

This is not a game. The nice guy finishes last here. In this kind of matter, the nice guy finishes last.

Take a look at what we do when we buy insurance, for example. Insurance

companies profile for risk. That is what I am asking that we continue to do. We need to profile for risk. What is our threat profile? What is the threat? What is the risk?

Think about it with an insurance company. Nobody says this is an illegitimate or somehow not politically correct matter. It is a fact of insurance. If they are going to insure somebody, they had better assess their risk.

It is the same as if anybody wants to invest in business. If one wants to invest, they had better assess their risk. That is exactly what profiling does.

Back to insurance. Let us talk about insurance. We know, for example, that males between the ages of 16 years old and, say, 21 years old, and then an additional profile between 21 and 25, we know that males in that age bracket tend to speed more. We know they tend to drink and drive more. We know that they tend not to use their seatbelts.

Members see what I am saying: we can begin to build a profile of why, when somebody is a 16-year-old driver, why we charge a higher insurance premium to a 16-year-old driver than we do to a 36-year-old female, mother of children, et cetera, et cetera.

Members can see the comparisons. We know that the risk of a 36-year-old female, say a mother, and there are some other classifications that can be put in, other components that can be put into the profile, is at much less risk of drinking and driving, for example. Probably uses her seatbelt every time she gets in the car; probably straps her children every time they get in the car.

We can compare it to a 16-year-old white male who probably is not using that seatbelt, who speeds around, who is not, frankly, as mature as the 36-year-old is.

It sounds like a lot of common sense. Nobody in these Chambers would disagree with this type of profiling. All I am saying is it is a huge mistake, a huge mistake for us to allow political pressure by a very select number of people to give any kind of commitment that we will not allow ethnic background to be considered as a component of a threat profile.

We are correct, however, to accept pressure and to make commitments not to use as a profile the sole, the sole component of race, because, as we know, when the sole component is race only, that does tend to lead to the difficulty of discrimination which most people in this country, if not the overwhelming majority of people in this country, believe that discrimination should have no less than zero tolerance, zero tolerance for discrimination.

So I am not a proponent of, nor are my colleagues proponents of, what I would call that type of racial profiling, where the only factor we have, looking to the left to my poster, the only factor that we have to consider is race or ethnic background.

But I am strongly advocating that we continue to encourage, in fact that we

mandate, until we come up with a better alternative, that we mandate threat profiling. It is common sense. It is not rocket science; it is common sense.

For example, we can pretty well take a look at a person's behavior, what we may know about their behavior. We may know their age, we may know their gender, we know their nationality, we know the ethnic background. They may have certain flight information; for example, did they buy a one-way ticket, a round-trip ticket, et cetera, et cetera. We might know their religious background, educational background, criminal background.

As we begin to get more and more information on these elements, the more information we get, the more accurate the threat profile becomes. Threat profiling is an essential law enforcement tool in this country. Threat profiling is no different than the type of profiling that many other walks of life utilize in our everyday life.

As I said earlier, newspapers use it, TV stations use it; even the people who blast me in an editorial, for example, for what I call threat profiling, ask them what they know about their readership and how they got that information about their readership.

The bottom line is simple. The bottom line is that I agree that ethnic background, and in fact, I advocate that ethnic background alone should not be used as the sole component of a profile. At that point, I think it is fair for us to call it racial profiling.

But once we begin to use ethnic profiling as a component, one of several components to build a profile, I think it is very legitimate. I think it is smart. Obviously, it is constitutionally protected. It may not be politically correct, with a small number of people. It may be abused by a small number of law enforcement personnel.

But overall, if it just saves one terrorist attack, and it will save a lot of terrorist attacks, we have proven evidence of that and we know it does, so if it can just assist our Nation and the citizens that we have a responsibility to protect in this Nation by giving them some assurance of protection and actual protection, then we ought to be using it.

So I would ask my colleagues, as this continues, number one, very quickly ask for the facts of the abuses that are alleged. Ask them to lay out each particular case where this so-called abuse took place. We will find in some of those cases that abuse did in fact take place, but I believe Members will also find that most of these allegations are limited in number, maybe legitimate but limited in number.

Then take a look at what a good threat profile, which allows as one of its components ethnic background, take a look at how much good that can do, how powerful that weapon is for protection of not just ourselves but protection of our fellow citizens.

So I urge that my colleagues take into consideration and run away from

the politically correct theory out there, and to take into consideration just how much we depend on threat profiling for the protection of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I want to change subjects real quick and talk about one of my favorite topics, that is, missile defense.

A little history on missile defense. We have a treaty called the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. My colleagues know what that is about. Back in the 1970s, there were only two nations, only two nations in the world, only two nations in the world that were capable of delivering a missile into the borders of the other nation: the United States and the Soviet Union.

There was a theory back then that there was an arms race that was going to get out of control, and as one of the ways to slow down the arms race in the seventies, somebody came up with a theory: let us create what we call the Antiballistic Missile Treaty; in other words, antimissile. That is exactly what the treaty is called.

What they said in that treaty, or the way they put kind of the structure of the treaty together, was to say, all right, if Russia is not allowed by treaty to build a defensive mechanism against U.S. missiles, Russia then would not initiate an attack against the United States because they would have no protection when the United States retaliated against Russia.

It also works vice versa: Why would the United States initiate an attack against the Soviet Union if the United States had no way to defend itself from the multiple missile warhead that the Soviet Union could deliver into the borders of the United States?

So they put together this treaty. In this treaty, they said Russia will not build a defense system and the United States of America will not build a missile defense system.

For many years the treaty really has gone unnoticed. A lot of people did not pay much attention to the treaty. In fact, we could ask the average citizen, and at one time one probably could have asked me, before I became a little more knowledgeable on the subject: Okay, if a foreign country launches a missile against the United States, what happens?

If that person was somewhat up to speed they would say, well, we have the NORAD space command, the detection service in Colorado Springs and Cheyenne Mountain. It is a granite mountain. They hollowed out the inside of that mountain, and we have within that NORAD, the alliance between Canada and the United States of America, to detect missile launches, or to detect foreign objects, or to kind of put a radar in the sky; kind of our eye in the sky. That is NORAD.

Then if somebody fires a missile against us, NORAD would be able to detect a missile launch, which yes, they can do anywhere in the world; they would be able to do it within a few

seconds, and that is accurate. And they would be able to tell us where that missile is going to hit, and that is accurate. They would be able to tell us the speed of the missile, and that is accurate. They would be able probably tell us what type of missile it is, and that is accurate.

But now we begin to leave the accuracy and what most people thought was the truth.

□ 1700

That was, once they figured all that out, we would somehow fire a missile and stop that missile from striking the United States, and that is a falsehood. The United States of America today does not have the capability to defend against an incoming missile.

Let me tell my colleagues that just a month ago people were mocking, saying, the United States, nobody is ever going to fire a missile against the United States. I have advocated for some period of time that not only do we have to worry about an intentional launch of a missile against the United States of America, we have to worry about an accidental launch of a missile. We all know that the old Soviet Union had, what, 6- or 7,000 nuclear warheads. We cannot be assured today, even by the capable leadership of Russia, we cannot be assured by the leadership today that they have all of those weapons; that they know where all of these missiles are; that those missiles have all been kept up on their maintenance, et cetera; and some people would not take me seriously.

Some people said, how can anybody accidentally launch a missile? About a month ago it happened. It happened in the Black Sea. The Ukrainian military launched a missile by accident, and what was the result? They shot down a passenger airline. They shot it right out of the sky by an accidental launch. If the Ukrainian military can launch, by accident, a missile against a passenger airplane, I can assure my colleagues that at some point in the future the United States of America, we, will be the victim, in my opinion, of an accidental launch.

Let us shift real quickly from an accidental launch to an intentional launch. Remember, when the treaty was drafted in the 1970s, there were two countries capable of delivering a missile against each other. That was the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Let me tell my colleagues what has happened in the 25 years since the signing of that treaty.

Take a look at this poster to my left. Again, let me reiterate, in the 1970s, when the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was negotiated and when it was signed, there were two countries capable of delivering missiles against each other, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

Look what has happened in the last 25 years or so. Countries that now possess ballistic missiles: Afghanistan, that is something we have heard about;

Algeria; Argentina, look at it; Belarus; China; Czech Republic; Egypt; France; Jordan; Hungary; Russia; obviously Saudi Arabia; Slovakia; South Africa; Syria; Taiwan. The blue on this map indicates countries that now have ballistic missile capability.

That is a big change. Twenty-five years ago the only blue on that would have been the Soviet Union and the United States. We would not have had any blue down here. We would not have any blue over here. We would not have had this blue over here, would not have blue around these areas, out there in Taiwan. That did not exist.

We would say, well, did not people back in the 1970s, when they were talking about putting this Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty together, did they not think about that? Did they not ever think that maybe somebody in the future would also deliver or develop the capability for ballistic missiles? The answer to that is yes.

In fact, the people that executed that treaty, the people who helped draft that treaty knew that the circumstances could change. They also knew when they put that treaty together that the circumstances could change so dramatically that the treaty would be of no use to either party, that the treaty would actually work to the detriment of the Soviet Union and to the detriment of the United States of America.

I can tell my colleagues that today, actually several years ago, but today the point is here. This treaty is now a detriment to the national security interests of the United States of America. This treaty is now a detriment to the Soviet Union. Why should the United States of America not build a missile defense system? Why should the Soviet Union not build a missile defense system to protect their citizens and their allies, frankly?

Look at what we have got going on today. We have a war going on in Afghanistan. What if we lost control? What if the Pakistani Government lost control of its nuclear missiles and nuclear capability? What if bin Laden got ahold of one of those missiles? Do my colleagues think he would hesitate for 1 second to fire that missile against the United States and destroy hundreds of thousands of people instantaneously? Of course he would not.

We have an inherent obligation, it is our job, it is our responsibility, number one, to pull out of that treaty; and number two, to build a missile defense system that will protect the interests of the United States of America. And we can share that information; we can share that information with our allies like the Brits, for example, or the Italians, who support this, to go out and build their own missile defense system so they are not under a threat by some rogue country or under a threat by a very legitimate country that, by accident, launches a missile.

What about that treaty? What did the treaty say? They did have the fore-

sight, the people that drafted this treaty, they had the foresight to put provisions within the treaty that would allow us to abrogate the terms of the treaty. Within the four corners of that treaty, they foresaw that at some point in the future the circumstances of 1970 might not match the circumstances of 2000 or 2001, and that is where we are today.

Let me show my colleagues exactly what the treaty says. We are just going to look at an article on this treaty, but it is the pertinent clause of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty that allows us, as a right, as a right, to withdraw from the treaty. We are not breaching the treaty. We are not breaking the treaty. And the Soviet Union, if they decided to withdraw from the treaty, would not be breaching the treaty, and they are not breaking the treaty.

Some columnists in the journalistic world out there like to parlay to their viewers or their readers out there that if the United States or the Soviet Union were to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty that they would be breaching or breaking, like breaking a contract. These people obviously have not read the treaty because the treaty, within its own four corners, within the document has specific, specific language about allowing a country, either the United States or the Soviet Union, to pull out of this treaty.

Remember that no other nation in the world, no other nation in the world that has ballistic missile capability, no other nation in the world other than the United States and the Soviet Union is subject to this treaty. They can do anything they want. They are not subject to this treaty.

Let us take a look at the specific language contained within the treaty that allows us to withdraw from the treaty. Article 15 of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the poster to my left. "This treaty shall be of unlimited duration."

Number two, key paragraph. "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty," the word "shall," "have the right to withdraw from this treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests." Let me go through it again. "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right," it is a right, it is not a breach of contract, it is not a breach of the treaty, it is a right contained within the contract, within the treaty, "the right to withdraw from this treaty, if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests. It shall give notice of its decision to the other party 6 months prior to the withdrawal from the treaty. Such notice shall contain a statement of the extraordinary events the notifying party regards as having jeopardized its supreme interests."

Let us look at the key part of this paragraph. Number one, each party has the right. The Soviet Union has the

right to pull out and the United States of America has the right to pull out from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. They have that right only if they decide that extraordinary events, extraordinary events, now, remember, that extraordinary events are not defined within the confines of that treaty. They are not defined. But I think we can define it within a couple of paragraphs, and I will show that in a few moments.

"If it decides that those events are related to the subject matter." Obviously, there are lots of events that are related to the subject matter of missile defense. Extraordinary things have happened in technology, in those people, that contain ballistic missiles in the last 25 years.

"Have jeopardized the supreme interest." I will state, jeopardization of our supreme interests must include within that category an accidental or intentional launch against the United States of America, not only by the Soviet Union, but by any other country or any other regime in the world that has the capability to do it.

So what would be those extraordinary events that would justify this? Let us pull up the previous chart. This is an extraordinary event. Compare, look at what has happened in the last 25 years.

Twenty-five years ago the United States of America and the Soviet Union had ballistic missile capability. They were the only two countries in the world that could deliver those missiles. And then some extraordinary things happened. All of a sudden other little countries all over the world begin to get not only nuclear capability but the ballistic missile capacity to deliver that nuclear capability, or a traditional warhead, conventional warhead, through the utilization of that missile. That is extraordinary, unfortunately, extraordinary in kind of a fearful way. But it is an extraordinary event that has taken place.

If for one moment we do not think that the proliferation of these missiles throughout the world is not a threat to the national interests of the United States of America, of course it is a threat, and it is a direct threat. And mark my words, just the same as the Ukraine military by accident fired a surface-to-air missile and by accident brought down a passenger airline, at some point in the future of this country someone will either intentionally launch or accidentally launch a missile against the United States of America.

Now, we can completely neutralize that treaty if we allow our administration, which has been very aggressive on their commitment to build a missile defense system for this country, we, every one of us in these Chambers, in my opinion, have an inherent obligation to help our administration build, first of all, we have the technology so it is to a point now where it is almost time to build missile defense for this country. This is an extraordinary event.

Let me show some other extraordinary events, as if proliferation of ballistic missile capabilities throughout the world is not enough, standing alone, to fill out the definition of an extraordinary event. Let me show some others.

The threat is real, as posted on my left. Rogue states and weapons of mass destruction. Among the 20 Third World countries that have or are in the process of developing weapons of mass destruction. Take a look at this. These are extraordinary events as was intended by the people that drafted the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. These are the kind of extraordinary events that the drafters of this treaty must have thought of as a legitimate reason for the United States or for Russia to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and to build a missile defense system that would protect the national security interests of their respective countries against a threat.

Who would have ever imagined 25 years ago that the country of Iran would have nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons and advanced technology for ballistic missiles? Who would have imagined that Iraq would have had nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons and advanced ballistic missile technology? Libya, same thing. North Korea, same thing. Syria, same thing.

These reflect, in my opinion, extraordinary events. These reflect the necessity as recognized by our administration, as recognized by George W. Bush, our President, and our Vice President, DICK CHENEY, and their Cabinet, their very capable Cabinet. This indicates, it demands, it insists that the United States, that the leaders of this country back this administration and allow this country to go forward with a missile defense system. We owe it to our citizens.

Now, until September 11, many people never thought it would happen and we could delay it to another day. Well, let the next generation worry about it. I am saying today, today, colleagues, we cannot afford to let the next generation worry about it.

□ 1715

We have to protect the next generation as well as this generation, and we have to do it as soon as we possibly can.

The day is coming. The day of reckoning is coming when the question will be asked, or the question could be asked, why did we not stop that missile? Did we have the capability to stop that missile? Why did we not build a missile defense system? Or the day is coming when the comment could be made, thank goodness that our government saw fit and understood their responsibility to the national security interests of this Nation, and they put in place a missile defense system that stopped that accidental launch.

And by the way, let me make a comment about all those people who are le-

gitimately, well, I disagree with some of their points of view, but certainly have a protected right to be pacifists, who say, oh, my gosh, war is terrible. And, of course, all of us agree war is terrible. But just keep in mind what Winston Churchill said. He said, "The only thing worse than war is losing one." Think about that. The only thing worse than war is losing one. And we can lose the war against missile defense if we do not provide missile defense for this country. But back to the pacifists. I think every pacifist in the United States, everybody opposed to the war in the United States of America should be urging and supporting President George W. Bush in his determination to build a defensive missile system for this country.

Now, one might ask why. I will tell you why. Think about it. You could avoid the next war if you had the capability of stopping a missile. Let us say, for example, that by accident some country, say North Korea or Russia, by accident, launched a couple of missiles against the United States; that the missiles were in such a silo arrangement and the electronics were such that there was a multiple launch, by accident. So the United States not only gets hit by one nuclear missile; it may get hit by one, two, or three nuclear missiles.

If we had the capability to stop it, there would be no retribution, or the retribution would not at least come in the way of a nuclear missile fired back towards Russia. But if we did not have the capability to stop it, because we simply neglected to build a missile defense system for the protection of this country, because of that neglect we were not able to stop an accidental launch, we could very well find the United States with no choice but to retaliate for the horrible, horrible results of a nuclear missile strike against the United States.

That is why I think that people who oppose missiles, who oppose war as an answer, that is why those people should be saying, look, the best way to disable missiles is to be able to defend against them. And we can actually make missiles obsolete in the future if in fact it is a weapon that can be defended against.

If we were able to develop a bullet-proof vest which covered the whole body, we could make the shooting of a bullet against a police officer an obsolete weapon. We have only been able to protect a part of the body, and we cannot protect it against all shots. But we are very, very close to having the complete technology to provide this country the kind of missile defense that it needs.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues are very stubborn. I cannot imagine or fathom why anyone in their right mind would object not to an offensive system but to a system that will bring down any type of missile attack against the United States of America. And I hope my colleagues

never ever use in front of me the excuse, well, it is not going to happen, or the odds of this happening are so small. And by the way, keep in mind, colleagues, that a missile does not have to have a nuclear warhead on it. As we know, it could have a warhead of a high concentration of anthrax in it. The possibilities, the horrible possibilities of what can be delivered by a missile is unimaginable, just as unimaginable as 3 months ago somebody would have told us that the World Trade Center Towers would have collapsed and the Pentagon, hit all in a simultaneous act of terrorism. It was unimaginable 3 months ago.

It was unimaginable that the Ukraine Navy, or their military, on a military exercise, would accidentally launch a missile and bring down a passenger airline. These things take on a much more realistic view for us since September 11 of 2001.

We are charged, my colleagues, with the responsibility of the security of this Nation, of the security of this Nation's people. And one of the tools that we must deploy immediately is missile defense. And as I said earlier, I do not understand how anyone could object to it. I guess we can complain about the cost. These things are expensive. Our defensive mechanisms in this country, our military operations, are expensive. We have no choice. But thank goodness a few years ago we spent money to make our military number one in the world; that when some SOB attacks our country, like these terrorists did, that we have the capability to defend ourselves.

