and out of the Pentagon, urging caution on the issue of a pre-emptive strike against Iraq.

In an address recently in Florida, he warned his audience to watch out for the administration's civilian superhawks, most of whom avoided military service as best they could. ''If you ask me my opinion,'' said Zinni, referring to Iraq, ''Gen. (Brent) Scowcroft, Gen. (Colin) Powell, Gen. (Norman) Schwarzkopf and Gen. Zinni maybe all see this the same way. It might be interesting to wonder why all of the generals see it the same way, and all those (who) never fired a shot in anger (and) are really hellbent to go to war see it a different way.

''That's usually the way it is in history,'' he said.

Another veteran, Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., who served in combat in Vietnam and now sits on the Foreign Relations Committee, was even more blunt. ''It is interesting to me that many of those who want to rush this country into war and think it would be so quick and easy don't know anything about war,'' he said. ''They come at it from an intellectual perspective vs. having sat in jungles or foxholes and watched their friends get their heads blown off.''

The problem is not new. More than 100 years ago, another battle-scarred soldier, Civil War Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, observed: ''It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, more desolation.''

Last month, Vice President Cheney emerged briefly to give several two-gun talks before veterans groups in which he spoke of ''regime change'' and a ''liberated Iraq.''

''We must take the battle to the enemy,'' he said of the war on terrorism. Cheney went on to praise the virtue of military service. ''The single most important asset we have,'' he said, ''is the man or woman who steps forward and puts on the uniform of this great nation.''

But during the bloodiest years of the Vietnam War, Cheney decided against wearing that uniform. Instead, he used multiple deferments to avoid military service altogether. ''I had other priorities in the '60s than military service,'' he once said.

Cheney is far from alone. For instance, neither Paul Wolfowitz, the deputy Defense secretary, nor Richard Perle, chairman of the Defense Policy Board, has served in uniform, yet they are now two of the most bellicose champions of launching a bloody war in the Middle East.

What frightens many is the arrogance, naïveté and cavalier attitude toward war. ''The Army guys don't know anything.'' Perle told The Nation's David Corn earlier this year. With ''40,000 troops,'' he said, the United Stats could easily take over Iraq. ''We don't need anyone else.'' But by most other estimates, a minimum of 200,000 to 250,000 troops would be needed, plus the support of many allies.

Even among Republicans, the warfare between the veterans and non-vets can be intense. ''Maybe Mr. Perle would like to be in the first wave of those who go into Baghdad,'' Hagel, who came home from Vietnam with two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star, told The New York Times.

Secretary of State Colin Powell, a Vietnam combat veteran and former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has often expressed anger about the class gap between those who fought in Vietnam and those who did not.

''I am angry that so many of the sons of the powerful and well-placed managed to wangle slots in Reserve and National Guard units.'' he wrote in his 1995 autobiography, My American Journey. ''Of the many tragedies of Vietnam, this raw class discrimination strikes me as the most damaging to the ideal that all Americans are created equal and owe equal allegiance to their country.''

Non-combatants, however, litter the top ranks of the Republican hierarchy. President Bush served peacefully in the Texas National Guard. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld spent his time in a Princeton classroom as others in his age group were fighting and dying on Korean battlefields (he later joined the peacetime Navy) Another major player in the administrator's war strategy. Douglas Feith, the Defense undersecretary for policy, has no experience in the military. Nor does Cheney's influential chief of staff, Lewis Libby.

The top congressional Republican leaders—Senate Minority Leader Trent Lott, House Speaker Dennis Hastert, House Majority Leader Dick Armey and House Majority Whip Tom Delay—never saw military service, either; only one, Armey, has shown hesitation about invading Iraq. In contrast, House International Relations Committee Chairman Henry Hyde, R–Ill., a World War II combat veteran, has expressed skepticism about hasty U.S. action, as have some prominent Democrats—House Minority Whip David Bonior, Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle and former vice president Al Gore—who were in the military during the Vietnam War.

No administration's senior ranks, of course, have to be packed with military veterans in order to make good military decisions. But what is remarkable about this administration is that so many of those who are now shouting the loudest and pushing the hardest for this generations's war are the same people who avoided combat, or often even a uniform, in Vietnam, their generation's war.

Military veterans from any era tend to have more appreciation for the greater difficulty of getting out of a military action than getting in—a topic administration war hawks haven't said much about when it comes to Iraq.

Indeed, the Bush administration's non-veteran hawks should review the origins of the Vietnam quagmire. Along the way, they might come across a quote from still another general, this one William Westmoreland, who once directed the war in Vietnam.

''The military don't start wars,'' he said ruefully. ''Politicians start wars.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The Chair must remind Members to avoid improper references to Senators.

TRIBUTE TO THE HON. PATSY MINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 would like to begin by congratulating my colleagues who provided the review of the irresponsibility of the Republican majority toward the economy and my previous speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio, in terms of her spirit of indignation expressed about cavalier attitudes towards war.

