

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, November 15, 2000.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday November 13, 2000, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AN APT DESCRIPTION OF THE END OF THIS SESSION OF THE 106TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, T.S. Eliot said: That is the way the world goes, not with a bang but a whimper. It seems like an apt description of the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from Slate, which is a magazine, an online magazine, entitled "Ralph the Leninist."

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Slate magazine, Oct. 31, 2000]

RALPH THE LENINIST

(By Jacob Weisberg)

Over the past 10 days, liberals have been voicing shock and dismay at the imminent prospect of their old hero, Ralph Nader, intentionally throwing the election to George W. Bush. A first, eloquent protest came 10 days ago from a group of a dozen former "Nader's Raiders," who asserted that their former mentor had broken a promise not to campaign in states where he could hurt Gore

and begged him to reconsider doing so. Others, including Newsweek columnist Jonathan Alter, have expressed a similar sense of disappointment and betrayal.

Nader's response to all this heartfelt hand-wringing has been to scoff and sneer. On Good Morning America, he referred contemptuously to his old disciples as "frightened liberals." The Green Party nominee is spending the final week of the campaign stumping in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Washington—the very states where a strong showing stands to hurt Gore the most. Nader has said he wants to maximize his vote in every state in hopes of attaining the 5 percent of the vote that will qualify the Green Party for \$12 million in federal matching funds in 2004. Speaking to foreign journalists in Washington yesterday, he explicitly rejected Internet vote-swapping schemes that could help him reach this qualifying threshold without the side effect of electing Bush president. In various other TV appearances, Nader has stated bluntly that he couldn't care less who wins.

This depraved indifference to Republican rule has made Nader's old liberal friends even more furious. A bunch of intellectuals organized by Sean Wilentz and Todd Gitlin are circulating a much nastier open letter, denouncing Nader's "wrecking-ball campaign—one that betrays the very liberal and progressive values it claims to uphold." But really, the question shouldn't be the one liberals seem to be asking about why Nader is doing what he's doing. The question should be why anyone is surprised. For some time now, Nader has made it perfectly clear that his campaign isn't about trying to pull the Democrats back to the left. Rather, his strategy is the Leninist one of "heightening the contradictions." It's not just that Nader is willing to take a chance of being personally responsible for electing Bush. It's that he's actively trying to elect Bush because he thinks that social conditions in America need to get worse before they can get better.

Nader often makes this "the worse, the better" point on the stump in relation to Republicans and the environment. He says that Reagan-era Interior Secretary James Watt was useful because he was a "provocateur" for change, noting that Watt spurred a massive boost in the Sierra Club's membership. More recently, Nader applied the same logic to Bush himself. Here's the Los Angeles Times' account of a speech Nader gave at Chapman University in Orange, Calif., last week: "After lambasting Gore as part of a do-nothing Clinton administration, Nader said, 'If it were a choice between a provocateur and an anesthetizer, I'd rather have a provocateur. It would mobilize us.'"

Lest this remark be considered an aberration, Nader has said similar things before. "When [the Democrats] lose, they say it's because they are not appealing to the Republican voters," Nader told an audience in Madison, Wis., a few months ago, according to a story in The Nation. "We want them to say they lost because a progressive movement took away votes." That might make it sound like Nader's goal is to defeat Gore in order to shift the Democratic Party to the left. But in a more recent interview with David Moberg in the socialist paper In These Times, Nader made it clear that his real mission is to destroy and then replace the Democratic Party altogether. According to Moberg, Nader talked "about leading the Greens into a 'death struggle' with the Democratic Party to determine which will be the majority party." Nader further and shockingly explained that he hopes in the fu-

ture to run Green Party candidates around the country, including against such progressive Democrats as Sen. Paul Wellstone of Minnesota, Sen. Russell Feingold of Wisconsin, and Rep. Henry Waxman of California. "I hate to use military analogies," Nader said, "but this is war on the two parties."

Hitler analogies always lead to trouble, but the one here is irresistible since Nader is actually making the argument of the German Communist Party circa 1932, which helped bring the Nazis to power. I'm not comparing the Republicans to fascists or the Greens to Stalinists for that matter. But Nader and his supporters are emulating a disturbing, familiar pattern of sectarian idiocy. You hear these echoes whenever Nader criticizes Bush halfheartedly, then becomes enthusiastic and animated blasting the Green version of the "social fascists"—Bill Clinton, Gore, and moderate environmentalists. It's clear that the people he really despises are those who half agree with him. To Nader, it is liberal meliorists, not right-wing conservatives, who are the true enemies of his effort to build a "genuine" progressive movement. He does have a preference between Republicans and Democrats, and it's for the party that he thinks will inflict maximum damage on the environment, civil rights, labor rights, and so on. By assisting his class enemy, Nader thinks he can pull the wool from the eyes of a sheeplike public.

If Nader's goal were actually progressive reform—a ban on soft money, a higher minimum wage, health-care coverage for some of the uninsured, a global warming treaty—it would be possible to say that his strategy was breathtakingly stupid. But Nader's goal is not progressive reform; it's a transformation in human consciousness. His Green Party will not flourish under Democratic presidents who lull the country into a sense of complacency by making things moderately better. If it is to thrive, it needs villainous, right-wing Republicans who will make things worse. Like Pat Buchanan, Nader understands that his movement thrives on misery. But the comparison is actually unfair to Buchanan (words I never thought I'd write) because Buchanan doesn't work to create more misery for the sake of making his movement grow the way Nader does. From a strictly self-interested point of view, Nader's stance is the more rational one.