So please do not make money the issue, and do not make the issue that the technology is not there. I mean we did not have technology when the Wright brothers first flew an airplane. We did not have the technology to take that airplane across a State or fly it across the country or take it to high altitudes or to pressurize it. All of that technology came in steps. We had to start somewhere. Same thing with a car or anything else. We start somewhere.

Our technology is advanced enough today for missile defense that the President is right; that the President's commitment to providing a missile defense for this country should be supported by each and every Member of the United States Congress. Any Member of the United States Congress who chooses not to provide a missile defense for this country ought to be questioned by their constituents in a public forum. And I would be very interested to see how they explain to their constituents that the United States does not need missile defense.

And by the way, before my colleagues go out to their constituents, they better make sure not to get themselves in a corner by saying that we would be breaching a treaty; that the treaty prohibits us from doing that. Understand from my lesson today, from my comments today, that the treaty, in fact,

allows us because of extraordinary events, which are very easy to justify, allows us, under extraordinary events, to withdraw from the treaty and build a missile defense system.

So save yourself the embarrassment. Do not go out there and say the treaty does not allow it, because the treaty clearly does. Its language is as clear as can be that we are allowed to withdraw from the treaty, legitimately withdraw from the treaty and then build a missile defense system. And keep in mind, if you object to a missile defense system, not to get yourself in a corner on money. Obviously, we have to make sure the money is spent efficiently. We do not want pork. We do not want waste. But the technology is out there.

Keep in mind that just 3 or 4 months ago we had the successful test. We had two missiles connect in space. Two missiles, an intercept missile and an offensive missile, coming into the United States. Obviously, it was a test. Both missiles were test missiles. It is working. Our technology has made giant steps towards being perfected so that it can provide an effective shield for the United States.

That is what we are asking for. We are not asking with missile defense to enhance our capability to attack another nation, but there are lots of nations around the world that can do it. And as we now know, there are people in the world who wish great harm on this country. So all we are asking for is the capability to protect, to put a shield over the United States and give us the protection that our citizens deserve.

Now, time is wasting. Ever since September 11 our realization of what can occur received kind of an aggressive jerk. We hit a pretty hard speed bump in the road. We now realize there are dangers out there that may be much closer to the United States than we ever imagined.

So, colleagues, in conclusion with my two subjects today, let me say that I speak from the bottom of my heart when I say to my colleagues how critically important it is that all of us support President George W. Bush in his commitment to build a missile defense system for this Nation. We ought to give him a resounding "yes" vote. We ought to give this President what he needs to put that security blanket over the United States to prevent a missile attack against our country.

And, finally, on my first subject of discussion this evening, do not run away from threat profiling. What we ought to prohibit is profiling that is based strictly on race alone. I am not asking for that. I think that does lead to discrimination, and I think we should have zero tolerance for discrimination. But I am saying that in the game, in the matter we are involved in right now, the nice guy finishes last. The politically correct guy finishes last.

It is very important for us to allow our law enforcement agencies and our

protection agencies to engage in what we call threat profiles. And threat profiles do not exclude ethnic background as an element or as a component, nor do they make that the exclusive element of the profile. It puts together a series of components so that we can then construct some type of risk profile, the same as we do in insurance, the same as we do in marketing, and the same as we do in our schools. It is exactly what we are asking to do for the national security of the United States of America.

#### CATERPILLAR'S BARRIERS TO TRADE

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the necessity of passing H.R. 3005, a bill to renew trade promotion authority, is epitomized by the experience of Caterpillar, headquartered in my home State of Illinois. Caterpillar's motor graders made for export to Chile face nearly \$15,000 in tariffs. Caterpillar motor graders manufactured in Brazil for export to Chile face a tariff of only \$3,700. And when Caterpillar's competitors produced the same product in Canada, it can be exported to Chile free of tariffs because of the Canada-Chile free trade agreement. Caterpillar employees in Illinois are forced to watch as workers in other countries provide products to our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, while other countries are making preferential trade deals, we are sitting on the sidelines lacking the authority to negotiate. Make no mistake, our foreign competitors have this authority, and they use it to their advantage. Of the more than 130 free trade agreements in force today, the U.S. is party to only three.

Trade works for America. Let us pass H.R. 3005 and keep America's economy growing.

#### AFTEREFFECTS OF SEPTEMBER 11 TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do have an opportunity now to speak with a sense of appreciation as well as a sense of questioning. Many of us have come to the floor of the House in the weeks after September 11 to raise many issues to help heal this Nation or to help solve the crisis that was created. I am never far from thinking of the enormous loss of life that occurred on September 11. For that reason, I believe that there is certainly never enough commentary and solutions that could be offered to help heal us from September 11.

□ 1730

We, of course, have been told to get on with our lives, to go about our business as Americans, to not be intimidated by the terrorist acts, and I would add something else, to not turn, if you will, into the kind of people who would perpetrate hatred so deep that it would take innocent lives. I am very gratified Americans have not done any of that, that there is a great deal of charitableness, there is a great deal of desire to be involved in how we can be problem solvers. For that reason, I see it fitting that we continue doing our work in the United States Congress to be problem solvers.

So to my colleagues tonight, I believe there is a degree of work that is yet undone, and we must keep busy to help solve these problems. There is work undone with respect to airline security, Federal security, federalizing the airline security in our airports.

We have yet to address the approximately 5.4 percent unemployment, the surge in unemployment, the many industries that have been hit so hard because of the tragedy of September 11, such as the tourist industry, hotels, hospitality, those particular employees, and many others.

I was riding on a plane with a constituent who said that an accounting firm had laid off 400 workers. Every day we are finding different industries that are being impacted from the events of September 11. Is American going about its business? Yes. Americans are cheered and buoyed by their values, and they are committed to the wonderfulness of this Nation.

I also see the effort by Americans to draw closer together, as diverse as this Nation is, from the many walks of life and many ethnic backgrounds that our citizens have come from, and I have seen a renewed zealotness around our values, our songs, our spirit, our charitableness; and it has been done not with any particular negativeness.

We have overcome or maybe we have spoken about or spoken out against the idea of targeting any particular group. We have joined together to say that this is not a fight against Islam, this is not a fight against the Muslims, but clearly what this is is to recognize that we are standing against terrorism. That is why we acknowledge the fact that September 11, 2001, left thousands of victims from around the world. The attacks killed hundreds from Britain, from Israel, 250 from India, and scores of others from Japan, Mexico, Iran and elsewhere. As I have said previously and as the mayor of New York City has said, these attacks were crimes against all humanity, and much of it was more than any of us could bear.

But I think as we look at our challenges and before this Congress recesses this year, there is still work to be done. As chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am very gratified that we will have an opportunity to debate H. Con. Res. 228 on the floor, and I would like to thank my colleagues for

this opportunity and I ask Members to join me in that opportunity. That is legislation to finish one piece of our task, and that is addressing the needs of children of this terrible tragedy.

I introduced Members to the Calderon family just a week ago. They have become very real symbols for the 10,000 to 15,000 children which have confronted this terrible tragedy, having lost a parent or parents or guardian on September 11. The pain is still being felt. The reaching out to find these children is still occurring. The need to nurture these children is still occurring. The long-term results of the impact of this tragedy on these children is still being deciphered. We do not know.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that children are being deprived access to mental health services. We realize, of course, that there is a great need. That trauma in children's lives can be implemented, if you will, in many different ways. We have yet to determine what those ways will be.

H. Con. Res. 228, with sponsors from around the Nation, is a legislative initiative that helps us recognize the plight of these children and establishes a quick expediting through Federal and State and local agencies the needs of these children. The psychological needs, counseling, nutritional and medical counseling, and upon determination of death of their parent or parents or guardian, in 60 days those benefits can be generated for them.

I want to applaud the opportunity to be able to debate this, which I am hoping and looking forward to doing, and I want to applaud the bipartisan effort on this legislative initiative.

This is the Calderon family. This is Naomi, 4, and this is their 20-month-old son, and they lost their mother.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that I have been joined by a number of colleagues on this issue. Again, we are talking tonight about work undone, work that we need to carry forth because we have been given this very special challenge of September 11. While there are many who are still burying their loved ones, they are also requesting that the United States Congress moves towards addressing issues dealing with children, but also dealing with the question of airline security and also dealing with the economic stimulus package.

As I introduce my friend and colleague from Texas, I am going to continue to discuss my family that is symbolic of the children who lost parents on September 11. That is one unfinished business. How do we address their needs, the thousands that have yet been, if you will, secured; or if we have not found the kind of resources for them, we must do so and establish the bully pulpit to get the government focused on them. But we have something that we have been focused on.

Just this past weekend in Chicago it was determined that an individual going through the security check was

found to have had a myriad of more than utensils, threatening instruments, stun gun and box cutter and knives. As I recall the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), we were here last week debating vigorously on the floor and just adopting the Senate bill so we would have legislation in place as we speak tonight. I consider that unfinished business, and I yield to a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and for the significant work she does and her statements regarding the children.

There is, indeed, much work that remains to be done. It goes obviously to the heart of people like this family that is exhibited in the picture that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has been talking about and many, many others who lost loved ones, families broken apart. Those are hurts and pains that will take literally forever to heal, and probably never to be able to be put back together. There are things that we can be doing in the House of Representatives and in the Congress of the United States to put into place and make a difference in people's lives.

Mr. Speaker, one of those other areas of unfinished business happens to be airport security. It is unbelievable to me that we continue to have a debate at this late date. The attack occurred on September 11. The gentlewoman joined me and others of our colleagues only 5 days after September 11 with a specific plan that we discussed at one of the major airports in Houston, Texas, and that we discussed at other airports in southeast Texas. We came back here, and there was a proposal made in the House of Representatives. The Senate took it up soon after that, passed a measure unanimously that we could not pass in the House of Representatives.

It seems that our desire and America's desire for us to be considerate of all the needs of all of the people and considerate of our political differences set partisanship aside; and on so many things we have done that. But in too many areas we have broken down in our ability to work together.

I have big concerns about where we are and why we are not able to move this forward. We would not dream of contracting out the protection that our police provide or the protections that our military provides. Why are we having a debate today on whether or not this body would attempt to contract out airport security? That is, finally, we hope, going to be debated in a conference as soon as the Senate, I think they are preparing to name their conferees, as we did yesterday.

Airport security forces have to be reliable, standardized and verifiable. There should be no compromise on this. We should speak to the will of the people of this country, 82 percent of whom have told us what needs to be

done. That is in the Senate's legislation that will be discussed between our two Houses, hopefully within the next few working days. We should not continue to even think about rewarding the private companies who have a proven track record of egregious violations.

The example about the man carrying knives, Mace, and a stun gun that slipped past the screeners, well, slipping past people is not acceptable any longer. If we are going to affect the lives of the family that the gentlewoman is talking about, and every family happens to be dealing with the safety of travel within this country, our ability to move about the country and promote economic security and development throughout this country relies on safe transportation; and that means in the air just as it does on the ground.

We must move this legislation through the conference committee, and do so quickly and effectively. Speak to the will of the people of this country and put into place so that the national defense and security, which are the charges of the Federal Government, will indeed work to keep our skies safe, and it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to make it happen.

□ 1745

It is plain and simple common sense. I hope that everyone in this country and certainly everybody in this room tonight asks themselves, who do you want protecting you and your family, a Federal security force or the lowest bidder? I think that question is real simple on almost everyone's minds.

I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for allowing me to come and speak a little bit to this concern, this one particular area of concern that I have and the many things that are left to be done, as you are graciously taking the opportunity to point out to us and give our other colleagues the opportunity to talk about.

We have an economic stimulus package that is critical for the United States of America. We obviously were in an economic slump before the attack on September 11, and we certainly are today. We are trying tremendously hard to affect the real areas of our economy that can make a difference in re-creating the activity that helps so many people enjoy some level of quality of life. That does not mean that we have to put money out to those businesses that are continuing to lay people off. It needs to be put in the hands and the pockets of the people who will spend it today because they need it today. They need it to have food and clothing and shelter that will make a difference for themselves and their families.

We will pray for the family of the woman whose life was lost in that attack, and we will also pray for each and every person in the United States of America that we will continue to hold together as we have and fight through this war that we are now living in the hopes that we will overcome

terrorism worldwide, that we will not ever face the terrible tragedy that we faced in this country on September 11, and the pain and suffering of the people like this gentleman and two young kids will have to face because of the loss of a loved one. We do not ever, ever want to see that happen again. If we will act on these pieces of legislation soon, now, we can make a difference in their lives and an appropriate one.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to have the time. I wish you well in your continued work as I do for all of us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentleman for his leadership on these issues. We did draw together quickly in Houston at our airport after the terrible incident to hear from our local officials but also to address those concerns. We are now here in November, and I believe it is extremely important that we move forward. You may be aware that the U.S. Conference of Mayors supports federalizing the security at the airports.

Might I just, before I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, mention that just yesterday at Dulles Airport, a passenger was able to get on with a different boarding pass. That compounded with the situation of Mr. Gurung at O'Hare to the extent, I just want to call out what it is alleged that he had, seven knives, a stun gun and pepper spray. And that he was also released. Certainly we believe in civil liberties and respect for the individual's rights, but because there were no standards, the individual was released, where he was, if you will, able to leave without further determining any associations that he might have.

I yield to you to answer this question. This is not an issue now of numbers of employees or who hires employees. I think the American people realize this is an issue where we need consistency. We need every single person dealing with security, whether they are in a small airport in Mississippi or California or a large airport in Texas or New York to have the same comprehension of what you should be looking for, what the standards are for an individual who may have violated the law. You treat them with the respect of the law, but you also treat them with the severity of the issue.

Let me yield to the gentleman. Does the legislation that we are trying to propose even with the conference and the fact that the bill that the Senate passed 100 to nothing but did not pass the House have anything to do with politics or does it have to do with securing our Nation?

Mr. LAMPSON. In my opinion, the ideology difference that we had in the House came down to politics. It is clear to me that 49 Senators and 50 Democrats and one independent coming together in the Senate on one bill was not a political statement. It was a statement in belief of the American people. When it came to the House, the House was broken on ideological

grounds and that broke down to party lines. That is unfortunate. That is what I am talking about. The biggest concern that I had during that whole debate was not that people are not going to be hired; people will be hired. We need that experience to be the same regardless of what airport it is.

As you were just saying, the training has to be much more significant than what it has been. And if we leave the people in charge of the process who have been a part of the process, and I might add that before the Transportation Committee just 2 or 3 weeks ago, we had some of the major airport security companies represented at a meeting, three of the five present were foreign-owned businesses. If we are going to allow people working in our airports for foreign-owned companies to be in line with our Federal security agencies, with information that is critical to the security of the United States of America and allow them to come into this loop, I think that is a ludicrous thing. But at this point, we just have to have a bill before this President to sign so that the country can get back to traveling and feel safe in doing so.

I hope that the House will quickly consider what the Senate put forth and that in our conference, whenever it happens and hopefully it will happen very quickly, maybe Monday or Tuesday of next week, that we can have a bill that the people of this country will be as happy with and feel secure with as they have in the statement that was made very clearly that this whole process be federalized. Regardless of the end run, we have to have the standard in training and in action and in a career path that allow people to keep an interest in the job that they are doing in the hopes that because they do a good job at one level, they will be able to grow from level to level and on through, so it truly becomes a career.

Through that, I think our country will be safer and more secure in their travels, our economy will get back to what it was doing before with so much of it being driven by tourism, by hotels and many other tourist activities that are involved with air travel. I think these are critical pieces.

My plea to our colleagues is that we set aside partisan politics in this matter, do the business that the people of this country want them to, and let us get this bill back over here so we can put it on the President's desk and let it become law.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am hoping that is the case. I am very pleased that we have also been joined by the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), whom I believe is as well on the Transportation Committee and the cochair of the Women's Caucus.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for highlighting for us the importance of standards and just how ludicrous it is that we would have incidents like this that are occurring. That is why I

believe that our discussion this evening is so important, work yet done that we have to address. I have indicated establishing an expedited process for these children to get their benefits so that they can continue on with their life, so that schools can be notified in case there is a special treatment or special process, a special notice to help them with the trauma that they may be feeling; but yet we also have this airline security bill. Thanksgiving looms, one of the happiest and joyous times when families are going about the country visiting. I want them to do so.

We have been on airlines since September 11. We were leaving to go to our district shortly thereafter to hold forums, as I did and as I know the gentlewoman did, to hold forums to share with people what happened and let them express themselves. At the time, I believe we all committed to working on airport security, to looking at the issues dealing with Afghanistan, to try to deal with the pain of people being laid off. Our work is still yet done.

I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman to talk of the work undone and that we must try to finish our legislative business so that some of these people who have been so devastated, whether they have lost loved ones, whether or not they have not got the full confidence of flying, even though we are encouraging everyone, we are not trying to scare people, we are just trying to do our jobs, but we need to finish these tasks. These are very important tasks, so that we can make good on our commitment to the American people.

I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I thank the gentlewoman so much for yielding. Let me commend you on the leadership that you have taken for our children around this country, those who have been devastated by the horrors of September 11, as we call 911, urgency. Let me also commend you on your tenacity to make sure that this House gets in front of it the piece of legislation that will help these children to get benefits for those horrific things that they had nothing to do with: the loss of parents, the loss of loved ones, the loss of even having the ability to carry on without counseling. I would like to join you and the Women's Caucus to call all agencies to see how soon they can expedite the funding, the benefits for these youngsters so we can get counseling done so that they can get back on track. I would love to join you in those efforts.

I also commend you for helping us to categorize just what is left on this floor, why we are still here this November 7 or 8, I have lost count of the dates; but it is because when we rushed to pass an airport bailout, I was all for that, being a senior member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the full Transportation Committee representing California; and I thought this was the proper thing to do, because on

the day of 9–11, we had to bring in 2,200 flights from the air to the ground at the request of the Secretary of Transportation and the President and Vice President.

But little did we know that an airline security bill would be this long in coming, for heaven's sake. We thought that after bailing out the airline industry, the secondary thing would be to make sure that all of our folks who work at the airports and on the aircrafts will be secure. Of course we asked for the cockpits to be fortified, and that is what was in all bills. We asked for the flight attendants to get antihijacking training as opposed to some generic type of training. That was put into the bill. We also asked, and I was very dogged about this, that you do not remove these screeners until they have the opportunity to vie for positions, to take exams and to try to keep their jobs. I am livid that that happens and continues to happen. You do not just erase thousands of people off a job just to bring out a whole new crop. You see how qualified those are who are currently in those positions. But the whole thing of federalization comes to be.

And when we talk about security, that is a national issue when it comes to American people. And so I will say to you that I am a little disheartened over the fact that we have not passed as yet the people's bill, because that is the people's bill. That bill will rush people back on to the aircrafts; it will boost our economic stimulus, because what it will do is bring back that \$6.6 trillion that we see with the traveling public. It will bring an additional \$6.5 trillion that we see in tourism. And so all of those things will help our economic stimulus package.