I think the subject that I want to talk about tonight, the lady that I want to talk about, the Congresswoman I want to talk about tonight, would very much approve of what our previous colleagues have done here already tonight. I want to talk about Congresswoman Patsy Mink, who recently passed away in Hawaii.

Patsy Mink is known for many things, but I know her as a Patsy Mink who was filled with righteous indignation and anger against injustice, and my colleagues have presented tonight very intelligent presentations, well-documented presentations, but that will get all the time. I think I heard in their voices also some outrage. They were upset. They were angry about the irresponsibility of the Republican majority, and that we have all too little of here in this Congress, all too little righteous indignation and anger.

We are going to miss Patsy Mink because she was a lady with great righteous indignation against injustice. She was angry at the kind of callous approach to human welfare that was exhibited too many times on the floor of this Congress.

Yesterday we had a resolution on Patsy Mink, and many people spoke. I was not able to speak, but I did submit for the RECORD a tribute to Congresswoman Patsy Mink, and I would like to start with that tribute and make comments on it. The tribute, of course, is in its entirety in the RECORD, Tuesday, October 1.

In Tuesday's RECORD this appears in its entirety, but I would like to repeat it and comment as I go, because I heard my colleagues yesterday talk about Patsy in many ways. Most of the references were personal. I would like to focus primarily tonight on Patsy Mink as a policy manager, Patsy Mink as a champion of the poor, Patsy Mink as a champion of women, Patsy Mink who could be very intense, although she always was polite and warm, and lots of people talked about that yesterday.

Patsy Mink will be remembered with a broad array of accolades. She was a warm, compassionate colleague. She was civil and generous, even to the opponents who angered her the most. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which when Patsy Mink first came to Congress was called the Committee on Education and Labor, as a member of that committee, in any long markup, and we could have some long markups, we always knew that Patsy would try out macadamia nuts to supply for all of us to refresh myself, and she would share my macadamia with everybody, those who were opponents as well as those who were allies.

I remember her chiding me, joking with me when I talked about how much I loved macadamia nuts. I was a macadamia nut junkie, but I said to her, Do not bring any more because I am on a diet, and these things certainly do not help anybody's diet. The next time she came with macadamia nuts, they were chocolate-covered macadamia nuts, and they are even more delicious than

regular macadamia nuts and greater calories. But that was the kind of person she was.

She was quite warm, cared very much about everybody, but she could be angry. She could be a peace of chain lightning.

For me, she will be remembered as my friend, mentor and my personal whip on the floor. Often at the door of a House Chamber, Patsy would meet me with instructions. ''We,'' she said, ''are voting no,'' or, ''We are voting yes on this one.'' I did not consider that to be intimidation at all. I considered it always an honor to have been invited to function as an ideological twin to Patsy Mink. She was not telling me or instructing me. She was making assumptions about how we would be together in our analysis of the problem, our conclusions about what to do with respect to voting. That was a great honor, and I am going to miss that.

In the Committee on Education and the Workforce, as well as on the House floor, I was always inspired by Patsy's convictions. She was always an independent spirit, and she pursued her causes with total dedication. She was not just another advocate for education or for women or for jobs for welfare mothers, not just another one. Patsy Mink was a special advocate.

She was forever a fiery and intense advocate on these issues. She frequently exuded an old-fashioned righteous indignation that seems to have become extinct in the halls of Congress. For Patsy, there were the right policies and laws which she pushed with all the zeal she could muster, and there were the wrong-headed, hypocritical, selfish and evil policies which had to be confronted, and they had to be engaged to the bitter end.

When colleagues spoke about partisan compromise negotiations, Patsy would quickly warn Democrats to beware of an ambush or a trap. I think Patsy in her encyclopedic approach to her mission, encyclopedic concern about anything that affected human beings, would have very much appreciated the presentation by my colleagues before the 1-hour presentation on the economy.

On the Committee on Education and Labor where Patsy served and I have served for the 20 years that I have been here in Congress, we used to have hearings and testimony from economists, because this committee was charged and is still charged with overall responsibility with respect to the economy as it impacts on working families and working men and women, and as the human resources interact with the other factors in our economy. So we used to have many economists come, and our approach was certainly not a tunnel-vision approach.

She would have been concerned and has been concerned all year long about the fact that the economy has been deteriorating, the fact that unemployment is increasing. The unemployment rate averaged 4.1 percent in the year 2000 and reached a 30-year low of 3.9 percent in October of 2000; but today the unemployment rate has increased to 5.7 percent nationwide. We have presently 8.1 million unemployed Americans, an increase of 2.5 million compared to the year 2000. The number of Americans experiencing long-term unemployment over 27 weeks has almost doubled in the last year.

Some of this my colleagues heard from my previous colleagues who spoke on the economy. I think this is summarized very well by my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform. Job creation has reversed.