I am joining the Democrats and especially the Senate side and our side, too, in asking for the stimulus package to include a consumer interest-type of provision for those who are low-income workers who do not have homes but need some type of rebate so that they can go out and join the crowds in the mall with this upcoming big holiday. I would like to ask for \$14 billion for tax rebates to low-income workers, \$27 billion to spur businesses and their investments.

I would like to also talk about those small businesses that came to talk with me. As the ranking member on the Small Business Committee, I had about 15 businesspeople from lower Manhattan come to meet with me last week. They said, we need some type of stimulus; we need some type of push because we are losing our family businesses in lower Manhattan, New York.

□ 1800

That is what we are talking about, making sure that small businesses get their rightful stake in this stimulus package.

Lastly, I would like to see the \$24 billion that is being requested by Senator DASCHLE and others who are working

on this stimulus package to be for health care and unemployment benefits. If we are going to rush people off of jobs, 100,000, we certainly should have the funding to give them unemployment benefits that they rightfully deserve. We should be able to try to give health care to the over 11 million children who are uninsured and the 44 million adults who are uninsured.

So I thank the gentlewoman tonight for allowing us to bring into focus for the American people the unfinished business, the business that is truly the people's business that is going undone.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for her leadership on this very important issue, and I might ask and pose a question to the gentlewoman as well on this question of unfinished business: Can we do any less?

First, I want to thank her for her leadership, as I indicated, as Chair of the Women's Caucus, and also her work in the Committee on Small Business as well her work on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. All of that seems to be lodged right here.

The gentlewoman raised a point that I think is very important, and I hope in the conference, if they change anything in the bill, they will address the question or at least make known that there are some qualified individuals who are presently working for private contractors who should be given the opportunity to apply. What we are saying is that there are no standards, there is no training, and we are also saying that these private companies have erred toward not paying money, not paying benefits, undermining the quality of the employee so that they can get the cheapest bid.

We know that one of those companies was engaged in O'Hare, and in fact, we have run into that same company engaged in some other activities that brought about tragedies. I think it is well-known and they have been published. So they are really an example, if you will, of the need for not promoting self-interest, if that may be the case, of worrying about what private contractors may be eliminated, and really talking about the public interest, the national interest, of how we can create standards. So I want to applaud the gentlewoman for that.

I think if there is anything else they fix in the conference while they place federalizing the security as a priority out of that conference committee, taking it out of the Senate bill, would be also the eliminating of this super-citizenship, which means you have to be a citizen for 5 years. We respect the fact that there are difficulties in dealing with people who are not citizens, and I have raised that concern.

I have another concern on that issue, but I am going to focus just tonight on making sure if you are a citizen, then there is no reason to put a number of years on it. I do not think we need to do that.

But my question to the distinguished gentlewoman deals with the economic

stimulus package, and that is that we are about to enter into the holiday season. We have been charged and challenged by the President to go on with our lives. If there is ever a season where families are out, when consumers present the final indicators of how the economy is doing, it is the Thanksgiving through the holiday season, the many names that the Christmas holiday season is called, whether it is for the different faiths. But it is a holiday season.

I cannot for the life of me understand why we cannot immediately move an economic stimulus package that goes to the consumers, small businesses, to provide for health care and unemployment benefits, not just for the airline workers, but as we are coming to understand, workers around the Nation.

What I believe is so important is getting this message out to the American people of how we need to move on that package.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman. As I have said, and I will reiterate, in order to move any economic stimulus package, you must have people buying into the economy, and in order to do that, you must give low-income workers a rebate so that they can provide the toys and those other types of things that we provide for our children. We can ill afford not to do that.

I also would like to say that when you talk about the private companies engaging in the screening and screeners, we know that those private companies were in violation over millions of dollars. But if we are talking about national security, we have to be careful of how we disseminate information that we want to do now, that we are talking about the integration of information.

We have to be careful how we are going to integrate information coming from the CIA and FBI to some private company, especially foreign-born companies. So we have to be very clear and very careful on that.

Secondly, when you talk about federalizing workers, as a former personnel director, we had a merit system in place in the Federal Government. You will have a merit system, and you cannot just do an exodus of employees without them having their due diligence and fairness. So this is why we need the federalization of those screeners.

I thank the gentlewoman so much for having us come today to talk about this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman. The important point she raised was, first of all, the disseminating of information. When we are looking to secure our airports, share intelligence, would it not be more appropriate to have these particular workers under the Federal auspices, under Federal law enforcement, under the Department of Justice?

Then, with the economic stimulus package, does it make sense to give billions of dollars to corporations, and the

consumers are left holding the bag? I would like to say to her, I would like to take her up on that offer in trying to reach out to Federal and local and State agencies to see how they are doing with our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to yield now to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

When I mentioned to her that we were on the floor today to talk about unfinished business, knowing her work in the Committee on the Budget, I know she has great insight into what we need to do with the budget, on how we need to balance the needs for securing this Nation, and also her experience. Both of us have experienced terrible natural disasters, when she had to single-handedly work to help save her hometown and local community of Princeville, and I just experienced Tropical Storm Allison. You have to get busy and finish the job because people are in pain.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her great leadership on the Committee on the Budget and on the Committee on Agriculture and her knowledge about rural areas.

As I yield to the gentlewoman, no one has really mentioned the last plane fell in Somerset, Pennsylvania. I imagine that was a rural area. We do not know what kind of impact it had, we have not made a determination. There is a lot of work we need to do.

I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas. Again, I want to join my colleagues in thanking you for arranging this special order so we can talk about the unfinished work that we should complete prior to the holidays or the work we should complete in the next few days or certainly in the next few weeks.

The gentlewoman mentioned the issue of airline security that has been talked about by both of my colleagues who preceded me, being on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and having interest in the airlines.

I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and today we had a homeland security hearing. At that homeland security hearing we were privileged to have the Director of GAO share with us a number of reports that they had performed throughout, I guess, the last 2 years.

But the latest report that the government is using comes from the GAO audit, which actually was released the very day that President Bush came and spoke to the combined House here in the House of Representatives when he spoke to the Nation. It basically talked about the threats that may affect our homeland security and looked at what the roles of the government should be.

Obviously, there are things we could do now, not only because of that report

having been identified, but things we have undertaken on this floor that have not been finalized. As flawed as the transportation piece is that came from the floor, we are hoping that during the conference meeting it will be improved. You have already mentioned some things perhaps it ought to consider.

But we had our opportunity at bat over here, and most honestly, we missed a few balls. But, as they say in the ball game, "It ain't over until it's over," and it is not over until indeed we have finalized the conference bill. So there is hope.

I think we do need to federalize the security. I think it is unthinkable. We would not think of not federalizing the Border Patrol. Those workers are under a certain standard. The idea that we cannot find ways of dealing with them in a fair way, in recruiting those who are among the contractees now who possibly could qualify is to suggest that we do not know how to recruit people. So I think that is a bogus argument that we cannot control, or we do not know how to dismiss them or discipline them.

We know how to discipline our military. They are federalized. They have a certain standard. We know how to discipline our CIA. They have a certain standard. It is the same thing with them. We know how to recruit and employ and discipline the FBI. They are all federalized.

So the intelligence, the military, in fact, the Capitol Police officers, are employed by the Federal Government with certain standards. So to suggest that we need to have a different structure because it is unmanageable does not bear well on the consistency of how we protect ourselves.

I want to spend my time, though, talking about your idea of what we do in terms of children, and I want to parallel some opportunities.

I think in homeland security, as well as national security, we need to take every opportunity to look at our communities in holistic ways. We need to take opportunities as we look at these threats, again referring to the Committee on the Budget, the threats on our water system, threats on our food program, bioterrorism, chemical threats, low-tech threats, all of the information, cyberterrorists, all of these are potential threats that we need to find ways to handle.

But we have an opportunity before we leave in the next few days to make sure we find resources to make it available to our local health departments, our local front-line defenders, to give confidence.

What we have as a result of September 11, America is really feeling great fear and anxiety, more anxiety about the homeland threat than they are about our national threat, to be most honest. Not only with the attack on September 11, but since that we have had the anthrax attacks; and all of those have just raised the level of

anxiety and fear and increased the lack of confidence in our infrastructure being capable of responding or protecting us.

The first responsibility a government has is to protect its citizens. The next one, it seems to me, is to give a sense of freedom and opportunity that they can bring their children up or their families can grow and be provided for. We need to make sure that we are providing those necessary resources to shore up our health departments, to shore up our first-line responders, to give them the tools, the information, the technology, the collaboration.

I am pleased that President Bush has appointed someone to focus on that. Governor Ridge has that responsibility, and I am very pleased that that has happened. But that will not do it, just to have a spokesman. He needs to have the authority, plus the local people who will be working with him, whether State or local, need to have the capacity to respond to give our communities that kind of response.

The whole idea of homeland security is, not only have we been threatened physically, but our economy has been threatened, our way of life has been threatened. So we need to give confidence back to families that the government will respond to them in their hour of need.

Yes, we did pass the airline reinsurance, or bailout, whatever you want to call it, and perhaps they needed those monies. But I thought it was grossly unfair to put them ahead of people. I thought both of them needed to be helped. I did not think that the big dogs needed to eat before the little dogs. I thought all of them needed help. Children and unemployed people need to have that opportunity.

So we have an opportunity still to make sure we extend those resources, make sure health care is there, and to provide for families to do that.

Finally, I want to parallel children in foreign countries as well. We have made a military response to the attacks, and they were horrific. They were unacceptable and there is no excuse for it. There may be causes, but it is still unacceptable.

□ 1815

So it was a terrorist act without justification. But nevertheless, in those countries, there is the instability that gives opportunity for terrorists to grow. In those countries are families and children who are suffering. In Afghanistan itself, it is reported as of this last week, 6 million people, most of them women and children. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker: 6 million people. We are dropping more than 1 million packages of food which will feed for one day. It will not at best respond to more than 1 million. Already they cannot get the food in certain areas. So we need to find ways of working with our allies to bring, in parallel with our military, a humanitarian approach.

Now, the United States has done well in terms of providing food for needy countries, but we can do far more. Our strategy must be one that says our military will always be strong; but our strategy has to be, if we do not want our homeland security and our national security continuously threatened by terrorists who come from unstable situations, we have to be smart enough to try to prevent the cause of that, as we indeed defend militarily anyone who is killed or maimed or brought harm to the American citizen. So we have an opportunity here in this country, both to respond to corporate America, but we also have to respond to the average citizen and children. We also as a great Nation have an opportunity, an obligation to defend our country. So military strategy has to be involved, but at the same time we ought to be doing humanitarian strikes.

So we have an opportunity as we close these last few days, yes, to do the final version of the airline security; and hopefully, they can work out a compromise that will improve what we have, and we certainly need to do more on the stimulus. The stimulus program that we passed in this House is really shameful when we understand the needs of the unemployed, the needs of the children, and the needs of those who do not have opportunities for other resources, and giving them a tax break is not the response that they need for shelter, for clothing, for food, and yes, also for Christmas and toys. They need some basics, and we are not providing that as a great country; and I think we can do that.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and her vision to challenge all of us that in these waning days, we have an opportunity, but more than that, we have a challenge and an obligation to make sure we take care of the American people and take care of all of them, not just part of them, all of them. Our humanitarian efforts, our responsiveness to the whole community requires us to look at our infrastructure, requires us to look at our health and education needs, and requires us to look at security of our airlines. But nationally, the reason we have trouble in our homeland security is that we are threatened by those who dislike us enough to kill us. Whether that is reasonable or not, we have to find how we change that. Not to suggest that we ever give up our military response, but we are very shortsighted as a country if that is the only approach. Because what we will be doing is fighting this war sometime next year, the next year and the next year, because what we are doing is giving opportunities for new terrorists to attack us.

So our homeland security and our national security is tied almost the same way in that our policies do matter. There are consequences of our foreign policy and there are consequences from our domestic policy. To the extent that

we do patchwork, we get that kind of response. So we have an opportunity to respond to the holistic need and the vulnerability that my people back in my district feel, both physically, but also economically, and the vulnerability that we see that is nationwide is also one of military strength, but also of diplomacy and humanitarian. So we have opportunity.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to participate.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing her insight to the floor of the House this evening, particularly since the gentlewoman just came out of a very important budget hearing on the question of how we prepare long range.

As the gentlewoman well knows, we have formulated a Homeland Security Task Force that has just presented a report that our caucus has received and reviewed; but what the gentlewoman is highlighting, and I want to yield to the gentlewoman on this question, is that we now have the opportunity. We are here now. This is November. Our work is not yet finished; appropriations bills are yet unfinished. But we need a new bill from the administration and we need the Committee on the Budget engaged so that we can address these issues head-on with a plan. The Committee on the Budget provides the plan, the vehicle, and I know that with some sense of humor; but we will not make light of this. There are always some vigorous debates sometimes between our budget legislators and our appropriators, but we have been working together.

The gentlewoman has seen now what the long-range plans need to be. It does not seem like the economic stimulus package that has been proposed by this House that so many of us opposed took into account the dollars that we might need for long-range planning, and I am going to pose that question to the gentlewoman. As we move through the appropriations process, this economic stimulus package is sort of a part of that; but it has no plan to it, because none of us can comprehend billions of dollars going back to large corporations on tax rebates to them dated back to 1986. My son was born in 1985. It almost looks like we are burdening people with monies that have been long given and really are not at this point the appropriate utilization of precious Federal dollars.

The other point I would like the gentlewoman to be able to comment on, and I thank the gentlewoman for that, I am not sure how we can approach this; but the gentlewoman has highlighted a very important point. What is happening in Afghanistan and neighboring Pakistan is that children are being sent to these terrorist schools, these schools that are training them for lack of something else to occur in their lives, and they are being led to believe that we are bad and they are good.

Unless we deal with the needs of people, the starving people in Afghanistan, the starving people around the world; in the Sudan, there are tragedies happening there between religious groups; but unless, as I hear the gentlewoman saying, we address the pain of starving, millions of starving Afghans, millions of starving people who are innocent, the terrible cold that is going to be approaching, and we can certainly salute our military.

By the way, I want to salute them. We are approaching Veterans' Day. I want to thank all of the men and women who are protecting us all over the world who are part of the United States military. But unless we address the question of the pain in this country, and that we take these children away from these kinds of terroristic training, we take them away from being brick makers at 8 years old. I do not know if we know that Afghan children are working at 4 and 5 and 6 and 7 years old to bring home 50 cents a day, 50 cents a week, making bricks. I think the gentlewoman knows that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is doing a briefing on Afghan women. We have agreed to join her to do one on a separate day on Afghan children. But as I hear the gentlewoman saying, we have to wake up and address those issues.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, first I think it is almost shameful that we ask the local policemen and the firemen to sacrifice their lives, and yet we give GM and these big corporations big tax breaks, but we do not give the families of these people those kinds of breaks. Just to use the comparison in that stimulus. There are some principles in the stimulus, and the Committee on the Budget might not agree on both sides, but they agree on the principles. The stimulus needs to be short-lived. The stimulus needs to have an effect that it would cause people to have confidence, and also the stimulus would be the one that would bring no harm in terms of increasing the deficit. Also the issue of Afghanistan and what we must do in that area, I think the gentlewoman is right.

I think to the extent we fail to speak to the great gap between societies, we are creating those vacuums where dictators and terrorists come and fill that void. That is what bin Laden did in Afghanistan. That is what we find in other countries where they are harboring terrorists or governments that are unstable. So there is value in America spreading democracy or trying to stabilize those communities for our own selfish interests. It is in our interests to have stability in the Middle East. It is in our self-interests to have stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan, if no more than to keep down the potential of a threat of terrorists; but it is also in our interests in the long run to have trading partners. So we want to secure those.

So both of those questions are very important. Again, I want to thank the

gentlewoman for the opportunity, and I want to wish her well in pushing her bill and that we should consider that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I thank all of my colleagues who have taken the time to address the question of unfinished business. I started out by saying that 9-11 was a day in infamy, it was a day of pain. It was a day where many of us have said, let us go on with our lives, we do not want to talk about it; but it is the responsibility of those of us in government to talk about it and act upon it to heal the American people.

Let me just summarize what I think our unfinished business is. It is to deal with the children. As I started out, I want to thank the leadership of this House that I understand will possibly be giving us an opportunity to debate this resolution, and I am very pleased with that. I think the Members of the House realize the importance of the long-range impact on the children that lost a parent or guardian or parents on that day. They are going to need foster care assistance, adoption assistance, medical, nutritional, psychological care, educational services and other services.

We realize that those children who are separated from family members are going to need the kind of direction from government, or at least the impetus of government, to encourage that these children get with relatives, close relatives; and then we are going to need to give those relatives the financial support based upon benefits that are due these children. This resolution will address local and State government and the Federal Government to get those benefits out, not handouts, but benefits due these children in a 60-day period from within the determination of the death. We think this is something we can do. I applaud the leadership of the House for the appearing opportunity to do this.

Airline security must be done now, and it must be federalized. The Attorney General said about a private contractor even before this terrible incident in Chicago, an astonishing pattern of crime that potentially jeopardized public safety described one of the private contractors doing Federal security. My friends, let us restore the faith of the American people back into the travel industry, and in particular our airlines, on the brink of this holiday season. I am flying. We are all not trying to create hysteria; but it is long overdue for us to be able to check and to screen checked bags, to be able to train and have standards on people who are checking us into the airport. We do not mind being checked. We just want to make sure that they check us the same way in Atlanta that they do in Chicago; that someone is not just looking at you in Chicago and screening you and all that you have in Atlanta. Standards are extremely important for federalizing.

I plan to offer a bill, it has been in the drafting stages, to outlaw once and

for all the idea of knives and such instruments being carried on to planes. I think if the American people know you cannot carry them on, you will be subject to criminal penalties, they will adhere to that; and I believe that is extremely important.

□ 1830

And then it is crucial in the economic stimulus package that we take care of those individuals who have been laid off through no fault of their own because of this enormous tragedy; that we provide unemployment benefits and health benefits; that we get help to the small businesses that are out there struggling, as they are the infrastructure, the backbone of America; the concessions in the airport are suffering as well; that we provide a rebate to those low-income workers and moderate-income workers who will take those dollars and put them back into the economy as we move toward the holiday season.

Let us not get into any kind of warfare about what large corporations deserve funds and which do not. Let us attempt to do the job, Mr. Speaker; finish our business and provide for the American people through a real stimulus package; with airport security, federalize it and let the conferees do the bidding of the American people.

Then let me be grateful for the fact that we are going to work to help our children. We have not forgotten this family. I would simply say that we have work to do. Let us get it done.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedies of September 11, 2001 left thousands of victims from around the world, killing hundreds from Britain, more than 130 Israelis, more than 250 from India, and scores of others from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico, Japan and elsewhere. Indeed, these attacks against all people, and against all humanity are, as Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani correctly noted, "more than any of us can bear." But perhaps the greatest victims of these tragedies are the yet-to-be counted children whose parents or guardians never came home on September 11, 2001, and never will.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I call on Congress to recognize the uncounted victims of these tragedies: the children. Their slain parents and guardians were the passengers and crew of Flight 77, Flight 11, Flight 93, and Flight 175. They served our great Nation at the Pentagon, both as civilians and military, and they were the thousands of innocent civilians and rescue workers killed or injured at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001.

Today, six weeks after the September 11, 2001 attacks, there is still no official overall count of the bereaved children. Speculation as to just how many children have lost at least one parent or a legal guardian range in the area of 10,000 (based on various news sources and cited last week on National Public Radio by Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON) to 15,000 (cited in an editorial in *The Times* on September 26, 2001), to the conservative estimate of 4,000 who qualify as "orphans" under the Twin Towers Orphan Fund. Finally, the early estimate of 1,500 children left by the 700 missing *Canter Fitzgerald* employees

alone is strong evidence that the projections of children affected should be interpreted quite liberally.

Whatever the actual number, one thing is clear—as Members of Congress we must address the needs of our children, the most vulnerable of all Americans, first and foremost.

My resolution before us today, H. Con. Res. 228, addresses this great need. It expresses the sense of the Congress that the children who lost one or both parents or a guardian in the September 11, 2001, World Trade Center and Pentagon tragedies (including the aircraft crash in Somerset County, Pennsylvania) should be provided with all necessary assistance, services, and benefits and urges the heads of Federal agencies responsible for providing such assistance, services and benefits to give the highest possible priority to those children.

This resolution is non-controversial. It merely prioritizes the delivery of Federal benefits currently available under Federal law to children who have lost their parent(s) or guardian in this horrific tragedy. These should include: (1) foster care assistance; (2) adoption assistance; (3) medical, nutritional, and psychological care; (4) educational services; and (5) such additional care or services as may be necessary in light of this tragedy.

Additionally, we urge such agencies, to the maximum extent possible, to take such steps as necessary to ensure that such assistance, services and benefits are provided within 60 days of the date of the determination of the death of the child's parent or guardian.

Much of the funds that would be utilized for services in this legislation would come from the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). The SSBG is a flexible source of funds that states may use to support a wide variety of social services activities.

In FY 1999, the largest expenditures for services under the SSBG were for child day care, foster care for children, and prevention and intervention services.

There are no federal eligibility criteria for SSBG participants. Thus, states have total discretion to set their own eligibility criteria (with exception of the welfare reform law's income limit of 200% of poverty for recipients of services funded by TANF allotments that are transferred to SSBG). States also have wide discretion over the use of these funds. Federal law establishes the following broad goals toward which social services must be directed: Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate delinquency; achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency; preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests, or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families; preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; and securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate, or providing services to individuals in institutions.

Federal law also provides the following examples of social services that may relate to these broad goals: Child care, protective services for children and adults, services for children and adults in foster care, health support services, and services to meet special needs of children, aged, mentally retarded, blind,

emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, alcoholics and drug addicts.

My legislation, H. Con. Res. 228, would express to the States that these funds be expeditiously distributed to the proper Agencies so that needed services for the children who lost parents or a guardian during the attacks of September 11 may be rendered.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is greatly needed now.

**Foster Care and Adoption Services:** These services are crucial to any child who has lost their parent(s) or guardian. The importance of providing such services expeditiously cannot be underestimated, particularly in light of compounding emotional trauma endured by these children.

At a recent Congressional Children's Caucus briefing held on October 12th, 2001, Cindy Freidmutter, Executive Director of the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute in New York spoke to this issue. She noted that after September 11, the Adoption Institute proposed the Permanency Project to minimize further trauma and uncertainty in the lives of children who lost one or both parents in the attacks.

This project is needed due to the uncertain future faced by children who have lost their parent(s) or guardian. For many of these children, extended family members become decision-makers and permanent caregiver for these children. Some children, however, may not have a relative or friend to assume parental responsibility and eventually enter the public welfare system. Other children find themselves moved around from relative to relative.

Best practices and research in the fields of adoption and child welfare dictate that two considerations should be paramount in offering crisis services to these children and their families/caregivers. First, it is critical to quickly institute and support a stable family structure because repeated changes in caregivers for displaced children can cause irreparable harm. Second, children who have lost their parent benefit by having a permanent caregiver who is a family member or close family friend, and when possible, it is beneficial for such children to remain with their siblings. Separation from remaining biological family members can cause these children significant additional trauma.

This resolution recognizes these needs, and to the greatest extent possible, provides for services that best serve these children.

**Medical and Nutritional Services:** Without a parent or guardian to provide regular medical and nutritional services, children face worsening situations still. This resolution ensures that such services are available.

**Psychological Services:** According to the National Mental Health Association, children who experience such trauma are at extreme risk of mental disorders, particularly in situations such as this, where ongoing trauma exists due to the loss of parents or a guardian. For example, children who lost a parent in the Bosnian War still experience chronic depression, post traumatic stress disorder, and grief, even years after the Bosnian War ended. These children have been further deprived of a normal grieving process due to difficult and painful thoughts in the way in which their loved one died. As a result, these children needed and continue to need intensive and long-term mental health services.

Importantly, the trauma that the Bosnian War children endured closely parallels that of

the children who lost parents or a guardian in the September 11, 2001 tragedies because the circumstances and violence of the loss is analogous.

The combination of witnessing and experiencing traumatic events and multiple environmental and family factors further contributes to various mental health problems. Statistics indicate that only one in five children with a serious emotional disturbance receive mental health specialty services. That's why I introduced H.R. 75, the "Give a Kid a Chance Omnibus Mental Health Services Act of 2001" to promote mental health among all children and their families and to provide early intervention services to ameliorate identified mental health problems in children and adolescents. This legislation is greatly needed, but the resolution before us today, H. Con. Res. 228, effectively address the issue of mental health in our children in light of these tragedies.

Mental health is indispensable to personal well-being, family and interpersonal relationships, and contribution to community or society. This resolution recognizes the need for such services and makes them available.

**Educational Services:** Clearly, children displaced from their homes, communities, and families must be stabilized as soon as possible, before further damage is done. One of the most important factors in providing such stability immediately, and in preventing further de-stabilization is maintaining the level of education that existed prior to the loss of the parent(s) or guardian. This resolution provides for such services.

**Other Services:** Finally, other services may be deemed appropriate in light of the situation as it progresses. While it is impossible to anticipate and enumerate every conceivable situation calling for the need for such services, this resolution recognizes the need for common sense and discretion in determining what services are needed given the particular situation as it applies to children.

**Update on Mr. Calderon and His Children:** Mr. Calderon is 39 years old and moved to New York City from the Dominican Republic 7 years ago. He and his children currently reside in the Washington Heights neighborhood of Manhattan.

At an October 12 briefing sponsored by the Congressional Children's Caucus, Mr. Calderon spoke about his wife Lizie Martinez-Calderon, who is still missing from the attack at the World Trade Center.

Lizie was employed with Aon Financial Group, which was located on the 100th floor of Tower 2. They were married in 1996.

The Calderons have two young children, Naomi, 4 years old, and Neftali, 20 months, Mr. Calderon is a school bus driver, but was forced to take a leave of absence in order to care for his children.

As a result of that briefing, which included a panel of experts whose agencies deliver services to families, Mr. Calderon is now able to provide for his children. The American Red Cross, with the personal assistance of Ron Houle, presented Mr. Calderon with 2 months rent, and will be providing food and winter clothes for his children shortly. Mr. Calderon is also expecting financial assistance from the Red Cross to help with living expenses and to help secure a future for his children. Because of this greatly needed assistance, Mr. Calderon is able to return to his job in a few weeks.

**Afghan Children:** While H. Con. Res. 228 specifically speaks on the children who lost parents during the September 11 attacks, there are millions of children in Afghanistan who will lose a father and/or mother as a result of the War Against Terrorism. A generation of Afghan children is at risk. We cannot forget these children and they will be the focus on an upcoming briefing co-sponsored by the Children's Caucus.

As Members of Congress, we bare the great burden of providing and protecting these children. This is perhaps our greatest and most sacred responsibility. So today I urge us all to come together as parents, as leaders, and as Americans to provide these children with the services and benefits that they so desperately need are entitled to.

Thank you. God bless the Children, and God bless the United States of America.

---

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2500, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002**

Mr. ROHRBACHER (during the Special Order of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that I intend to offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROHRBACHER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the bill, H.R. 2500, be instructed to insist on the language contained in section 626 of the House-passed bill and section 623 of the Senate amendment, prohibiting the use of funds in the bill by the Department of Justice or the Department of State to file a motion in any court opposing a civil action against any Japanese person or corporation for compensation or reparations in which the plaintiff alleges that, as an American prisoner of war during World War II, he or she was used as slave or forced labor.

---

**DENOUNCING BRUTAL TREATMENT OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND WOMEN AROUND THE WORLD**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I am here again to denounce the brutal and horrific treatment directed against Afghan women and women around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have developed a track record for supporting legislation and championing causes that support the needs of women, such as pay equity and the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws.

My passion for supporting the needs and rights of disenfranchised women and children has motivated me to urge my fellow House colleagues to join me in denouncing oppression wherever it is manifest.

I have vowed to revisit the plight of Afghan women each week until gender apartheid there ceases to exist, and for several weeks I have passionately addressed these concerns. Therefore, I come before this body not only to express my outrage and sorrow about the plight and treatment of Afghani women by the Taliban regime, but to also express my outrage regarding domestic violence within our own borders. There are atrocities that we and the House will not allow and will continue to fight until justice is done for all women.

In Afghanistan, the Taliban regime is mistreating women. Their actions are woefully inconsistent with the Islamic religious injunctions that recite one should be just and compassionate to women.

Contrary to Islamic custom, Muslim women and girls are forbidden from receiving an education. They can be severely punished and even put to death for violating Taliban laws. These laws enforced by the Taliban are not those set forth in the Muslim's holy book, the Koran. The laws are reflective of narrow and atypical interpretations of Islamic law.

The end result is that Afghani women are confined to their homes to live, suffer, and sometimes die in a state of fear. The fathers, brothers, husbands, uncles, and men of the society share in the mistreatment of these women. Reports continue to be published about the extent of brutality that women and little girls are being subjected to. Domestic violence is not only common but rampant.

I am horrified by this. It is my belief and understanding that women are supposed to be held in high esteem. If this is the case, I am forced to wonder how these men of the faith can justify such inhumane behavior to Muslim women.

Domestic violence is a phenomenon that plagues women nationwide. In the United States, a woman is beaten every 9 seconds. This year, almost 4 million American women will be physically abused by their husbands or their significant others.

Wife-beating, a common and repugnant behavior employed by far too many men, results in more injuries requiring medical treatment than rape, auto accidents, and mugging combined. These figures are disturbing, Mr. Speaker, and disheartening, because underlying these numbers are those not counted that are even more appalling.

For example, 42 percent of murdered women are killed by their intimate male partner. But a tragic and disgraceful irony is that prison terms for killing husbands are twice as long as those for killing wives. There must be parity in sentencing for domestic violent crimes. The women of this House have fought and will continue to fight for resources to protect the lives of women.

In the 7 years since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act,

more than \$1.5 billion in grant funds have supported the work of prosecutors, law enforcement officers, the court, victim advocates, and health care and social service professionals.

Through the support of VAWA funding, my home State of California maintains 23 sexual assault response teams, 13 domestic violence response teams, and scores of domestic violence advocates located in law enforcement agencies throughout the State.

I am proud of these resources, but more work and funding is needed. Women need more safe havens and protection against domestic violence, not only for themselves but for their children.

Mr. Speaker, we will often hear people say that I am a mother of all children; and in order to do that, we must be the defender of women's rights.

#### IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions risen on this floor to address the body with regard to the issue of immigration and immigration reform, and tonight is no exception to that rule. I do this often because I believe it is a significant problem, perhaps the most significant problem we face in this country from a domestic policy standpoint.

We argue on the floor of the House day in and day out and night in and night out about a variety of issues. All of them, of course, have major consequences.

We have spent a long time debating the issue of airline security, for instance. It was mentioned again just in the course of the previous speaker's comments. It is undeniably an extremely important issue, the issue of airline security. It is for those of us, especially, who fly as often as those of us in the House do.

I, for one, am on an airplane twice a week, and my family are off and on airplanes. I assure the Members that I have just as much concern about airline security as the next person, and perhaps more so, from a very personal standpoint. Therefore, the decisions we make in this House with regard to the particular kind of security that is put in place are certainly important. I do not mean for a moment to suggest that they are not relevant to our debates here.

But I do mean to suggest that they are not as important, Mr. Speaker, as one other issue. That issue is the defense of our borders.

As I have said on more than one occasion, the defense of this Nation begins with the defense of our borders. The extent to which we devote time and energy and resources protecting the flying public, to the extent to

which we do that, of course, it is commendable and it is important; and it is absolutely the right thing to do.

But it is amazing to me how much time and energy we spend in that. We passed something called a stimulus package. It is really a security package. It is designed to make sure that the American economy remains strong and that people remain employed, and we do this as we watch an economy that is deteriorating. We all know that.

We are taking the right steps, I believe, in the measures that have been passed by this House to address this economic downturn. But they will, of course, take time.

All of these issues deal with, in a way, some directly, some indirectly, national security. But in every single instance, we also have the issue of immigration and immigration reform working its way into those discussions. I will try to deal with both of them tonight.

The issue of airline security. Let me talk about that on a broader scale. It is, of course, important to make sure that we are safe when we get on an airplane. Is it not also important, is it not even of paramount importance, to try and do something about the millions of people who come across our borders, either by land or by air or by sea, every single year? And they, for the most part, come here not to necessarily do us harm, but for their own purposes, almost always economic in nature.

It is understandable. No one is suggesting that it is not the desire of every human being on the planet to better themselves and to provide more for themselves and for their families.

But they do come across our borders, Mr. Speaker; and they do so sometimes, some of these people come across our borders with evil intent, as we learned all too savagely on September 11.

Now, there is an undeniable problem. It is one of those huge problems; and in a way it is like the typical story of the 500-pound gorilla in the room that nobody wants to acknowledge, but everybody knows it is there. In this case, "it" is a completely broken, completely incompetent INS, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

I want to focus the first part of my remarks this evening, Mr. Speaker, on this incompetence and on the desperate need we have for national security purposes to not only make sure that the flying public is safe, but to make sure that we are safe every day on the streets of the United States from people who come across our border, from illegal aliens or from immigrants who are here even legally, but have the desire to do us ill.

We have a responsibility to point this out, and I try my best to do so. I have, every single time I come to this floor, people who write us, who call us, who take advantage of e-mail, which is right now probably the best way to contact us.

I have people who do that by the thousands, contact our office to tell me

of stories that I have put in the category of almost too incredible to be true, but they are true. Many, many of them are documented.

Many, many of the stories come from people who work for the INS, people who are trying their best to do a good job in light of a bureaucracy that has absolutely no interest in having them do a good job, especially if that job is in internal security within the boundaries of this United States.

I am going to start this evening's discussion with a story about a gentleman by the name of Walter Cadman. Mr. Cadman is an employee of the INS, a very high-ranking employee. I will tell the Members what that specific position is in just a moment. But let me give a little bit of background, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cadman's climb through the bureaucracy of the INS began when he joined the service in 1976; and after working as an investigator and a regional director, he took over a job in Florida, the Florida operations, in 1992.

Three years later, a seven-member congressional fact-finding team visited Krome, and that is a facility, a detention facility for detainees, alien detainees. They visited the Miami International Airport also.

Mr. Cadman was among several high-ranking INS officials who attempted to deceive these Members of Congress into believing that Miami immigration operations were well managed. Mr. Cadman and others abruptly released 58 inmates from the critically overcrowded Krome detention center 2 days before the task force's visit, according to an exhaustive Federal investigation.

All of this, by the way, everything I am telling with regard to this case is documentable. Again, if anybody wants more details, this is the way, Mr. Speaker, that one would obtain those, by contacting our office.

Let me go on. More than 100 other aliens were hidden in the facility to dupe the House delegation, Members from the House of Representatives, to give the illusion that the inspection process at the Miami airport was well managed.

□ 1845

Staff was bulked up and noncriminal detainees were allowed to wait in an unsecured lobby rather than in a less hospitable holding cell. Inspectors were also ordered to remove their gun holsters and handcuffs to portray a much kinder, gentler INS that focused on customer service.

This phrase, "customer service," I heard many times from many INS officials and many people who have come to our office as whistleblowers to talk to us about the incredible pressure under which they have been placed by INS management. They are told the same thing, that they are to treat anyone coming, trying to get into this country, and even those who have come here illegally, as customers; and the customer is always right. In this case,

the customer chose evidently not to stay in the cell.

After more than 45 employees, many of them union members, blew the whistle on their bosses, Kromegate broke. The office of the Inspector General for the Justice Department investigated the matter and in June 1996 released its 197-page report. In this report, Inspector General Michael Bromwich not only detailed the conspiracy behind the INS sham but also explained how Mr. Cadman and other officials tried to cover up the wrongdoing.

Initially, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the Inspector General told a member of the delegation, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), who was at the time I believe even the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, told him that it would be done, that this report would be done within a few months, that the facts were clear, and if they could get simply the response that they required from the INS in terms of access to documents, the report would be done in just a few months. It actually took over a year because, of course, to no one's real surprise, the INS was not forthcoming with the documents that were required to conduct the investigation.

Mr. Bromwich wrote in the report: "Moreover and perhaps more troubling, Mr. Cadman was a willing participant in efforts to mislead INS headquarters and then to mislead and delay the investigation of this matter." That is a very damning statement. We have heard statements to that effect in other cases, people trying to mislead investigators, people trying to delay the investigation. We remember that all too clearly, I think, from past administrations.

Anyway, Justice officials found that Cadman had presided over meetings in which the conspiracy was planned. On the day of the visit, Mr. Cadman, reportedly red-faced with anger, threatened to arrest two INS inspectors who tried to alert representatives about the whitewash. Mr. Cadman even called airport police.

Again, this story gets better when I tell my colleagues where this gentleman now resides within the INS. So just hang with me here a minute. Again, put it in the category, unbelievable but true, and of course, with regard to the INS, the folder gets bigger and bigger and bigger every day.

Mr. Cadman's cover-up efforts began after the Office of the Inspector General started its investigation. Mr. Cadman, "did not deny that large numbers of aliens had been transferred and released from Krome," Mr. Bromwich wrote in his report. "However, Mr. Cadman essentially represented that all alien movements were normal in light of the overcrowded condition there."

That explanation, investigators determined, was not true. Rather than cooperate with investigators, Mr. Cadman forced the Justice Department to obtain subpoenas to access his com-

puter files. As I say, the Inspector General expected that there would be some degree of cooperation. I do not know why they thought so, but they did. It was not forthcoming, however.