In the year 2000, the year before President Bush took office, the economy created 1.7 million new jobs. This trend has been reversed, and the economy has lost almost 1.5 million jobs since President Bush took office in January 2001. Poverty is increasing. After decreasing for 8 straight years, decreasing for 8 straight years and reaching its lowest level in 25 years, the poverty rate increased from 11.3 percent in 2000 to 11.7 percent in 2001. In the first year of the Bush administration, 1.3 million Americans slipped back into poverty, with a total of 32.9 million Americans living in poverty in 2001.

Incomes are falling. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are filing for bankruptcy. Mortgage foreclosures are at a record high. The Federal budget deficit is increasing. In 2000, the year before President Bush took office, the Federal budget, excluding Social Security, showed a surplus of $86.6 billion. The most recent figures from the Congressional Budget Office indicate that for 2002 the Federal budget excluding Social Security will show a deficit of $314 billion. This represents the largest budget decline in U.S. history, and it is the third largest on-budget deficit in history, exceeded in size only by the deficits of 1991 and 1992 under the first President Bush.

□ 1930

I think Patsy Mink would be, has shown all year long, that she is very concerned about all of these matters. Patsy Mink, in the 107th Congress, was one of the great spirits continually pushing to get more activists going in response to the decline of the economy.

Patsy was a policymaker. Patsy should be remembered as a policymaker, as a fighter. Whatever else we remember about her as an individual, we should not trivialize her role in the dynamics here in the Congress with respect to making policy. Her profound wisdom on all matters related to education in particular and matters relating to human resources, whether it was job training or occupational health and safety, whatever matters relating to human resources, she had a profound wisdom about that because she had been here for quite a long time. Her long years of service on the Committee on Education and Labor, which later became the Committee on Education and the Workforce, afforded her that kind of wisdom.

Too many of us in the Congress have forgotten the value of institutional memory. While the House is filled with Members who speak as experts on education, Patsy Mink was among the few who had hard-earned credentials with respect to education. She was a part of the development and the nurturing of title I to the point where it has become the cornerstone of Federal education reform. She was here during the Great Society program creation. She served with Adam Clayton Powell and Lyndon Johnson in the years that they passed more social legislation than has ever been passed in Congress.

Title IX was a landmark reform to end the gender gap in our educational institutions, in school athletics; but also many other aspects of higher education. Title IX belongs to Patsy. She conceived it decades ago, and she had to fight all the way to the President. Even recently, in this 107th Congress, there were skirmishes seeking to cut back on the funding for title IX. Title IX was passed in 1972, but right up until recently, the grumbling and the attempts to undercut have persisted.

I will talk more in greater detail about some of the things that have happened along the way as Patsy was forced to fight to keep title IX. As I said, she had an encyclopedic approach. She was involved in many issues. There were certain issues she would focus on tenaciously. And because she focused on them, she was prepared to defend them, and she very effectively saved many of these programs from the jaws of those who would roll back progress.

Title IX, like many other Federal policies and programs, was considered to be impossible, something else we could not afford. We could not afford to have equality in our education activities for women. That would be a burden on our higher education institutions. That would be a burden on higher education athletics, college athletics, or school athletics. Always those who want to conscript and limit the opportunities for a class of people insist that it is not doable.

Social Security originally was attacked. We know we did not get a single Republican vote when Social Security was implemented and passed. Social Security was attacked as something that would wreck the economy. The minimum wage was attacked. The minimum wage provision was attacked as another item that would wreck the economy. Always reasons are found to stop the spreading of the benefits of our great American democracy and our great economy to all.

They particularly hold on with respect to matters relating to women. We are way, way behind, even in liberal America, liberal and progressive America. We are still way behind in recognizing full unfettered rights for all women. There is no more category of

human being more oppressed in the world than women. If you want to look at numbers, the greatest number of people oppressed throughout the world are women. In all societies, just about, there is oppression. In societies that suffer from racial prejudice, an oppression because of race, or in others who suffer as a result of colonialism, and all those societies where everybody might suffer, the women still suffer most of all because of male dominance. Male chauvinism seems to hold on. It seems to be institutionalized in certain religions. And when we liberate women finally, we will have arrived as a civilization.

But there is a great need to have the fullest possible liberation for women in America. We are more advanced in this respect than probably any society. The mountaintop is in view, and we should certainly go on to make certain that all of the pathways are cleared so that women and men are clearly equal in one society in the world, that is the American society, and that this will spread first in the Western world and on and on and break down any shibboleth that may remain in terms of religions that insist that women are inferior and women do not deserve complete equality with men.

Patsy was an advocate for total equality for women, and that is quite appropriate. Her spirit will be missed. We should remember Patsy as an advocate for women. She was the coauthor of title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 that prohibits sex discrimination in all education institutions receiving Federal funds. This law, which Patsy cited as one of her greatest accomplishments, has had a dramatic impact in opening up opportunities for girls and women in the professions and most visibly in athletics.

In 1970, before the passage of title IX, only 8.4 percent of medical degrees were awarded to women. By 1980, this figure had increased to 23.4 percent. By 1997, women were earning 41 percent of medical degrees. So in addition to athletics, in an area like medicine, Patsy's title IX opened the way for women.