When the Office of the Inspector General finally gained access to Mr. Cadman's computer, all his e-mails relating to the delegation's visit had been deleted. According to the report, "In his interview, Mr. Cadman stated that as matter of consistent practice, he contemporaneously deleted his electronic mail messages shortly after responding to them. In searching his e-mail, however, we," the OIG, "did find some of Mr. Cadman's messages from June 1995 which was inconsistent with Cadman's representation to us."

In an extensive and time-consuming process, investigators were eventually able to locate 61 messages that had been sent or received by Mr. Cadman regarding the congressional visit, many of which helped OIG, Office of Inspector General, prove that the officials had purposely deceived the Congress of the United States.

"On the basis of the evidence gathered in this investigation, we believe the appropriate punishment for Miami District Director Walter Cadman falls within a range from a 30-day suspension to termination of employment." This was the OIG's, the Office of Inspector General's, conclusion.

They went on to say that, "Should he not be terminated, we urge his reassignment to a position where he would not have significant managerial responsibilities." I want my colleagues to listen to that carefully, Mr. Speaker. The OIG said should this man not get fired, which is as we all know almost impossible in the Federal bureaucracy, contrary to the protestations of those who want to federalize the airline security service, but it says, "Should he not be terminated, we urge his reassignment to a position where he would not have significant managerial responsibilities."

After Mr. Cadman's removal from Miami, he virtually disappeared in the INS bureaucracy. Then, on March 4, 1997, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) held hearings on Kromegate, trying to find out how Cadman and his cohorts were punished.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) asked then-Attorney General Janet Reno the following question:

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS): I need to know what happened to the people. Let us get to the bottom line here. What happened to the people that misled the Congress? Name the names. Where are they now?

Janet Reno's response: Dan Cadman elected a voluntary demotion to a GS-15.

By the way, a GS-15, that is, if not the highest, it is close to the highest category of GS, of government service, that one can get. It is at least \$100,000 a year.

He elected to take this demotion to GS-15, criminal investigator in headquarters operations. Okay. That was the demotion.

Congressman ROGERS: Well, where is he now?

Attorney General Reno: I cannot tell you precisely.

Congressman ROGERS: Is he still working?

Attorney General Reno: He accepted a voluntary demotion, sir, so I would assume he is still working.

Congressman ROGERS: He is a Justice Department official; correct?

Janet Reno: So far as I know, sir.

ROGERS: He misled the Congress and he still works for the Justice Department?

Correct.

Now here is the punch line, Mr. Speaker, and listen carefully to this. Roughly a year later in 1998 the INS promoted Mr. Cadman to head the newly formed National Security Unit.

The gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLEY) represents this whole thing as a case where truth is stranger than fiction.

Five years after Mr. Cadman left south Florida in disgrace, only to take a job as a very high-paid INS administrator and as a, quote, "demotion," he was appointed, if we can believe it, to head up the newly formed National Security Unit. Chalk that up, Mr. Speaker, to another incredible but true series of events of which we have become aware in the last several months as we discuss the issue of immigration reform in this country.

We wonder then how is it that so many breaches of security could have happened over the years? And more recently, how is it that even Mohamed Atta, a name all too familiar to every one of us now since September 11, how is it that Mr. Atta could have been readmitted to the country in January even though he had left the country? He was here on a particular kind of visa. He left and he was supposed to apply for what is called an I-512 form, or authorization to leave the country and return. By law he was supposed to put that in writing, the reason he was leaving and for how long and how long he would be gone. Now, he never did that.

So, therefore, of course, after he left to go to Spain, which he did in January and then returned to the United States coming through Miami, should never been allowed to reenter the country. But, of course, the INS did not catch it and essentially did not care. That is the truth of the matter. They do not care.

There is a lot more attention being paid to it now, that is true, since September 11. But prior to that time, let me just give some examples once again of the unbelievable but true incidents or situations that we have become aware of while we have been doing this analysis of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the United States.

Approximately 35 million people come into the United States every year

on visas. Now, Mr. Speaker, not every one visiting the United States needs a visa. People come from certain countries where we have agreements where visas are not necessary. So we have far more people coming to the United States each year. In fact, we have about 500 million visitors a year. But about 35 to 40 million come as a result of the visa process.

Now, that process is one where people go to the consulate in their home country. They fill out some forms; and it is the responsibility of that consulate official to determine whether the person making the application is indeed who they say they are, number one, and, number two, whether or not they have any sort of background that would prevent them from being able to come into the United States. So about 40 million come.

Very little attention is paid, and was up until September 11, very little attention is paid to anybody's background. They could not care less, frankly. Again, they have been told that all of these people must be treated as customers. Again, if a customer wants to come to the United States, the customer is always right. So a visa is almost automatically granted.

Once they get here, there are certain conditions that they must follow. If they are here on a student visa, they are supposed to be students. If they are here on a work visa, they are supposed to work. There is an H1B. This is a category of visa of a person, usually a white collar worker, usually in very high-tech industries, computer programmers. That is what they are supposed to do while they are here.

It is estimated somewhere near 40 percent of all visas are violated every year, 12 million, in other words. Twelve million people either stay here even after their visa says they should go home or in some other way violate the visa, as many of the 19 hijackers of September 11 did.

The process is one where if someone violates their visa or if someone commits a crime while they are in the United States as a visa holder, they are taken to court. But they are not taken, Mr. Speaker, to a regular court, the kind of court that we would be taken to if we violate the law. Not a district court, not a county court. They are taken to an immigration court. And believe me, there is a significant difference.

What happens at that point in time is fascinating. And I will tell another anecdote, another story in a moment, another incredible but true story.

They can go to the immigration court, charged with a crime. It could be as insignificant as overstaying a visa. It could be as significant as murder. Crime brings them there. They get arrested and end up in front of a judge, and the judge listens to the case, and he either gives bail or he throws the case out of court or he orders the person deported. Then they are essentially turned over to the INS; and that is

where the problem begins, as we can imagine, turned over to the INS for their handling of the case, for their enforcement essentially.

□ 1900

Now, would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are, as we sit here tonight, at least 300,000 people wandering around in the United States of America completely free to do whatever they are doing and want to do, 300,000 people who have, in fact, been ordered deported, but the INS has not taken charge of it? They have simply let them walk. And they have done so because, I contend, Mr. Speaker, the INS does not care.

We have documentation; and I will read from a letter I received, an e-mail message we got not too long ago, like we get so many times, as I say, hundreds sometimes in a day, and it has now accumulated into the thousands of letters about this issue, and e-mails about this issue, and one of them came from an INS agent. Again, I will read part of it later, but he essentially expresses the opinion that the INS does not care, does not want there to be any close scrutiny of these people. The whole idea of internal investigations, internal security and what happens when people come across the border illegally, or what happens if they overstay, do they go after them? The answer is absolutely not.

There are literally millions of people here. I am using the figure of 300,000, which I gave earlier, Mr. Speaker, which only refers to people who have actually been to a court and then ordered deported but have not gone anywhere. When we talk to the INS, they say I do not know where they are; I have not the slightest idea. This is a favorite response of the INS to almost every question; it is a shrug of the shoulders. I do not know. I do not know where they are, have not the slightest idea. After all, we can only look at so many people. How can we follow all these people? They give you a million excuses. But, of course, that is their job. Theirs to have internal security, but nobody cares much about it. So 300,000 people that have been ordered to be deported that the INS have done nothing about, did not take them to the border and deport them.

One anecdote here to add to this list of incredible but true, unbelievable but true, however you want to put it. I will give an example of something that happened. Again, every day I am telling somebody about this and they will come to me and say, ah, that is nothing, listen to this. It is astounding now. Our files, if we stacked them up here, they would reach higher than the sign here.

A magistrate, an INS magistrate told the story to a Member of Congress about a person that came before him as a criminal. He had been arrested. He was about, I think, 18 or 19 years old, if I remember correctly, but he had no identification on him. He had mugged

an old lady, I think broken her arm or leg and had stolen her purse. Anyway, he had been arrested and taken to immigration court. The judge listens to the case and orders him deported. Actually gives him a choice: Do you want to go to jail, or do you want to get deported? Well, the kid I think probably made the right choice under that circumstance and said I would just as soon go back to Mexico, which is where he had come from.

He told the judge and the arresting officers that he was an illegal alien; that he was here without permission. And he had no identification. He gave his name, or he gave a name to the police and to the judge. They actually, in this case, did take this particular person then, put him on a bus, and sent him to Mexico through San Diego, I believe. Shortly after this gentleman got into Mexico, he called his mother and said, okay, will you bring down my ID now. Because, of course, this gentleman was not an illegal alien. He was born in the United States, his parents were born in the United States, his grandparents were born in the United States. He was not here illegally.

But he had learned, Mr. Speaker, he had learned that if you say you are an illegal alien, you will be taken to immigration court and you will not find yourself in a prison, or even in a jail waiting to go to prison. You will be sent on a trip, in this case down to Mexico. So he called his mom and said, would you bring down the ID; and his mom dutifully got in the car, drove down to Mexico, drove across the border, I guess it was 100-some miles from their home, handed him his ID and he then, of course, came right back across the border with her, showing his ID to the INS agent, the border guard, as if anybody paid attention even there, but showed his true ID and came into this country as a citizen.

All records of the original offense, of course, were attached to that person that was deported to Mexico, not to the person that was coming back in. Two different people. This guy was an American citizen. But he knew how corrupt, how messed up the system is. He knew that it was better for him to pretend to be an illegal alien and take advantage of the laxity, the incompetence, whatever you want to call it, of the INS to get away with his crime. Amazing, but true.

Here is another one. Would you not think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be only appropriate, certainly expected that a high-ranking official of the INS would understand the words "legal" and "illegal" and the definition of the word "crime"? Would that be asking too much? Perhaps we need to give a test to every potential administrator at INS so they could actually define these words; because evidently, Mr. Speaker, some of them are having a very difficult time with the English language and with understanding the English language.

Here is what I mean. Mr. Fred Alexander, the deputy district director for

the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Fairly high-ranking position, would you not say? A position where you would expect someone to be able to understand the English language? Well, I am now going to attribute what he is quoted as saying to language problems. I am not going to suggest that he is actually abetting criminal behavior, aiding and abetting or encouraging criminal behavior. That is too much to suggest. Because if you actually ended up maybe prosecuting this gentleman for aiding and abetting criminal behavior, he would be moved up to an even higher position within the INS, following INS protocol.

Here is the comment by Mr. Fred Alexander: "It is not a crime to be in the United States illegally." It is not a crime to be in the United States illegally. Is there something wrong here? Maybe it is just that he does not understand the English language; does not know what a crime is; does not know what the words illegal and legal mean, the difference between those two.

He went on to say: "It is only a violation of our civil law." Now, evidently a violation of a civil law is not a crime. If you are here illegally, it is not a crime. What kind of a statement is this? It is a reflection of what the INS thinks their job is. They believe themselves to be social workers. They believe that they were put here to encourage immigration into the United States, and it does not matter how anybody gets here.

The INS, for the most part, I will contend, Mr. Speaker, would just as soon there be no borders whatsoever. The INS would then find themselves in a position of sending out agents to countries all over the world to explain why they should come to the United States, and that the fact is there would be no restrictions against them doing so and everything will be better off as a result of hundreds of millions of people crossing our borders.

I believe that that is the motivating factor and the real basis, the ethos, of the INS, I do believe, after all the things we have come across here, after all the things that have been e-mailed or faxed to our office by thousands of people, some of them wanting to know what they could do about this horrendous problem; but many others are like the gentleman I am going to read or address here in a moment.

We got this in our fax just a short time ago. I cannot reveal his name right now, except to say that he, according to his letter, works for the INS. And I will just read excerpts from his letter so as to avoid any indication of who he is for fear of whatever retribution might be in store for him.

"I wanted to write you and let you know that I, as well as my entire extended family and all my close coworkers and friends, appreciate your efforts to reform our immigration policies." That is the kind of thing they usually start out with. They are not alone, and believe me, I know it. We are inundated

with not just faxes and e-mails but people coming to the office, INS agents, present and past INS agents, telling me essentially the same thing; thanking us for doing what we are doing here, trying to reform that system.

I think my colleagues could understand those kinds of things happening, Mr. Speaker. We have all been confronted by a Federal employee in this agency or that who is disgruntled and wants to come and tell his or her story. We have to oftentimes look at it in light of what the circumstances are: Have they actually gotten into some sort of trouble, are they being fired or something other? But never, ever have I had so many people from the same agency coming to tell me of the problems that they face there.

He says, "I currently work for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and have for" blank years. I am not going to say. He goes on to explain what his background has been. He served in a variety of different capacities in the INS and he was recently transferred. He said, "Every honest border patrol agent will tell you that every illegal alien makes it through the border, it just takes some longer and more attempts than others to get across. In any event, make no mistake about it, every determined illegal alien, from the youngest of the young to the oldest of the old, and even disabled aliens can find a wheelchair, and make it to the interior of our cities. Once they are there, they live amongst us with very little fear of discovery and deportation."

An absolutely true statement. And even those outside INS know this is true. There is not a Member on this floor, and certainly probably most of the population of the country recognizes that once an illegal alien is here, the chances of their ever being returned to their country of origin are slim to none. It is because the ethos inside that Department says, come on, come on over.

He goes on to quote something, this gentleman who wrote me, goes on to quote something that his employer, one of his supervisors told him that puts in a nutshell everything I have said about the INS and the ethos there, the thinking. He said, "I would also like to point out that probably close to half the illegal aliens in our country first entered under some sort of legal method and subsequently violated or overstayed their original status."

This is what I mentioned earlier: came here through a legal process, under a visa perhaps or some other process, but then just simply stayed. And there are literally millions. We are not sure how many. Figures range from 7 to 15 million. No one really knows, but we know it is in the millions, and I certainly believe it is in the double digits.

"Here in the interior," he said, "there is almost zero enforcement operations which target these violators." Absolutely true. Documented time and

time again. "Finally," he said, "I would like to make you aware that I believe the INS is totally mismanaged." Again, a common theme. "After writing that, I feel it is a complete understatement," he said, "but the English language probably doesn't have a word which would convey my sentiments without being vulgar."

When he was transferred to this particular district office, he said that his new supervisor said to him, and we have heard this phrase over and over again, Mr. Speaker, "Now, listen, big cases, big headaches; little cases, little headaches; and no cases, no headaches." "That in a nutshell," this individual writing me goes on to say, "seems to be the INS management philosophy."

□ 1915

"That same supervisor told me not to be too gung ho about doing my job because the United States is not ready for an efficient immigration service." The letter concludes that he would be happy to discuss this later with me, and that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in a way sums up the attitude of the INS with regard to what their job really is. Big cases, big headaches. Little cases, little headaches. No cases, no headaches. And do not be too gung ho about doing your job because the United States is not ready for an efficient immigration service. Maybe this supervisor is right, and we are not ready for an efficient immigration service. I disagree.

There was a time when I would stand on the floor of the House, as I do tonight, and ask my colleagues to join me in an effort to reform the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and there would be relatively little comment except from the general public. I would hear from folks all over America. When I get their e-mail address or any other way to contact them, we try to respond, and we have thousands and thousands who have contacted us in that way.

I would be asking my colleagues time and time again for their help on this issue, and this gentleman's observations were accurate. Nobody really cared that we did not have an efficient immigration service. There were political problems with trying to make it efficient.

One party, the Democratic Party, recognizes that there is a great deal of political support that they get from the immigrant communities; they want to encourage massive immigration for that purpose. The other party sees that there are both business interests and political problems that develop as a result of actually trying to do something about immigration reform.

Many businesses are not happy about what I talk about here on the floor and, believe me, I hear from them. They suggest that it is my responsibility to make sure that they have a cheap work force. That is really what it boils down to.

They seldom say it in just those terms. It starts out "Mr. Congressman, I have to hire them to do the job." We explain that we would be willing to look at some sort of guest worker program, but people should come to the United States legally. I try to encourage them to think about that as the right way to do it. Maybe, yes, they will have to pay more money for the service. Employers do not like to hear that. I was an employer, and I recognize that an employer is always looking for the best help at the lowest wage.

But the reality is that there are tremendous problems as a result of massive immigration to the United States, and especially massive illegal immigration to the United States. Because of the problems that I have identified with both political parties, for the longest time, we could not get anyone to pay attention. I would come to the floor and say, there are problems with standard quality-of-life issues with massive immigration, with the balkanization of the American culture and society; and there are national security problems with not being able to control our own border and not knowing who is coming across at any given time, not knowing what they are doing here, or if they have gone home when they are supposed to go home.

I recognize that there are massive problems with actually trying to secure our borders. Let me suggest, although I certainly hope that we will use the military, either the Active Duty military or the National Guard, to secure our borders, along with using all kinds of technology that is available. We are not talking about having guards standing shoulder to shoulder across thousands of miles between Canada and the United States and Mexico and the United States, I am talking about patrolling, use of sensors and overflights, and there are a variety of ways.

I am also talking about deploying massive numbers of people for internal security purposes. We started talking tonight about security issues. How much more relevant are the discussions with regard to the internal security of the United States than just the person who looks through that little machine and screens our bags? I want good ones, but I am trying to keep the bad guys from coming here in the first place.

We cannot just stand at the border and say, you look like someone who wants a job; even though you are illegal, there is probably an eager employer willing to hire you and oftentimes, unfortunately, exploit you. We could do that and try our best to figure out which ones we want to let in illegally.

The INS would be all for that, by the way. They would say, let us look for certain characteristics. Are they Arabs, let us keep them out. Even those, we have to be more specific. The reality is we cannot do that. If we are going to have secure borders, that

means that we are going to stop all people from coming across the borders illegally.

We have to stop it, Mr. Speaker. We have no alternative but to try and control our borders. It is a very difficult task. Everybody recognizes that. But I suggest that we have to rise to the occasion.

There is hopefully legislation that will be making its way through the Congress. I understand that there will be some legislation coming up soon that will actually do something about the INS structure. I am not sure what it is right now. I think that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is developing it. I hope that it is comprehensive in nature. I hope that it actually abolishes the INS, or the part of the INS that is designed to deal with security and enforcement. I hope that it abolishes that responsibility that we give to Customs, to the Department of Agriculture, to the Coast Guard, and a variety of other agencies that are cobbled together in order to try and create some kind of border security.

Right now there are so many agencies with such conflicting responsibilities and specific regulations as to what they can do, what they can look at and what the other people cannot, people will wait on the border to see which line is being monitored by which agencies. Certain agencies can look in the trunk and certain ones cannot. So if you are trying to smuggle drugs into the country, you will pick one line. If you are trying to smuggle people in, you will pick another. Put that in the category of idiotic but true.

I hope that we abolish all of those agencies or those parts of it that are supposed to deal with border security, and I hope that we create a brand-new agency. Let us call it the United States Border Security Agency for our purposes together tonight, and all of their functions are to secure our borders and root out those people who have come here illegally and send them back. If they violated the law while here, they serve time for it.