I think her colleague, Senator AKAKA, in honoring Patsy, was able to bring some light on her personal travails as a woman. Patsy wanted to be a doctor. She applied for medical school after studying zoology and chemistry at the University of Hawaii. She applied in 1948 to a medical school there, but she was rejected, along with other bright young women who were aspiring to be doctors at a time when women made up only 2 to 3 percent of the entering class. Patsy went on to apply to a law school instead. She gained admission to the University of Chicago.

It was during her years at the University of Chicago that she met and married her husband. Patsy returned to Hawaii and gained admission to the Hawaii bar in 1953. But as a woman, even then, she had difficulty, because it was said that her husband was a native of Pennsylvania, and a woman had to gain her bar admission in the area where her husband lived. She challenged that piece of sexism and she won. She was admitted to the Hawaii bar, and she became the first Japanese American woman to become a member of the bar in Hawaii.

In 1965, Patsy brought her views to the national stage when she became the first woman of color elected to the United States House of Representatives to represent Hawaii's Second Congressional District. 1965. You can see that she was here during the time when Lyndon Johnson put forth his Great Society programs, and she was a colleague of Adam Clayton Powell as each one of those measures came through the Committee on Education and Labor on its way to the floor of the House to be passed successfully by a Democratically controlled Congress and Senate. So the institutional memory, the institutional achievements of Patsy Mink ought to be remembered as part of the record.

She is a role model that the present Members of Congress should look up to. She is a role model that should be held up to future Members of Congress. We need role models that go beyond the fact that we are all very intelligent men and women who come to this Congress. You will not find a single person elected to Congress who is not intelligent. You do not get here unless you are very intelligent. Most of us have extensive formal education. Most of the Members of Congress are college graduates. Many are people who have gone beyond college and have professional degrees. So intelligence is not a problem here.

If intelligence were the kind of cleansing overall virtue that I once believed it was when I was in high school and college, that intelligent people always do the right thing, intelligent people understand the world, they understand what is right, and they do what is right. Intelligence does not automatically lead to correct and appropriate, democratic, generous, progressive, and charitable behavior. So intelligence is not the problem here in this Congress. The quality that is missing here is indignation, righteous indignation, dedication to the proposition that all men and women are created equal. And if they are all created equal, they all have a right to share in the prosperity and the benefits of this great country.

We have to make a way for them to do that, even if they are people who are very poor and at one time or another have to go on welfare. At one time or another they have to be the recipients of the safety net benefits of our Nation. We have safety net beneficiaries who are rich farmers, yet we never are critical of them. But we have safety net beneficiaries who are welfare mothers, mothers of children; and you do not become a woman on welfare unless you have children. It is Aid to Families With Dependent Children. So welfare women, who we refer to, are really mothers of children who are covered by the law Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

In this Congress, Patsy declared war on the oppressors of welfare women. It was a lonely army that she led. A very tiny platoon, I would say, that she led as she made war on the oppressors of welfare women. No one was more incensed and outraged than the Member from Hawaii when the so-called welfare reform program of President Bush threatened greater burdens and smaller subsidies for welfare recipients. Patsy came to me often and said we must fight this, we must do something, we must not allow this to happen. We must point out the fact that welfare benefits have been greatly reduced in most of the States. We must point out the fact that in the model State of Wisconsin, the State where the Secretary of Health and Human Services, former Governor Thompson presided, they have reduced the welfare benefits for a family of three to less than $300 a month; and they are praising him for having made that reduction. That is wonderful; that a welfare family of three only gets less than $300 a month.

That same Governor Thompson had transferred welfare money that would have gone to welfare beneficiaries to other functions in State government. Maybe he had a few other cronies he wanted to employ, maybe he gave a few more State banquets, who knows where the money went; but the Federal money that was meant to go to welfare beneficiaries, the law allowed him, if he saved it by curtailing the benefits for welfare families, then he could use it in other ways. No one was more incensed and outraged by that kind of activity than Patsy Mink.

Patsy said, we must do something. The Democrats are going to be rubber stamps to the Republican proposals. The Democrats are going to be rubber stamps to President Bush's proposals. Patsy Mink came forward, and we had made many proposals. We fought the greater burdens and smaller subsidies for welfare recipients. All of Patsy's proposals in the House were voted down. We did not pass anything at all. But I admire and will always praise Patsy Mink for leading the fight which stirred up the long-dormant conscience among Democrats.

□ 1945

Democrats did come to the floor with an alternative bill. We did produce a fight on the floor. We did have a debate on the floor. We offered an alternative. We set the stage for what happened after the bill left this House and went to the other body. We would like to believe that the fact that deliberations on this very important matter, welfare reform, continues and is stalled because we fought valiantly under the leadership of Patsy Mink, and that fight still goes on as a result of the record. We united behind Patsy. We were voted down, but we were together.

As I said before, Patsy Mink is a role model for what needs to happen in this

House. Some Members of Congress focus on housing issues. Some focus on transportation issues. Some focus on health issues. Whatever the issue, they need to bring to it the kind of indignation and determination that Patsy brought to the issues she cared about. She cared about education and welfare mothers. Nobody knew better than Patsy about the correlation between poverty and poor performance in education. She had many poor people in the rural parts of her district, and Patsy Mink understood the correlation.

There is a correlation between poor performance, and the ability of students to take full advantage of the educational opportunities offered, and poverty. Poverty and education should not be discussed separately, they should be discussed together. What we do to welfare families hurts education. When a welfare family has their budget curtailed to the point where children go to school hungry, and the best meal they get is the school free lunch because supper is not going to be adequate, breakfast is not adequate, and at some schools we have begun to provide breakfast because of that, why not provide higher benefits and substitutes for the families so the children who are going to school get over that first hurdle and they come to school prepared to learn because they have a wholesome environment at home.

We had on the floor today several resolutions which attempted to force the issue. Again, I think Patsy Mink would have been very pleased with what happened this afternoon in the regular session. We had four resolutions which showed some outrage, some indignation. We want to force the issue. We do not want to bide time here in this Congress the way that the Republican majority has decided we should. We do not want to just be here and not deal with the issues. I would hate to read history 50 years from now and hear how the historians analyzed what happened to the great America; that at its apex when it was most powerful, most prosperous, the leader of the entire world, the only remaining superpower sat around and, like Nero, fiddled while Rome was burning.

There are so many issues related to the changing patterns of the weather, the climate, so many things that reach beyond our economy; and, of course, the ongoing fight against terrorism. That is no less an issue, but we have to chew gum and walk, sing, dance and do a lot of things at the same time, and we are letting most of our resources, the tremendous brain power of the Congress lies fallow, unutilized. There is tremendous brain power and energy. The Congress is not being utilized because, for political reasons, somebody has decided that it is best for us to tread water and do nothing.

My colleagues in the Democrat Party, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), they offered resolutions saying let us do something.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) offered a resolution relating to family farmers and bankruptcy. Be it resolved that the House of Representatives should call up for consideration H.R. 5348, the Family Farmers and Family Fishermen Protection Act of 2002, which will once and for all give family farmers the permanent bankruptcy protections they have been waiting for for over 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, why not? We are all here. Why do we not debate an act on this vital resolution? No, the Republican majority chose to vote it down. With a motion to table, all you need is a majority of the votes, and a motion to table takes effect.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) wanted to deal with the fact that patent drugs, the drug companies are playing with patent law so they can hold on to patents longer and keep the cost of drugs higher and avoid the utilization of generic drugs. That was voted down, too.

The Brown resolution attempted to call for some constructive action, but it was also voted down, but he did it, and Democrats rallied behind the gentleman overwhelmingly out of a sense of indignation. Those of us who are sick of being victimized by the majority, we are held paralyzed. We are here, but we can do nothing. At least we can vote for a resolution to call for action, and we did. But again, the majority had the most votes, and this resolution was voted down.

The next resolution was by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). It was a simple resolution, after all of the whereases, resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should provide States with the resources they need to fully implement the No Child Left Behind Act as promised less than a year ago.

Less than a year ago we passed the No Child Left Behind Act. It was a bipartisan vote on final passage. I voted for it. I voted for it because of the promises that were made with respect to funding. The President said he would double Title I over a 2-year period. The President said he would provide and support the funding for the implementation for No Child Left Behind, meaning the tests, the training and the administrative costs related to that. The President said that he would support an increase in the special education funding, but he has reneged on those promises.

We would like to see the resources provided by passing the Health and Human Services and the Education and related agencies appropriations. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) offered that resolution.

I would like to note that Patsy Mink said No Child Left Behind was a piece of legislation that was an ambush; it was a trap. She voted against it in committee, and she voted against it on the floor of the House. And now she has been proven to be correct.

We made some stringent requirements there. We placed on the backs of school systems and teachers and students a lot of new regulations and threats, provisions for monitoring tests, and now we have reneged on paying the costs of all of that, leaving it to them. In Patsy's district, she complained several months ago that the provisions of the No Child Left Behind were beginning to upset parents because there are provisions that say if your individual school is failing in terms of the achievements of the students in reading and math, if it is failing, then you have a right to go to another school, transfer to another public school.

Well, just about all of the schools in a certain area of her district are failing, and the parents are frustrated because they want to use that right, but in order to go to another school, they would have to have air transportation. The island is constructed such that the only way they can get to a school that is better than the schools in that locale would be to have planes to transport them. The cost of transportation is so prohibitive that the law has no meaning for them. She was angry because they were angry at her, but they have been stirred up by the promise that was offered by the No Child Left Behind legislation.

I think that the next resolution that was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, was in the same vein, concerned about the fact that we have reneged on the promises of the legislation that we all voted for, most of us voted for, in a bipartisan compromise. Patsy did not vote for it. She said we would regret the compromise, and now we are living to regret it.