The reality is, the nature of this place and the business we do here and the pressures that are applied by special interest groups, especially by immigrant support groups, business interest groups and others, we will start out perhaps with a very good thought in mind, and by the time it works its way through the body, it will get diluted.

People in this business hope that everybody out there simply forgets the connection between the terrorists and immigration and our lack of enforcement. The hope is that people will simply forget about it and we can get back to business as usual. Business as usual, meaning porous borders, meaning unconcerned about who is coming across and why. There are plenty of people who still want that. They desire that situation. Again, the political motivations are strong.

I hope and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will never let this body forget

this, at least as long as I am here and I have breath. I will not let Members forget that 19 people came into the United States on September 11, all of them immigrants, all of them here on some status, some of them with legal documents, some of them who were here illegally because they had overstayed; and some of them, six to be accurate, we do not have the slightest idea what status they had when they came here. The INS cannot tell us about six of the individuals, if they were here on visas, here on green cards; they have no idea.

That tells us something, does it not, about exactly how those people did get here. I think they probably waltzed across the border without telling the INS and asking for a visa. I cannot even imagine such a thing, but they did. That is why when we talk about tightening visa requirements, I am all for it.

But let us assume that we get concerned about handing out visas like candy, and we begin to apply more scrutiny and we actually have a law if it is signed into law, the Antiterrorist Act, which has something which we proposed, the Immigration Reform Caucus, which said that if you are a member of a terrorist organization, you cannot come into the United States. Put this into the unbelievable but true category, Mr. Speaker.

Prior to the passage of that law, the antiterrorist law, a person could be a member of al-Qaeda, the organization that is devoted to our destruction, could be a member of that organization and that alone would not have been enough, would not have been sufficient to deny this person a visa.

There was a law on the book that said the INS cannot deny a person a visa simply because they belong to a terrorist organization or an organization that is devoted to destroying the United States of America. We did repeal that. That is good.

Now, if we find out that they are a member of al-Qaeda or an outfit that wants to destroy us, we can deny them a visa; and boy, do I feel better about that. The terrorist with his or her bomb in the bag waiting to come across, when they do not get the visa, do they go home and say, sorry, Mr. bin Laden, I cannot get my visa. You will have to get somebody else.

Does anybody believe that is what is going to happen? Does anybody believe that they will not simply use the same path that everybody else uses to come into the United States illegally, that is, the millions and millions of people who cross our border illegally? No. They will waltz across our southern border or northern border, or find a way to fly in undetected because our borders are porous, and there is no real defense mechanism, while we are wrangling over having these people who look through the screening device, whether they should be paid by the Federal Government or somebody else, as to whether that matters, as to whether they are competent. Amazing.

□ 1930

But that is what we wrangle over. And we do that to our peril.

If we do not address this issue, Mr. Speaker, if we do not do everything in our power to stop people from coming into the United States illegally, to find those who are here illegally and deport them, if we do not do everything in our power to accomplish that goal, then if, God forbid, another event similar to the 11th were to occur and it turns out that it was perpetrated by somebody who is here either on falsified papers, snuck across the border, here even legally but eventually became illegal because they violated their visa status, any one of the wide variety of reasons that someone like that can get into the United States today and stay here, if that happens, Mr. Speaker, then we are not just being irresponsible in this body, we are actually culpable, because we have the opportunity to try and stop it.

Can I guarantee that even if we implemented the most stringent border controls that we would never have an incident again like September 11? Of course not. Of course not. But I can tell you this, just because I cannot guarantee that we will never have such an incident does not mean that we should not do everything in our power to try to stop it.

We have a great window of opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in this body because the American people are with us, those of us who want immigration reform. I hear from you. I guarantee you. They want to know, they write me, they call me, they e-mail me and say, what do I do, what can I do to help? There are plenty of things that we can suggest and we do. There are bills coming up that need to be passed. There is action that needs to be taken. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that this body needs to represent the common sense that is manifest time and time again in the information I receive, from, quote, your average Americans. God bless them for being there. God bless them for being willing to come forward and tell their story, sometimes to their own detriment, to the fear of losing their job.

My immigration reform caucus, Mr. Speaker, will be holding a hearing, we believe next Thursday, at which we will have at least one individual that we have been able to obtain or we are working to obtain whistleblower status for if that is what is necessary to get him to be able to speak to us. He is an INS agent. He has been an INS agent for over 30 years. His stories about the troubled agency are again almost unbelievable but true. I hope that he will not be treated unjustly by being willing to come forward. I assure you that we will do everything we can to protect him from any retribution that might attempt to be wreaked upon him because of his willingness to come forward.

There are hundreds out there, Mr. Speaker, hundreds that are willing to

tell the story. They just need someone to hear it and then act upon it. I ask this body to heed their message. They know the threat to America. These are patriotic Americans who watched what happened on September 11 and shed the tears, the same tears, the kind of tears that you and I and everybody else shed. They work for the INS. They know the problems. They know and some of them tell me in very specific terms about what they believe happened and what they believe is wrong with the agency they work for that helped cause the horrible events of September 11.

Please, Mr. Speaker, I urge you and everyone else, all my other colleagues, to move expeditiously to reform immigration, to abolish the INS, create a new, a better homeland defense organization, stop illegal immigration at the border by every method we have at our disposal, devote resources to identifying the people who are in the United States illegally, and yes, deporting them.

Mr. Speaker, these may be harsh words; but these are harsh times in which we live. Who could have thought that we would be here talking about buildings collapsing as a result of terrorists turning planes into bombs? The days to be shy about immigration reform are over with. They were over with for me a long time ago. They should be over with for all of us. I am encouraged by the response we get from average Americans. Now all I need to get, Mr. Speaker, is the same response by my colleagues here.

#### WORKING FAMILIES PLAY VITAL ROLE IN WAR AGAINST TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the fact that in this war against terrorism, which we all recognize is going to be a long-term war, we are not recognizing that working families in this struggle against terrorism are very important. Working families in the struggle against terrorism have a vital role to play. It is important that we all recognize that role that working families play.

I am disturbed because of the treatment that I see working families receiving. Since September 11, we have not behaved well toward working families. They are a vital component of our long-term mobilization to make certain that this Nation is never again subjected to the kind of attack that took place on September 11. They are a vital component of a war for the Nation, a war for the whole of civilization, really, because the kind of fanatics and zealots who attacked the World Trade Center are that kind of threat. So working families should be respected and considered a vital part of whatever we are going to do in the future.

I am also concerned about the fact that some immigrants who are Americans, working families and happen to be immigrants, are being unnecessarily harassed. Particularly in my congressional district there is a large contingent of Pakistani immigrants, Pakistani Americans. They have been subjected to all kinds of harassment by the INS and the FBI. In an overzealous attempt to demonstrate that they are working hard, the INS and the FBI have arrested large numbers of people, they say more than a thousand across the Nation, in the metropolitan area it is about 250; and I know from firsthand contact that a large number of these people are innocent Pakistanis. It is ironic that the one Muslim nation that has gone the farthest out to join us in the fight against terrorism, taken a great deal of risk as a nation, is Pakistan.

Why are Pakistani Americans being lumped into the whole threat to America that it is perceived immigrants represent? Why not recognize that the President of Pakistan is coming to this country this weekend. He will be at the United Nations. He is going to talk to President Bush. Pakistan again has not reneged on their offer to make some air base space available. They are way out there with us. I think that to subject Pakistani Americans to unnecessary harassment and intimidation, some which resulted in the death of one Pakistani man in a jerry-built detention center in New Jersey, large numbers of people were being detained by the INS in a facility that was being run by the local county, the county jail, and the man had a heart attack and died. There are large numbers of others who are in detention right now whose names we cannot get. There are an unusually large number of women also who are being detained, Pakistani women. These are all people who are basically working-class people. I am emphasizing this because no wealthy Pakistanis would be involved in this. No wealthy immigrants are going to be subjected to this, either.

It is very interesting that those who talk about immigration never talk about the fact that in our immigration laws, we actually have provisions which encourage rich, wealthy immigrants to come in. We have incentives for wealthy immigrants. We put them at the front of the line. The assumption is made in this present situation where we are unnecessarily harassing immigrants, the assumption is made, I guess, that only the poor immigrants are a threat.

Why the assumption is made, I do not know, because Osama bin Laden is a rich man. Osama bin Laden comes from a very rich class of Saudi Arabians. There are many Saudi Arabians and other people from the rich Arab world that are in this country who never get harassed and never have been harassed since September 11, I assure you. There are many who have contracts with lobbying firms here in Washington. There

are some really very famous celebrities and ex-government officials who work in consultant firms for these same rich people. They are not immigrants, or in some cases immigrants. The children of these rich people are here on visas all the time. They are not subjected to this. It is another case of the mentality too much in America is a mentality which is weighed in a direction which makes working-class families suspect or second class.

I do not want to fall into the trap of fomenting a class war. The people who really believe in a class war are quick to accuse liberals and Democrats and progressives of wanting to start a class war. The class war is not even a war. The people who are in control in our country who have the greatest part of the wealth and the power, they are so overwhelming in their power that they dominate the working class. It is not a war. It is just a domination, the way they push the interests of the working families around.

There is no better example of that than what has occurred since September 11. Consider the fact that we passed a bill to bail out the airline industry, \$5 billion in cash for them to divide up among themselves because of losses we say they suffered as a result of being grounded by the Federal Government after the September 11 attack. They were able to play with that, and they are going to get another \$15 billion in loans. That is for the airline industry, the executives, et cetera. At the same time many of us pleaded that at least the airline employees should be taken care of in the same legislation, because, after all, when you grounded the airline industry, the planes, you also took away the employment of the people who work on those planes either in the base or in flight or the supporting services at the airports.

So why not have a relief package for them? Because of that traumatic economic blow to the airlines, they were already beginning to lay off large numbers of workers. So we said, the workers who are laid off, let us provide for them. We got from the Republican majority an insistent no, an ideological no. There was a lot of talk about ideologues. A blunt no, we will see about them later. We even got some half-hearted promise that next week. Well, next week has not come yet. There has been no particular special relief for the airline industry employees. We are now moving through the preparation of an economic stimulus package where the same ideologues are insisting that we should not have any great amount of relief for the unemployed in general. The unemployed people are at the very bottom who are suffering greatly from this economic slump that was given a great boost downward. It was pushed downward and made more serious by the September 11 attack.

We ought to stop and consider what our long-term mission is here. We have had forced upon us the need to consider

what is the United States of America all about. Before September 11, we were the most powerful Nation in the world.

□ 1945

We are the most powerful nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We were prosperous, very smug, and anybody who said we needed to stop and think about our relationship with the rest of the world and what our mission is as a nation and how our mission as a nation is important, because in defining that mission, we not only protect ourselves and defend ourselves and guarantee our children and our grandchildren will enjoy the same kind of liberty, prosperity and comfort that we enjoy. That is the dream I think every person has.

I am a grandfather, and I look at my grandchildren and say I want them to have a world as good as the world I am, and, if possible, better. So we want a better world. We cannot do that by acting in isolation as the United States of America.

A lot of us understood that before. Since September 11, most Americans are beginning to hear from the leadership that that is an impossibility, starting with the leadership in the White House. Appropriately, President Bush moved to establish a coalition, what is called a coalition, but the coalition is to deal with terrorism. The coalition spirit should be a permanent spirit.

In defending ourselves against terrorism, we are coming to grips with what our Nation is all about, what civilization is all about. Because the people who have perpetrated these terrorist acts are striking at the very jugular vein of our Nation and our civilization.

Our long-term mission has to be to understand that we stand for certain values, and those values are what bring about our enemies. The people who perpetrated the terrorist acts on September 11 do not like those values.

We should not cry about it or spend undue time worrying about whether we are liked or not. The question is, why are we not liked, who does not like us, and what do we think of the people who do not like us?

People hate our values, and we should not get into the trap of one religion being set up against another. Certainly Osama bin Laden wants to make it a conflict between Christianity and Islam. A lot of other people would enjoy having the real issue hidden under crosses and past history of crusades, et cetera. But we are not a country that accepts religion as a basis for our being. We are not a country that adopts one religion.

We have a certain value system, and the value system is really what upsets our enemies most. Whether we were Christian or Jewish or any other religion, they still do not like the value systems that are defined and set forth and promulgated by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Probably more so than the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence defines what America is all about. It is not a legal definition, because the Declaration of Independence, the preamble, is not a legal matter. You do not go to court on that. The Constitution is a legal document that we have a lot of wrangling about, back and forth in the court.

But Thomas Jefferson's declaration that all men are created equal and are endowed by certain inalienable rights, and among those are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, is the core of the spirit of what this Nation is all about, the core of our democracy and what it is all about, the core of what we carry about throughout the world, the core of what the world is responding to.

Anybody who says we are more hated in the world than we are liked in the world, I challenge them right away. I think we are more imitated, admired, and people would duplicate our system, if they could, ordinary people.

We have leaders out there, fanatics, zealots, who would like to see this belief in the equality of all men ended. And we should stop saying all men, but say all humans, because we clearly believe that women should be equal to men. That upsets a large number of people throughout the world. Equality of men and equality of women.

We do not subscribe to a system which says that you have got some people up here who can be ayatollahs or chiefs or kings or sultans or potentates that have a right to trample on the people underneath them, that the lives of the people at the bottom of the economic ladder are not as good as the lives of people at the top; that they do not deserve the same system of justice, the opportunity to improve themselves; that they do not deserve an education.

The spirit of America is what the enemies of America hate. That spirit is summed up in the statement about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and all human beings are created equal.

It does not matter what happens in our foreign policy today, tomorrow or the next day. If you do not back away from believing all men and women are created equal and we continue to have a democratic system, and we are going to have decisions made as fair as possible and keep trying to perfect it to make it real, we are going to offend large numbers of people throughout the world. Large numbers of zealots and fanatics are always going to be attacking us.

Do not worry about whether they like us or not. We have a mission to try to go throughout the world and make people understand how important this is.

We have succeeded greatly in expanding democracy in the 20th century. Just stop and think about two very sophisticated, powerful nations with influence stretching over large areas of

the world who became definite democracies. Without question, Japan and Germany, after the defeat in World War II, became democracies. Whatever else they are, nobody challenges; nobody would question the fact that Germany is a great democracy now and will be tomorrow. There is no likelihood that they are going to sink into fascism, totalitarianism. Germany is clearly a democracy. We accomplished that.

The transformation of Germany, some people said, well, we do not engage in nation-building. That is bad. Call it what you want. We did not exactly nation-build in Germany. They had a nation, very rigid rules and social strata. All kinds of things are happening there, and it is still happening in many cases.

It is just as in the case of Japan. We did not knock down traditions in Japan. We did not turn around their religion. We did not turn around their deeply entrenched practices with respect to marriage and a number of other things. But Japan is a democracy. Germany is a democracy. Two great nations with a lot of influence are moving forward as democracies.

The Soviet Union, which most of us felt in our lifetime would never be called a democracy, is struggling and moving and has operated for a number of years now, 10 years, as a democracy, a struggling democracy. A huge nation, but a very large sphere of influence.

Democracy. Democracy moves on. We should not back away from that mission.

India, whatever problems India may have internally, India is a democracy. The untouchables in India probably feel like blacks felt in America 20 or 30 years ago, and there are still a lot of things to be done about the way untouchables are treated in certain regions. But India is basically committed to democratic rule. They have gone through a lot of tribulations and travails, social and political travails, but they have not yielded to any temptation to lapse back into something other than democracy.

So our way of life, our mission in the world, is to perpetrate that democracy. That may mean we need to go to war when it is necessary, when we are attacked. I must say that people who say that what is happening in Afghanistan is similar to what happened in Vietnam are starting out with the wrong premise. The Vietnamese never attacked us. Whatever you may think about the war in Vietnam, we were never attacked. They did not perpetrate 5,000 casualties on us in the first day of the war.

A war was declared upon us. Even the Japanese at Pearl Harbor did not hit as many casualties, and they did not hit the mainland of America. So war was declared upon us via an attack on the mainland of America. As a nation, there was no choice but to accept the challenge and go to war. The nature of that war and how we conduct it is

something we can debate about, but war was necessary.

We are at war physically. Militarily we are at war. But we also are at war for the minds, and we understand the minds of the world, the minds of human beings all over the world are part of this war and effort.

So we must, as we conduct this war and understand our long-term mission, understand that working families are very vital in this struggle against terrorism. How working families are treated, how they are included, how they are allowed to participate, how we show concern for their problems is vital to the effort to win the war against terrorism and to win the war for a democratic world, where all men and women are seen as equal, where life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are the values of the people who are in charge of nations.

Barbarians are anyone choosing to define themselves as being against all this, who are our enemies. The barbarians are against equality, equal rights for all men and women. They are against life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as being a basic set of rights. They define themselves. We do not have to wrangle about their way of life or their religion, whatever. If you are against equality for all people, if you are against the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, you are our enemy. You define yourself, and we are committed.

We must maintain a mission to deal with that enemy. As long as the enemy believes that way and does not attack us, certainly we will not attack them. It is a battle of words. It is a battle of ideas. It is a battle of moral concepts. We would like to see it return to just a battle of words, ideas and moral concepts.

But since it is a hot war, a military war, engagement is taking place, working families and the sons and daughters of working families are very much involved in that war. If you look at percentages, I assure you the percentage of the people who are running the operation, whether it is the women in the rear, in the ships and the planning of the logistics or whatever, or the men who are in the Special Forces teams that landed already or are getting ready to land, you are going to find that large percentages of those people, overwhelming percentages, are from working families.

How dare we ignore the needs of working families when, if you did not understand how vitally important they are before, you certainly must acknowledge now how vitally important they are? Because this is nothing new. In all the wars that have ever been fought, there are always working families, people on the bottom who make the greatest sacrifices. Their sons and daughters have been the cannon fodder in every war since the Revolutionary War onwards.

Therefore, if we are wise and we want to continue the progress of our Nation

and fulfill the vision of the Declaration of Independence, working families should be treated well. They are on the battlefields, wherever they are. They sacrifice, they take the great risks. They are on the battlefield domestically. They are needed very much as we try to shore up our home security.

There are a lot of problems that we have just because we do not have the personnel, quality personnel, to fill jobs. I have spoken about this before, but, since then, just last week, the Government Office of Personnel launched a major campaign to get young people to come into the government. We are trying to entice people in to fill the positions.

There are investigative positions, there are analyst positions, there are positions in the computer areas, and there are, of course, translators. I talked about that before. There is a great need for translators, people who can translate from Arabic, from Farsi, just as an example.

So we have a great need that cannot be filled by educating just the middle class and elite children. I have talked about this many times. Our public education system, which is an American invention, public education, which sets forth the credo that all children should be educated, it is one of the great contributions to civilization.

It is also one of the reasons that we are greatest Nation in the world. Step by step, when we need it, the brain power to go forward, the brain power has been there. Thomas Jefferson understood that we had to get away from educating people just to speak Greek and Latin and deal with philosophy and religion. They have to be educated in the arts of farming, engineering, et cetera. So he was the creator of the model for the land grant colleges which came later.