The Obey resolution was, resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should complete action on the fiscal year 2003 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education and related agencies appropriation before recessing, and should fund the No Child Left Behind Act with levels commensurate with the levels promised by the act less than a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, we are here. We should act now. Why have we defaulted on action to the point where there is a discussion of nothing significant is going to happen until after the election. Nothing significant is going to be done about any appropriations issues until after the election. That is a swindle. We owe it to the American people to take action on critical activities and demonstrate what we are made of. Let us have a record. Let us go forward and not play with the public opinion polls where we know that the great majority of the American people rank education as a major issue. Education is ranked

as a major issue, and, therefore, we pay lip service to education, but we do not want to really doing anything.

The indignation shown by these resolutions, the attempt to force some action or at least to dramatize it, the mobilization of one party to make certain that this issue was on the floor I think Patsy Mink would be quite proud of.

Patsy was always concerned about the fact that education was so highly publicized by both parties. Patsy was concerned about the fact that there barriers put up about education costing too much, although in America we are only spending in terms of Federal funds, we only pick up 7 percent of the cost of education. There is a continued drumbeat that education costs too much. The Federal Government should not be more involved in education.

□ 2000

Our answer was, what activity is it that the American government is involved in that does not need education as more than a footnote? Education is a force in whatever activity we are engaged in and, therefore, what fools we are to continue to ignore education when we talk about critical issues. The Homeland Security Act, for example, the creation of a homeland security agency does not talk in any significant way about the role that education will play. The Education Department is barely mentioned. Yet the Homeland Security Act is a complex mechanism which will not work unless it has very educated people. It will not work unless it has cadres of people who are well trained in various ways. Homeland security will not work unless we train tremendous numbers of people in the cleanup of anthrax or the cleanup of biological warfare materials. We are preparing for that. We are discussing each day how we have enough vaccine to vaccinate our whole population in 10 days.

There are a number of things happening, but we are not discussing who is going to do it. Where are the people who will give the vaccinations? We have a shortage of nurses. We have a shortage of basic technicians in our hospitals. We certainly cannot deal with complicated biological warfare as exhibited by the way we handled the anthrax emergency here in Washington.

What happened in the anthrax emergency here in Washington? I will not go through the whole scenario, but Congress was threatened and the focus of attention of all the experts was on Congress. The post office, on the other hand, where the anthrax had to come through, was ignored. Even when they discovered that there was anthrax in the post office, all of the personnel were still focused here, all the expertise.

So we had two people die here in Washington. They were postal employees, postmen, who died, because we did not have enough personnel to do the total job and the total job was not really of epic proportions. The anthrax attack, whoever did it, they still do not know who did it, of course, it was small in comparison to what terrorists could do. I fear anthrax more than I fear nuclear weapons. After watching what happened here in Washington, after having been locked out of my office for several weeks, even now we have to irradiate our mail, after watching it take 4 months to clean up the anthrax in one building, Senate building; and the experts, the hygienists who handle anthrax, whoever the experts were, were so limited, the technicians so limited till they only focused on the Senate building. There were not enough to go around. We could not deal with the post office. We still have not dealt with the cleanup of post offices the way we should.

So we have a shortage of people who can deal with anthrax; and that is a clear and present threat, or something similar to anthrax. But in the Homeland Security Act, there is no provision for the training of more people in this area. There is no provision for dealing with the fact that we have a shortage of nurses. Who is going to do all these vaccinations in case we have an epidemic as a result of a biological attack? We have shortages of people who are going into police departments. We have shortages in fire departments in big cities like New York, for example. They are working madly to recruit people to replace the numerous firemen who lost their lives, but in general there has been an attrition over the years of applicants in terms of these agencies.

Many of these positions do not require a Ph.D., graduate education; but they do require some education. Getting people to pass a basic test involving literacy and simple calculations, getting graduates of our schools who can pass those simple requirements has become a big problem. We need to invest whatever is necessary if we are serious about homeland security, or if we are serious about fighting terrorism.

One of the factors that keeps coming up is the very embarrassing fact that we had a lot of data collected. Many of the facts that had been assembled by our reconnaissance agencies, by our satellites in the sky, picking up electronic communications, many of those items were there which told things that would have been very useful in counteracting what happened on September 11; but we did not have Arab translators. We did not have enough translators.

I have said here on the floor many times, that is inexcusable, that there were not enough Arab translators to stay current with the great amount of data that was being collected from Arab sources. Arabs have been terrorists for quite a long time. Since Ronald Reagan's reign when they bombed the barracks in Beirut and killed 200 Marines, on and on, every major act of terrorism, sabotage, Arabs have done it. So surely Arabs should have been high on the radar screen and the number of people who interpret Arabic should have been great. But it is not there.

I heard advertising on the radio and television in New York a couple of months after September 11 advertising for people who might want to be Arab interpreters. On and on it could go, including the fact that in the field in Afghanistan, where our troops have been victorious and conducted a high-tech war in a very effective way, nevertheless, the casualties, if you look at the casualties that we have suffered, the majority of them have been from friendly fire as a result of human error. We have suffered casualties ourselves as a result of human error and friendly fire. We have had a couple of embarrassing incidents with respect to the Canadians and with respect to some tribal groups as a result of human error. So as war becomes more high tech, education becomes an even more important factor.