Of course, those land grant colleges established in every State were fed by a system of public education, which, in State by State, over the years, has been very much imperfect, and there are many problems. The problems did not just begin a few decades ago. We have always had problems.

But we must rush now to solve those problems by making certain that working class families, children of working class families, get a first-class education, because in addition to them being our first defenders on the battlefields of the world when there is a military conflict, they are also the ones that have to replenish the human resources that we need to run the CIA, to run the FBI, to run the INS, to take care of a very complex society.

□ 2000

Even the airplanes and the aircraft carriers and the tanks and all of the weapons require educated people to operate them at this point. So it is imperative that we recognize the vital role of working families and we end what has happened this year in this country, this House of Representatives.

What has happened this year is that since September 11 it has come out more than ever before that there is great contempt for people in the working class. Working-class families are being treated with great contempt. The majority of Republicans show again and again their great contempt for the working families of America. Minimum wage, they refuse to talk about it at all. We have not increased the minimum wage. We have not even had a chance to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, I am making a plea to my colleagues that we end the contempt, the class contempt and the class hostility that is reflected in the way we have treated working-class families in this Congress. We refuse to discuss minimum wage, so people are mired at the very bottom and have had no movement for the last 2 years. No discussion of it at all.

What has happened since September 11? There is an article that appeared in *The New York Times* on Tuesday, yesterday, which I think is a very thorough analysis in a very compact way of what has happened to working families. The article in *The New York Times*, Tuesday, November 6 is entitled: "A Tax Hit Low Pay Jobs the Hardest. Many of the unemployed were in the service industry." It is by Leslie Eaton and Edward Wyatt. "The terrorists," and I read a quote from the article, "The terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center may have been trying to crush American capitalism and its masses of the universe on Wall Street, but the economic impact of the attack is felling a very different group of people: cooks, cab drivers, sales clerks, and seamstresses. Workers in traditionally low pay industries like restaurants and hotels, retailing and transportation, have been hit hard in the fallout from September 11, according to a new analysis from the New York State Department of Labor. A report released yesterday by the labor-backed Fiscal Policy Institute forecasts that almost 80,000 people will have lost their jobs by the end of the year, and that 60 percent of these positions paid an average of \$23,000 a year."

That is far below the citywide average salary of roughly \$58,000 in New York City. New York City has a slightly higher salary scale and standard of living. If we want to know who I am defining as working families, I am not going to get into trying to deal with expert definitions, but let us just say anybody who has a family and they are making less than \$50,000 a year can consider themselves in a working-family situation. The working families income-wise. There are other features. People have to get up every day and go to work. There are some people who may get \$50,000 a year from their investments in the stock market or various interest-bearing accounts or real estate, but the people have to get up and go to work every day and are making less than \$50,000 a year are clearly people who belong to working families;

and there are an overwhelming majority of people in America who fall into this category.

Continuing to read from the article that appeared in the *New York Times* on November 6: "The spillover effect hit the retail and service industries very hard in New York City, said James Parrott, the chief economist for the institute, and those tend to be lower wage jobs. A sudden decline in these jobs marks a sea change in the economy since September 11. Earlier this year while the job market was softening, the losses were concentrated among white collar workers like dot-com programmers, stockbrokers, and advertising executives. Now they are concentrated among people like Kim Daily. A single mother of two, Ms. Daily worked her way up from a \$6 an hour job picking up room service trays to a \$15 an hour job stocking mini bars at the World Trade Center Marriott. When the hotel was destroyed on September 11, so was her job. She has not been able to find another job. It is not for lack of trying. She stood in line for 4 hours outside a city-sponsored job fair, but never even made it to the door. She has been talking to a union, but the only position available so far was so tip-dependent, that she wondered if it would cover her \$700-a-month rent. A job bank had only a few hotel positions, and none of them paid anywhere near the \$25,000 that she earned at the Marriott last year. I do not want to go for less money, she said. But a changed job market raises huge challenges for the city at a time when hundreds of thousands of families have moved off the welfare rolls."

Here is a welfare recipient who got a job for \$6 an hour. She worked up to \$15 an hour, and \$15 an hour comes out to \$25,000 a year in her pay, so we are certainly not talking about wealthy, well-to-do people. We are talking about people who are working every day, but getting very low pay.

Continuing the article: "The changing job market raises huge challenges for the city at a time when hundreds of thousands of families have moved off the welfare rolls. The most successful of these former welfare recipients, as well as many newcomers to the country, found jobs at the hotels and restaurants, as cleaners of office buildings, and as messengers in lower Manhattan. Now that the economy has exploded along with the World Trade Center, their prospects of staying in the world of work have diminished, said David R. Jones, the President of the Community Service Society of New York, which has been helping workers who lost their jobs after September 11. His group is recommending a government-financed jobs program, he said. Otherwise we will have people sitting on stoops, getting a little check and doing nothing, he said."

That is David Jones of the Community Service Society talking. He is more optimistic than I am. Given welfare reform, there are a lot of these

people who are very needy, desperately needy, who will never get a welfare check. They will never be sitting on a stoop doing nothing, because the way the system operates now, you can almost starve. Your family can go completely mad before you get any help.

Continuing the article: "How many New Yorkers are unemployed is unclear. In a government survey taken in the week of September 11, which anyone who worked at all was counted as employed, 223,100 people in New York were looking for work. That was an increase of almost 20,000 people in a month. The unemployment rate hit 6.3 percent. The October survey will not be released for several weeks, but its results are included in Federal figures which were released on Friday. Those Federal figures show that a surge in national unemployment rose by half a percentage point to 5.4 percent," and we have all been reading about the fact that that surge to 5.4 percent represents the highest unemployment for the last 20 years. The unemployment rate is higher now than it has been in 20 years.

"Unemployment insurance covers only about a third of unemployed workers. The number of people applying for benefits in the city have soared. Last month, an average of 12,745 people a week had applied. A year ago, that figure was merely 5,616 a week. A special program, Disaster Unemployment Assistance, is supposed to help those who are not eligible for unemployment insurance because they work part-time or they were self-employed before. They are not eligible. But only 2,350 people are now getting those benefits."

In other words, out of the 12,745, only 2,350 are getting those special disaster unemployment benefits in New York State.

"Almost 25,000 people told the New York State Department of Labor that they lost their jobs because of the Trade Center disaster. The analysis said that the first 22,000 of these claims found that about 16 percent worked at bars and restaurants, 14 percent worked in hotels, and 5 percent worked in air transportation. Only 4 percent at Wall Street brokerage firms." And many of them have been relocated to some other place. They have fared the best.

"The largest group of people, 21 percent, worked in a category called business services. Many of these were temporary workers like Lisa Mendes, a single mother who lost her job as an accounting clerk on September 12. In years past when one temporary job ended, she could pick and choose among the offerings of the agencies. Now there is just nothing there. Ms. Mendes is typical of the unemployed in another way: she lives in Brooklyn. The Labor Department analysis said that almost 26 percent of the people who said they were jobless because of the twin towers collapsed lived in Brooklyn."

Brooklyn happens to be my home borough. The 11th Congressional Dis-

trict is located in the center of Brooklyn.

"Twenty-four percent of the people lived in Queens, 12 percent lived in the Bronx, and just 18 percent live in Manhattan where most of the jobs are located. Ms. Mendes, who is from Jamaica, is lucky of the many of the unemployed because she speaks English and she can use a computer. The Consortium for Worker Education, which runs a special program for people unemployed because of the disaster, and they have already counseled 3,200 people, they have 5,000 jobs in that special bank," for people who can handle that kind of need, I mean are familiar with computers. "Most of them are back office jobs, data entry jobs, word processing jobs, administrative assistance, said Sal Rosen, the Associate Director of that group.

"Hotel and restaurant employment has been devastated by the destruction of the trade center and the steep drop in tourism that followed. Most restaurants are not unionized, but Local 100 of the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union, which represents about 6,000 restaurant workers, say that 10 percent of its membership lost jobs immediately after September 11. About 200 of those, 600 have since found work, but not necessarily in restaurants.

"John Haynes has a short-term job at the Immigrant Workers Assistance Alliance helping undocumented workers. Until September 11, he cooked meals on the 106th floor of the World Trade Center for the 250 employees of Windows on the World. He said he earned \$408 a week before taxes, about \$25,400, and he lives in a public housing unit in the Bronx." Mr. Haynes is of course quite happy that he escaped death, first of all.

"The tourism and travel drought has hit many businesses in Queens, according to a new report by the Center for an Urban Future, a public policy group. Airline workers, freight forwarders, truckers and limousine drivers are all hurting." And on and on it goes.

They also included in the same article a chart which breaks out 10 occupations that were most affected by events of September 11, unemployed after the attack. The occupation: waiters and waitresses. The estimated layoffs were 4,225 as a result of September 11 events. The average hourly wage of those waitresses and workers was \$7.08 an hour. Cleaning and maintenance workers about 3,365, have lost their jobs. Their average wage was \$14.90 an hour.

□ 2015

Sales representatives (retail), 2,843. Their average wage was \$9.15 an hour; food preparation, 2,284, and they made \$8.90 an hour; cashiers, 2,282 and \$7.36 an hour they make; housekeeping workers, 1,840, and \$13.42 they make; food preparation and fast food service, 1,718 have been laid off, and \$7.09 was their average wage; general managers and top executives, 1,367 have lost their

jobs. Their average wage per hour was \$51.34; sales supervisors, 1,183, and \$22.42 an hour; service supervisors, about 1,070 have lost their jobs, and they made \$16.46.

This chart is for ten occupations most affected by the events of September 11. It appears in the New York Times Tuesday, November 6.

I include for the RECORD the entire article.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 6, 2001]  
ATTACKS HIT LOW-PAY JOBS THE HARDEST  
MANY OF THE UNEMPLOYED WERE IN SERVICE  
INDUSTRY

(By Leslie Eaton and Edward Wyatt)

The terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center may have been trying to crush American capitalism and its masters of the universe on Wall Street. But the economic impact of the attack is felling a very different group of people: cooks, cabdrivers, sales clerks and seamstresses.

Workers in traditionally low-wage industries, like restaurants and hotels, retailing and transportation, have been hit hard in the fallout from Sept. 11, according to a new analysis from the New York State Department of Labor.

And a report released yesterday by the labor-backed Fiscal Policy Institute forecasts that almost 80,000 people will have lost their jobs by the end of the year and that 60 percent of these positions paid an average of \$23,000 a year. That is far below the citywide average salary of roughly \$58,000.

"The spillover effects hit the retail and service industries very hard in New York City," said James Parrott, the chief economist for the institute. "And those tend to be lower-wage jobs."

The sudden decline in these jobs marks a sea change in the economy since Sept. 11. Earlier this year, while the job market was softening, the losses were concentrated among white-collar workers like dot-com programmers, stockbrokers and advertising executives.

Now, they are concentrated among people like Kim Daily. A single mother of two, Ms. Daily worked her way up from a \$6-an-hour-job picking up room-service trays to a \$15-an-hour job stocking minibars at the World Trade Center Marriott.

When the hotel was destroyed on Sept. 11, so was her job. And she has not been able to find another one.

It is not for lack of trying; she stood in line for four hours outside a city-sponsored job fair but never even made it in the door. She has been talking to her union, but the only position available so far was so tip-dependent that she worried it would not cover her \$700-a-month rent. A job bank had only a few hotel positions, and none paid anywhere near the \$25,000 she earned at the Marriott last year.

"I don't want to go for less money," she said.

The changed job market raises huge challenges for the city at a time when hundreds of thousands of families have moved off the welfare rolls. The most successful of these former welfare recipients, as well as many newcomers to this country, found jobs at hotels and restaurants, as cleaners at office buildings and as messengers in Lower Manhattan.

"Now that the economy has exploded along with the World Trade Center, their prospects of staying in the world of work have diminished," said David R. Jones, president of the Community Service Society of New York, which has been helping workers who lost their jobs after Sept. 11.

His group is recommending a government-financed jobs program, he said. "Otherwise, we'll have people sitting on stoops, getting a little check and doing nothing," he said.

How many New Yorkers are unemployed is unclear. In a governmental survey taken in the week of Sept. 11, in which anyone who worked at all was counted as employed, 223,100 people in New York City were looking for work (after adjustments for seasonal factors). That was an increase of almost 20,000 people in a month. The unemployment rate hit 6.3 percent.

The October survey will not be released for several weeks, but its results are included in federal figures, released Friday, that showed a surge in national unemployment, which rose by half a percentage point, to 5.4 percent. Unemployment insurance covers only about a third of unemployed workers, but the number of people applying for benefits in the city was has soared. In the last month, an average of 12,745 people a week has applied; a year ago, that figure was 5,616.

A special program, Disaster Unemployment Assistance, is supposed to help those who are not eligible for unemployment insurance (usually because they worked part time or were self-employed). But only 2,350 people are now getting those benefits.

Almost 25,000 people told the New York State Department of Labor that they lost their jobs because of the trade center disaster. An analysis of the first 22,000 of those claims found that about 16 percent worked at bars and restaurants, 14 percent worked at hotels and 5 percent worked in air transportation. Only 4 percent worked at Wall Street brokerage firms (many of which simply relocated workers to Midtown or New Jersey).

The largest group of people—21 percent—worked in a category called business services. Many of them were temporary workers, like Lisa Mendes, a single mother who lost her job as an accounting clerk on Sept. 12. In years past, when one temporary job ended, she could pick and choose among the offerings at the agencies. Now, "there's just nothing there," she said. "It's scary."

Ms. Mendes is typical of the unemployed in another way—she lives in Brooklyn. The Labor Department analysis found that almost 26 percent of those who said they were jobless because of the twin towers collapse live in Brooklyn; 24 percent live in Queens, and 12 percent live in the Bronx. Just 18 percent live in Manhattan.

But Ms. Mendes, who is from Jamaica, is luckier than many of the unemployed because she speaks English and can use a computer. The Consortium for Worker Education, which runs a special program for people unemployed because of the disaster (and has already counseled more than 3,200 of them) has 5,000 jobs in its special job bank.

"Most of them are back-office jobs, data entry, word processing, administrative assistants," said Saul Rosen, associate executive director of the group.

Hotel and restaurant employment has been devastated by the destruction of the trade center and the steep drop in tourism that followed. Most restaurants are not unionized, but Local 100 of the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union, which represents about 6,000 restaurant workers, says that 10 percent of its membership lost jobs immediately after Sept. 11. About 200 of those 600 have since found work, but not necessarily restaurant work.

John Haynes has a short-term job at the Immigrant Workers Assistance Alliance, helping undocumented workers. Until Sept. 11, he cooked meals on the 106th floor of the World Trade Center for the 250 employees of Windows on the World. He said he earned \$488.80 a week before taxes, or about \$25,400 a year, and he lives in public housing in the Bronx.

He does not think he will be able to go back into restaurant work, he says. "They are not hiring right now," he said. "So I'm going to go for job training, either in computers or photo imaging."

The tourist and travel drought has hit many businesses in Queens, according to a new report by the Center for an Urban Future, a public policy group. Airline workers, freight forwarders, truckers and limousine drivers are all hurting.

Listen to Greg Buttle, who operates valet parking lots at the three major New York area airports: You park at these lots and workers will shuttle you to and from the terminal for about \$13 a day plus tax. (They will also wash your car, change the oil, rotate or replace the tires, even pick up your dry cleaning.) Before, he normally had more than 150 cars in the lots; now, there are about 50, he said.

Mr. Buttle said he employed 45 people before Sept. 11; now he employs 30. "I tried to make sure that the part-timers who have come in most recently are the first ones to go," he said. "But some of our employees have worked for us for eight or nine years."

For more evidence of the spillover effect, look at Chinatown. Business has plunged at many of the more than 200 sewing shops below Houston Street and at least 20 went out of business in October, said May Chen, a vice president of Unite, the garment workers' union. At least a thousand of her 10,000 members have lost their jobs as stores and clothing companies have canceled orders. Others are working reduced hours.

Their job prospects are not good. "Because of the language barrier, sewing is about the only skill they have," said Susan Cowell, another union official.

Unite also represents workers at commercial laundries; because of the declines at many restaurants, about 600 of these workers have also been laid off.

With the public's attention riveted to the sad stories of the dead and the heroism of the rescuers, some workers fear that their plights will be ignored.

"No one wants to hear our stories," said Asmat M. Ali, a former captain at Windows on the World. "About a busboy or the dishwasher making \$250 a week and raising three kids in an apartment in the Bronx or Brooklyn. But 80 percent of the people who worked in the World Trade Center fell in that category."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a landmark article which clearly sets forth the basic thesis of my discussion: Working families in the struggle against terrorism are suffering greatly already in New York City.

The domino effect of the World Trade Center catastrophe and the declining economy goes right across the whole country. Workers in New York City are not the only workers suffering. The pattern that I have just set forth applies right across the country in the big cities, and certainly places where tourism was important, places where the service industries are important, they are all suffering equally. These are the people who are vital to our winning the struggle against terrorism, to the saving of our civilization. They are suffering in a very direct way. We are not responding in this Congress to that suffering.

As I said before, we approved a bill for the airline industries, and at that time we would not approve a bill for the airline employees who were being

laid off in large numbers. We said we would do it next week. It is 3 weeks later now, and we still have not done it. There seems to be no haste at all.

The airline employees, those who are unemployed, have been lumped with the other unemployed now. What does the Republican majority propose for the other people who are unemployed? Piddling, very tiny amounts of money were included in the stimulus package that has already passed this House of Representatives.

We passed the stimulus package in the House without any significant aid for the unemployed and for working families. The emphasis of the bill that passed the House by the Republican leadership, the Republican majority's bill, which passed by a two-vote margin, that bill places great emphasis on more tax cuts.

We are going to have more tax cuts because the ideologues say the tax cuts are necessary for investment. The ideologues say when we have tax cuts, people invest, the investment creates jobs, and it trickles down to people on the bottom.

But sometimes tax cuts are not invested, they are just hoarded. Sometimes tax cuts lead to people having money which they invest in other parts of the world where they get a higher return on their investment. Taking care of big business does not automatically lead to a benefit for people on the bottom, and that has been shown again and again.

The best way to help poor people, we know from social services practices, nonprofit services practices, the best way to help people is to put money in their hands. Unemployed people need money. Unemployed people, people who have working families, cannot save the money. They need the money now. They will spend the money now. It will turn over in our economy.

We recognize that the engine of capitalism is consumerism. Consumers make our economy go. Why do we hesitate, then, to make provisions for people who are the number one consumers? The working families are our number one consumers. It does not make sense.

Ideologues, people trapped in a vision of the world which says, no, government spending are always bad, tax cuts are always good, they have their heads in the sand in a dangerous way.

So we are stalled. Fortunately, yesterday the other body unveiled an economic stimulus package that sets up a situation where we will have another opportunity maybe in the conference to fight for the unemployed.