There is a recognition in the military world of the value of education. I would like to juxtapose the fact that they place a great deal of value on education on specific things related to the military while at the same time ignoring the greater funnel, the mass education that has to funnel people into the military. For example, we have quite a number of military academies beyond West Point. Most people only think of West Point, the Navy at Annapolis, the Air Force Academy; but we also have an Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National War College, Army War College, Naval War College, Naval Post Graduate School, Air War College, Air Force Institute of Technology graduate school and long-term training arrangements and continued service arrangements which allow members of the military to go to graduate schools anywhere when needed.

There is a great deal of understanding in the military of the value of education. Their personnel are constantly being put through a process of improving their education. The military is not afraid to spend money, also. It costs money to educate youngsters in this day and age.

I hear complaints that education costs too much, that when I was a kid we were only paying teachers so much and school costs were at very low levels per child, but now teacher salaries are too high, and we want computers. That is the way of the modern world. When World War II started, we only had four or five vehicles in the Federal arsenal of transportation. Roosevelt had a car and four or five other Cabinet members. We were at that stage. Now we have a whole fleet of cars. We have a fleet of planes. The world has changed.

If it has changed in every other respect, then surely it has changed in respect to education. But we do not recognize that when it comes to education. We do not look at the fact that

our military academies are spending tremendous amounts of money. I have only got figures for way back in 1990. They do not let you have current figures. In 1990 we were spending tremendous amounts of money for the Army academy, which is West Point; Naval Academy, et cetera. But more important than what they were spending overall, which is hard to deal with, as of 1996, the budget office study showed again with 1990 figures, that the amount of money being spent per officer, that is where we can make some comparison.

They say right now at Harvard and Yale, Ivy League schools may cost you between $40,000 and $50,000 per student per year now. In 1990, the cost per officer commissioned in the Army was $299,000. $299,000 per officer commissioned. In the Navy it was $197,000 per officer commissioned. In the Air Force, $279,000 per officer commissioned. We are willing to spend tremendous amounts of money when it involves personnel serving the military directly. If we are willing to spend $299,000 per officer commissioned, surely we can spend more than $8,000 per child in the New York City school system and understand that modern costs are such that $8,000 per child is not going to get you very much in terms of what is needed in this day and age.

I checked before Ron Dellums left as the head of the Armed Services Committee. I did get some figures which showed that the cost at that time, I think that was about 7 or 8 years ago, was down to $120,000 per cadet at West Point, if you left out the actual cost of the military training and just the academic training. The academic training at that time was $120,000 per student while Harvard and Yale at that time were estimated to be about $30,000 in the Ivy League. So either way you can see the difference. We are willing to spend tremendous amounts of money when we think it is important.

Patsy Mink and I used to talk a great deal about the great hypocrisy of American policymakers. In private schools, the cost per child is far higher than $8,000 per child, as it is in the New York City schools. $8,000 per child is what the average is in New York City, because it has so many different schools. There is a low end in my district. There are some schools where they are spending only $4,000 per child; and there is a high end where they are spending $12,000 per child because the expenditure costs are driven by the personnel costs. The greatest cost of personnel, the more experienced teachers and administrators are in certain schools in certain districts that they consider highly desirable places to be. So their salaries raise the cost per child in those districts, while the poorest schools suffer from too many substitute teachers and uncertified teachers and you have a very low cost. But what I am saying is that as a Nation, we are investing very highly in a well-qualified, well-educated military. We are blind to the fact that all the other sectors must go along.

A complex, modern nation, the leader of the free world, needs to have a comparable concern about education across the board. All of these Department of Defense graduate institutions, is there a single peace initiative we have which has Federal funding for graduate institutions? Is there a single graduate institution that we know of? There is a peace institute which you can hardly find in the budget, it is so small; and it is very cautious about what it does. But there is no place where we are training diplomats. There is no plan to make certain that the greatest Nation on Earth, the last superpower, has knowledge of all the other societies on Earth.

We not only have a shortage in people who can translate Arabic but in Pakistan and some other countries, they speak Urdu. In Afghanistan they speak Pashto. We have more than 3,000 colleges and universities in this Nation. If you have a plan, if the Homeland Security Act cared about really dealing with terrorism across the world, you would have a plan which showed that somewhere in America there is a college or a university that has an institute or a center which is not only learning the language, teaching the language, but also teaching the culture of any group of people anywhere on the face of the Earth.

Certainly any nation in the United Nations, we should have a program which has people who are studying it. We can afford to do that. By chance we have experts probably on everything, but single people who decide they want to go off and study and are ready when we need them for these kinds of assignments, that number is decreasing.

□ 2015

Why not have a plan which guarantees that we will always have enough people who speak Urdu to deal with increasing our friendship with Pakistan? Pakistan is a friendly Muslim Nation. Pakistan is our ally in the fight against terrorism. We need to know more about its culture and be able to deal with it. If we are going to have nation-building, that is a word that was trivial, used and ridiculed a few years ago, but now it is understood that we cannot fight terrorism without nation-building. We do not invest a large amount of energy, time, lives, effort in a nation like Afghanistan and then walk off and leave it to crumble back into the kind of primitive savagery that existed under the Taliban. If we do not stay and we do not do nation-building, we will have to do it all over again in 10 or 20 years. So nation-building is part of a process that we should have in our overall plan to fight terrorism.

Homeland security, military readiness, all that, we should look at education first and foremost. The funnel which feeds everything we do has to come up through our public school system. Fifty-three million children are out there in our public school system. They could supply every expert we need, every category of technician, but they are not doing it when they come out of high school, and they can only barely read and write properly, when calculations are minimal.

A large part of public school is inhabited by minorities, and one of the problems is, which Patsy and I talked about many times, as the minority population has increased in certain school systems, the big-city school systems in America, the commitment of the locality and the commitment of the State government has gone down, and we cannot get away from an observation that racism is at work in decision-making.

Doing less for the schools has happened as the population has changed, but let us take a look at what that means for America in one area. In our military those same minorities who are being neglected in our public schools make up a large part of our military relative to their percentage of population. African Americans are considered by the Census Bureau to be about 13 percent of the total population. In the Army African Americans total 25.5 percent of the Army population; 480,435 people are African Americans. Hispanics are 9.3 percent. In the Navy African Americans, which are only 13 percent of the population, are 18.9 percent of the Navy. African Americans, who are only 13 percent of the population, are 16 percent of the soldiers in the Air Force. In the Marines African Americans are 18.9 percent.

These same African Americans who are in the inner-city schools predominantly, the supply that goes into our military, is jeopardized if you do not provide appropriate education now. What would it be like in a few years? What is it like now? Is the quality of the soldiers declining at a time when the high-tech complexity of the military is increasing?

We should take a hard look at all the various activities of our society and how they complement each other.

Patsy Mink, as I said before, had an encyclopedic mind when it came to looking at human resources and looking at the various missions of a civilized society like ours should have. Patsy Mink and I have talked about the fact that it is ridiculous to have a homeland security program which allocates no significant role to the Department of Education or to the universities and colleges in America. It is sort of doomed to failure.

I would like to conclude by just refocusing on one particular project or program that is identified most immediately and specifically with Patsy Mink. That is Title IX. Many women who are doctors and lawyers, who had a basically equal treatment in the university system and graduate schools, have no idea what it was like before. I think one of the women on the Supreme Court told a long story about how she was denied access to decent

jobs in the law firms when she first came out of college and later denied promotions, et cetera. So there are individual stories that can be told, but the figures were outrageous before Title IX.

Title IX has made a big difference, but Title IX has been fought step by step all the way. It was signed into law in 1972, and Patsy had to go to war and fight the Tower amendment in 1974. She had to fight certain other Senate amendments that were attempted by Senator HELMS and S. 2146 in 1976 and 1977. On and on it goes. There have been attempts to gut Title IX.

So Title IX, the welfare rights, the welfare reform, all of it was part of why I say that Patsy Mink was a role model for decisionmakers of this Congress, and she is a role model for decisionmakers in the future. Compassion and riotous indignation are still vital qualifications for the leaders of a Nation. Patsy Mink was a great leader of this great Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for October 1 on account of congressional business.

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 Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, October 3.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 2002, 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:

9469. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order: Rules and Regulations-Decrease in Assessment Rate and Decrease of Importer Assessments [No. LS-02-09] received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9470. A letter from the Administrator, Regulatory Contact, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Milled Rice — received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9471. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9472. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9473. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clinical Chemistry and Clinical Toxicology Devices; Reclassification of Cyclosporine and Tacrolimus Assays [Docket Nos. 01P-0119 and 01P-0235] received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9474. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9475. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill approving the location of a Memorial to former President John Adams and his legacy in the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on Resources.

9476. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Snakeheads (family Channidae) (RIN: 1018-AI36) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9477. A letter from the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Rules Applicable to Surface Coal Mining Hearings and Appeals (RIN: 1090-AA82) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9478. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Thornyhead Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 091902E] received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9479. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Salary Offset Procedures for Collecting Debts Owed by Federal Employees to the Federal Government (RIN: 3150-AG96) received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9480. A letter from the Actig Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hobe Sound bridge (SR 708), Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 996.0, Hobe Sound, Martin County, FL [CGD07-02-119] received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9481. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Cape Fear River, Wilmington, NC [CGD05-02-075] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9482. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Mile 134.0, Cypremort Point, Louisiana [COTP Morgan City-02-004] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9483. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2002-63) received September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9484. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Supplementary Medical Insurance Premium Surcharge Agreements [CMS-1221-F] (RIN: 0938-AK42) received September 27, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

9485. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Programs of All-inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE); Program Revisions [CMS-1201-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AL59) received September 27, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1946. A bill to require the Secretary of