The other body's plan was drafted in close consultation with labor leaders who helped persuade key Senators to gear the package heavily to helping workers who have lost their jobs, but some elements sought by labor were trimmed back in the final hours, even though the plan is still far superior to the one that came through the House.

Democrats will be able to get the bill through the closely divided Senate Finance Committee. Tomorrow it is expected, but no Republican has signed onto the plan. It is even doubtful it could pass on the Senate floor unless it is agreed that they would not have a filibuster.

The House and Senate bills are almost mirror opposites of each other. The House bill devotes about 75 percent of its \$99 billion first-year cost to business and individual tax cuts, while only about one-quarter of the \$90 billion Senate bill would reduce tax revenue.

The Senate plan also includes \$20 billion for additional spending on infrastructure and security. AFL President John Sweeney said that "Congress took care of companies" with airline rescue legislation, and "they continued to lay off workers. Weeks have gone by and no action was taken and the unemployment numbers rise. It's about time they deal with the unfairness here."

One of the tax provisions, allowing companies to speed up depreciation of newly-purchased assets, would cost States about \$2 billion in revenue. With State budgets already under pressure, that could lead to layoffs of State workers, county workers, city workers.

We have contempt for the needs of the people on the very bottom at a time when it is pretty clear that they have to play a vital role in our war on terrorism.

I hope the message goes out and all of the Members of Congress who are listening would understand the need to communicate with their working families about the unfairness of this, and about the fact that this Congress is being managed in a way in which it is almost impossible to get up enough momentum to confront the party in control.

We spend a lot of time in recess. We spend a lot of time working back in the district. There is a plot, a scheme to minimize the amount of time spent on the floor of this House and people speaking in a way which might be picked up by the general public, and certainly working families.

So the message has to be gotten out there somehow that working families are being treated unfairly. Working families have a vital role to play in the struggle against terrorism, and they are not being recognized for their full worth. We demand that there be some definite changes made.

On another area, working families are being subjected to conditions which are going to create more unnecessary victims. We have a situation where we opened this Congress this year with a repeal of the ergonomics standards by OSHA. There was joy in the majority, great joy and celebration in taking away labor standards and standards to assist the safety of working people, working families, members who have to go out and work every day in the area of ergonomics.

There was a set of standards that would have helped make the workplace

far safer, less dangerous, and less debilitating for key people. On all measures that relate to worker safety, we have tremendous opposition from the Republican majority. I know because I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on WorkForce Protections. It is my job to deal with workforce protections, and we have bill after bill and effort after effort to cut down on the safety or the government's protection of the safety of workers.

Now this monster has raised its ugly head at ground zero in New York. At ground zero, we have a situation where rescue workers and other people in the area are not being protected properly, and we are going to have victims created unnecessarily.

Because of the contempt for workers, the hostility towards working families, nobody is paying attention to the need for protective gear. Recently, according to an article that appeared in the Daily News on October 26, "A Federal agency has slammed the city for not taking steps to protect rescue workers from injuries immediately after the World Trade Center catastrophe. In a sharply worded report, consultants for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences said nearly 1,000 injuries, ranging from blisters and nausea to severe burns and fractures, could have been prevented if the city had made sure workers had basic safety training and adequate equipment such as hard hats, and respirators."

The report was dealing with very basic, elementary kinds of things, but beyond that, the report gets into the discussion of toxic chemicals and metals: "Toxic chemicals and metals are being released into the environment around lower Manhattan by the collapse of the World Trade Center towers and by the fires that are still burning at ground zero," according to internal government reports. Dioxins, PCBs, benzene, lead, and chromium are among the toxic substances detected in the air and soil around the World Trade Center site by Environmental Protection Agency equipment, sometimes at levels far exceeding Federal levels, the documents show." This is a report in the Daily News also on October 26, an article by Juan Gonzalez.

"EPA monitoring devices have also found considerable contaminants in the Hudson River and in the water and sediment, especially after it rains. Six weeks after the World Trade Center attack, benzene, a colorless liquid that evaporates quickly and can cause leukemia, bone marrow damage, and other diseases in long-term exposure, continues to be released into the air in plumes from the still burning fires at relatively high levels."

On and on it goes to talk about the fact that the protective gear needed is not there. The highest level of benzene recorded was on October 11, 58 times higher than OSHA's permissible exposure limit. Other kinds of extremes have also occurred.

Workers' health and sometimes their lives are at stake in this kind of situa-

tion because later on these kinds of exposures lead to debilitating diseases and people die.

We have a situation that has now been revealed concerning the workers who worked on the spill at EXXON, the EXXON Valdez oil spill in 1989, when an oil tanker ran aground and spilled tremendous amounts of oil. The count was 250,000 dead birds, 2,800 sea otters, 300 harbor seals. We know what the animal count was, but only now are we beginning to understand that when 11 million gallons of oil were spilled and people from all over the country went out to clean it up, they became victims, also.

No one talks about the workers who stood in the brown foam 18 hours a day, who came back to their sleeping barges with oil matted in their hair, ate sandwiches speckled with oil, steered boats through a brown, hydrocarbon haze that looked like the smog from hell, and after the summer, some found themselves with oil traces in their lungs, in their blood cells, in the fatty tissue of their buttocks.

They got treated for headaches, nausea, chemical burns, and breathing problems and went home, but some never got well.

The story appears in another newspaper that this goes on and on, and many years later workers are suffering dramatically, and some people are dying as a result of not paying attention to the health of the workers.

Another way the workers are being treated in a hostile and contemptuous manner relates to the contracting process at ground zero. We started off on the wrong foot. There was an article in the New York Times on October 19 which talks about the fact that they were employing people who were not being paid. Day laborers at ground zero say they are not being paid. The story as it goes here shows that illegal immigrants were brought in by a contractor from outside the city and they were not even bothering to pay the people who were working at very low wages.

The treatment of workers in this situation amounts to a lockout of legitimate workers who live in New York. New York has a high unemployment rate. A few minutes ago, I said it is presently at 6.3 percent for adults. Yet, most of these workers were brought in from outside the city.

Day laborers are frequently illegal immigrants who are promised payments in cash. They have no form of employment contracts. They know their employer only through a crew leader who hires them on a street corner.

Officials with a cleaning company, in this case Milrose Services, Incorporated, of Freeport New York, the usual racket in which certain people in city government contract with people outside the city, and these officials of this particular company say they are not responsible for hiring and paying the laborers. They have the contract, they are not responsible.

□ 2030

The company hired a subcontractor to do that. What is unusual here is the setting. Ground zero has just been destroyed in an act which is attributed to illegal immigrants or undesirable immigrants. They are hunting all over the country for undesirable immigrants, but the contractor brings in illegal immigrants to do part of the cleaning work at the World Trade Center, and of course, the people are so crooked they do not even bother to pay the workers, and they make a mistake, and it becomes a matter in the paper.

One of the workers was named Cecilia Ramirez, but what is important here, and I would like to submit this entire article, is a documentation of the utter contempt they have for a working class that would go outside on a critical matter like cleanup work around ground zero and get illegal immigrants and bring them into New York City while other people are looking for work and these kinds of jobs.

I will include this article that appeared in the New York Times on October 19th in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 2001]

DAY LABORERS AT GROUND ZERO SAY THEY ARE NOT BEING PAID

(By Somini Sengupta)

The state attorney general's office is investigating complaints that day laborers hired to clear debris from office buildings surrounding the site of the World Trade Center have not been paid, some of them for up to two weeks of work.

The complaints here are hardly unusual. Day laborers are frequently illegal immigrants who are promised payment in cash. They have no formal employment contracts, and they know their employer only through a crew leader who hires them on a street corner.

Officials with the cleaning company in this case, Milro Services Inc., of Freeport, N.Y., say they are not responsible for hiring and paying laborers; the company hired a subcontractor to do that. (Late yesterday afternoon, the subcontractor said she was making arrangements to pay the workers.)

What is unusual here is the setting. In this case, the day laborers are at the center of the mammoth cleanup effort in Lower Manhattan. By 8 a.m. each morning, they are lined up, 100 deep, on the corner of Broadway and Fulton Street for a day's work. Escorted past barricades by police officers, they clear shards of glass, wipe soot off desks and sweep floors covered with ash and debris.

They are promised \$60 for an 8 hour shift, \$90 if they work 12 hours, and the buildings they clean include the offices of several city and federal agencies. But in interviews at the hiring site this week, several laborers, including some men and women freshly unemployed from shops and delis near the trade center, said they had not seen a dime for their work—some for a week, some for two.

One man, Gonzalo Carmona, opened his datebook and pointed to his nine days of work, starting on Oct. 1; by his calculations, he was owed \$780. A woman, Cecilia Linares, said she had worked for seven days straight; when she asked about pay, the woman who hired her, whom she said she knew only by her first name, Lumi, told her, "Tomorrow, tomorrow, tomorrow."

Early Wednesday morning, Ms. Linares showed up again and looked, in vain, for the woman.

The complaints first surfaced when an organizer with the New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health went to the hiring line to talk to workers about safety precautions; he heard an earful about how they were not being paid.

Yesterday morning, lawyers from the state attorney general's office came and the workers lodged their complaints.

"They gave us very specific information about where they worked, what they were promised, what they were paid, what they weren't paid," said Patricia Smith, the assistant attorney general in charge of the agency's labor bureau, whose offices are around the corner from the hiring site. "We've talked to the employer, we are investigating and, hopefully, we'll be able to resolve it."

Officials with Milro Services said yesterday that they were surprised and dismayed to learn of the charges. But they said hiring and paying the day laborers was not the company's responsibility, but that of a supervisor, Lumi Morel, who was acting as a subcontractor.

"I don't like that this is happening, if it is happening," said Tom Milici, the vice president of Milro. But, he added, "that's out of my hands."

Late yesterday afternoon, Ms. Morel, reached by telephone, said she had been delayed in paying the workers because of paperwork. She said that she owed money to about 80 workers, and that she planned to pay them by today.

Continuing in the same vein, suddenly beyond September 11 we had the crisis of anthrax. Anthrax is a very deadly substance, as we all know. I need not waste the time here to repeat what the Centers for Disease Control and the numerous press conferences over the last 2 weeks have told us about anthrax. We vacated the House of Representatives because of the anthrax possibilities, the scare. There is a Senate building which still remains vacant, the Hart Building, because of the anthrax scare.

What happened when it was discovered in the post office where working people work? What happened when it was clear that there was a danger to workers? We have two deaths, postal workers, two deaths that I consider to be totally unnecessary. If we had acted faster, if information had moved faster, if the people in charge of combating the anthrax problem had moved faster, with more purpose, these two men would not be dead, in my opinion.

I think triage was practiced. The intention was focused on the important people. We have Congressmen, Senators on Capitol Hill, and given the fact that we were not prepared, we have limited people who know how to handle this problem, which is most unfortunate and a little unforgivable because anthrax has been a clearly recognized problem since the Gulf War. They even, at one point, ordered all members of the Army to be vaccinated against anthrax.

If we became worried about anthrax during the Gulf War and we have had a situation where at one point all the members of the Army were ordered to be vaccinated against anthrax, why is there so little expertise in the country when an anthrax outbreak occurs in

Washington, so little expertise that we do not have enough to take care of the situation at the post office, at the same time we take care of the situation on the Hill in Senate and House buildings? They did not move fast enough. Information did not flow fast enough.

Our hospital system has been under pressure for the last 20 years and certainly will see no relief because of the ideologies in this Congress who insist that we continue to cut local facilities, hospital facilities unnecessarily. Of course, in the Washington, D.C., area they closed down D.C. General Hospital.

We watched the spectacle of two postmen who went to a hospital and because the hospital was so badly informed, because of their own pressures, they were turned away, and when they went back the next day, they were already dying. Here is a triage setup, and here is a setup which flows out of the inadequacy of our basic health system.

We should have a health system which is not just prepared to combat terrorism, but one that makes certain everybody gets equal and rapid treatment. It did not happen. Joseph P. Curseen is dead as a result. Thomas Lee Morris is dead as a result.

Then we have the spectacle of the D.C. General Hospital being used as a major headquarters for the process of dispensing the antibiotic and giving out information. D.C. General Hospital has been closed. The same economic forces, the same pitch on our health care facilities that has gone on throughout the country has forced the closure of D.C. General Hospital. But because there was no other place, the emergency center had to be set up at the D.C. General Hospital. The working class had to do with a closed hospital, a jerry-built situation to take care of a major problem.

Joseph P. Curseen is dead. Thomas Lee Morris is dead. They were postal workers at the bottom of the heap, and we are not taking care of our working families when we allow that kind of system to take place. When decisions are made, triage decisions, some people are more important than others.

It is important we go forward with a health care system that serves everybody. That health care system would certainly be ready for any kind of bioterrorism in the future, and workers' families would be treated in the same manner as any other families. There would be no priority set for anybody. Everyone would have the same service.

I conclude by saying that working families in the struggle against terrorism are as important as any other component. They may be the most important component in our struggle against terrorism.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an

amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2944. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The message was announced that the Senate insist, upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2944) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mr. INOUE, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. STEVENS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEARNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, November 8.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 8, 2001, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4527. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities; Puerto Rico [Region II Docket No. PR6-233a, FRL-7093-9] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4528. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; One-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstration for Philadelphia—Wilmington—Trenton Ozone Nonattainment Area [MD-074-3085; FRL-7089-1] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4529. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution for Volatile Organic Compounds, Solvent Using Processes, Surface Coating Processes, Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework Operations [TX-129-1-7471a; FRL-7091-3] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4530. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides From Stationary Sources in the Houston/Galveston Ozone Nonattainment Area [TX-134-8-7532; FRL-7092-7] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4531. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides From Stationary Sources in the Houston/Galveston Ozone Nonattainment Area [TX-133-1-7493; FRL-7092-8] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4532. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Lawn Service Equipment Operating Restrictions; and Requirements for Motor Vehicle Idling for the Houston/Galveston (HG) Ozone Nonattainment Area [TX-133-1-7493; FRL-7092-8] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4533. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Houston/Galveston Ozone Nonattainment Area Vehicle Miles Traveled Offset Plan [TX-28-1-7538; FRL-7092-4] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4534. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); Texas: Low Emission Diesel Fuel [TX-134-5-7509; FRL-7091-5] received October 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 136-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4536. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Norway [Transmittal No. DTC 121-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4537. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 119-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4538. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the temporary and permanent U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilians retained as contractors in Colombia involved in supporting Plan Colombia; to the Committee on International Relations.

4539. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting notification on the growth of real gross national product during the third quarter of 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 904(j); (H. Doc. No. 107-144); jointly to the Committees on the Budget and Rules, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 279. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002 (Rept. 107-273). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BUYER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 3240. A bill to amend 38, United States Code, to restore certain education benefits of

individuals being ordered to active duty as part of Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA:

H.R. 3241. A bill to extend the benefits of the weatherization assistance program under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 3242. A bill to ensure that the United States is prepared for an attack using biological or chemical weapons; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 3243. A bill to prohibit late-term abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. WATTS

of Oklahoma, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VISCIOSKY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FROST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COBLE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BACA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HORN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr.

PHELPS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 3244. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Spirit of America and to establish the Victims of September 11th Fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 3245. A bill to provide for an additional district judge for the middle district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of oral drugs to reduce serum phosphate levels in patients with end-stage renal disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H.R. 3247. A bill to terminate all unilateral United States sanctions against foreign countries or entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROTHEMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3248. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 65 North Main Street in Cranbury, New Jersey, as the "Todd Beamer Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 3249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow distilled spirits to be produced in dwelling houses, other connected structures, and certain other premises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE:

H.R. 3250. A bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to the Sioux Indians who served as Sioux Code Talkers during World War II in recognition of their service to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide, for a limited emergency period, that the payment of a bill, invoice, or statement of account due, if made by mail, shall be considered to have been made on the date as of which the envelope which is used to transmit such payment is postmarked; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. REGULA):

H.J. Res. 73. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Patricia Q. Stonesifer as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. VISCIOSKY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York,

Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HORN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on the occasion of his visit to the United States, and to affirm that India is a valued friend and partner and an important ally in the campaign against international terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WYNN:

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to Turkey for offering to provide special forces in support of Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 278. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H. Res. 280. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Islamic holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 281. A resolution commending and urging increased support for organizations led by Afghan women that are providing substantial education, health, and relief services during a time of humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and in Afghan refugee areas in neighboring countries, and for the inclusion of women in any new government established in that nation; to the Committee on International Relations.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

205. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 109 memorializing the United States Congress that the Commonwealth commends and supports the President of the United States as the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Services and sends its support, prayers and gratitude to all our military service personnel as they undertake the difficult tasks that may lie ahead; to the Committee on Armed Services.

206. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 107 memorializing the United States Congress to commemorate every September 11 as a day of mourning and remembrance; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Government Reform.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 122: Mr. UPTON.

- H.R. 162: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.  
 H.R. 633: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 883: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. KERNS.  
 H.R. 902: Mr. MOLLOHAN.  
 H.R. 959: Mrs. BONO.  
 H.R. 981: Mr. PENCE.  
 H.R. 1155: Mr. HANSEN.  
 H.R. 1187: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 1194: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 1198: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 1434: Mr. RAMSTAD.  
 H.R. 1556: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
 H.R. 1733: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1798: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 1928: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1948: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 2099: Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WU, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.  
 H.R. 2163: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 2166: Mr. SOLIS.  
 H.R. 2219: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2220: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 2375: Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 2377: Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 2457: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 2484: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. FLETCHER.  
 H.R. 2527: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 2546: Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 2555: Mr. HONDA and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.  
 H.R. 2610: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 2638: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 2669: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 2709: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2722: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILLNER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 2777: Mr. STARK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BENTSEN, and Ms. HARMAN.  
 H.R. 2794: Mr. HALL of Texas.  
 H.R. 2887: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 2897: Mr. WU.  
 H.R. 2946: Mr. BONIOR.  
 H.R. 2949: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. STICKLAND, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. EVANS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. OSE, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 H.R. 2980: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. CLEMENT.  
 H.R. 3007: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. SHOWS.  
 H.R. 3014: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BERRY.  
 H.R. 3038: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. PITTS.  
 H.R. 3077: Mr. TANNER and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 3088: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. SWEENEY.  
 H.R. 3109: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
 H.R. 3143: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 3209: Mr. HEFLEY.  
 H.R. 3212: Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3213: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 3221: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3230: Mr. DEMINT.  
 H.R. 3238: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.J. Res. 40: Mr. GEPHARDT.  
 H.J. Res. 66: Mr. SCHAFFER.  
 H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. BACA and Mr. SCHROCK.  
 H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H. Con. Res. 250: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SABO, Mr. KIND, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BACA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. KUCINICH.  
 H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
 H. Res. 235: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

---

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 2149: Mr. DICKS.  
 H.R. 2180: Mr. HILLIARD.