So Gore supporters might as well quit warning the Green candidate that he's going to put George W. Bush in the White House. Ralph Nader is a very intelligent man who knows exactly what he's doing. And they only seem to be encouraging him.

Mr. Speaker, this article lays out, I think, the basic premise by which this Congress failed to deal with the Patients' Bill of Rights, education, prescription medicines for senior citizens.

In talking about the Ralph Nader campaign, it said that Mr. Nader has made it perfectly clear what his strategy was. It is the strategy of Lenin; that is, to "heighten the contradictions." That is in quotes.

Now, the whole idea of bringing down the political process to make things better out of the ashes is one that has been very actively pushed by Mr. Nader in his campaign. He said it very directly in many places. He said, "We are

hoping that we will destroy the Democratic Party, and that from that will rise a new party on the left.”

This House and its failure to deal with these major issues today and in this session are a direct result of a strategy very similar announced by Speaker Gingrich. His idea, when he was in the minority, was to destroy the House; to do everything possible to discredit the government, to discredit the House of Representatives, to bring it into ill repute with everybody in the public.

Now we come to this session. He started it 6 years ago. He tried it for 2 years. He lost seats in the next election. He tried it again. He lost seats in the next election. And the third time they tried it, they lost seats in the next election.

Now, what we have got here is a situation where the Congress simply did not function. All that lovey-dovey kissy-face that was going on a few minutes ago is basically to obscure the fact that, although the Republican leadership said, “We will pass the budget and all its parts by a timely date the first of October,” but in fact, we stand here today, 1 month after the new fiscal year is in, and we have not passed three major bills. The Senate and House Republicans could not get their act together and get it down to the President.

They say, well, the President was not going to sign it. They never could get an agreement among themselves to send the bill down to the President and veto it if he chose. They sent some down, which he vetoed. But if they cannot decide among themselves, maybe they should go down and sit down with the President and negotiate and get the people's business done.

They could not do it. They could not bring themselves to. Having created these contradictions and all the fighting in here, they could not then sit down with the President and negotiate how to deal with tax relief for the middle class, how to deal with educational financing for schools. They could not deal with the Patients' Bill of Rights. They could not deal with prescription drugs for senior citizens.

I do not know how any State is going to plan their budget when they have no budget from the United States government. They are just sort of sitting out there waiting.

There are hospitals. The BBA give-backs, that is, the restoration of the unfortunate cuts that were made in Medicare, which have put hospitals all over this country in serious problems, have not been done.

We are going into an election with a hospital in every one of the 435 districts represented in this House where they do not know how much money they are going to have, or if they are going to have any money to make up for the deficits they are running now.

This comes from this idea that somehow they can radically rip this government up and start over new. It is a fallacious idea that Mr. Nader is using, and it was a fallacious idea that Mr. Gingrich used in this House.

We must come back here and work together in the future, or this country will suffer immensely.

TRIBUTE TO JIM AND BETTY McCANN ON THEIR RETIREMENTS FROM THE NEW BRUNSWICK DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE HONORABLE FRANK J. PALLONE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to two of my longest serving and most loyal staffers, Jim and Betty McCann, who retired this year from my New Brunswick district office.

Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual to have an outstanding individual on your staff for a long time, but to have two outstanding individuals who also happen to be married to each other is most unusual and most fortunate for me.

Jim and Betty McCann worked for my predecessor, the late Congressman James Howard, in the 1980s. Jim Howard recognized early on that Jim and Betty had the talent and the personalities to handle the varied and difficult job of running a congressional district office.

Just as we know that not everyone has the special skills needed to be a successful politician, so, too, not everyone has the versatility and interpersonal and organizational skills to survive and excel on a congressional staff.

After Jim Howard passed away and I was elected in 1988, I urged Betty and Jim to stay on and work for me. When redistricting reshaped the districts in New Jersey and I ran and won in the Sixth Congressional District, I set up a new office in New Brunswick, New Jersey, in the Middlesex County portion of my district.

Jim and Betty's experience on congressional and case work matters were very important to the success of my new office, which handled a tremendous amount of constituent casework and important projects in the most populous and ethnically diverse area of my district.

In all those years, I did not think I ever heard a word of complaint about the operation of the New Brunswick District Office. I knew it was being well administered, so I could divert my attention to other important issues in Middlesex County, secure in the knowledge that the equally important constituent matters were being carefully attended to.

I was often complimented in person and in letters about Jim and Betty's service to the Sixth District, and I would like to quote from some of the hundreds of letters that I have received thanking me, or thanking me for their efforts, over the years.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is from a physician in my district. He writes:

“Dear Congressman Pallone:

I am writing this letter to thank you and your outstanding office staff for the great effort in dealing with my difficult case. Mrs. McCann has been very helpful, sincere, and had the leading role in solving my complicated case.

Over the past few months, I have been dealing with Mrs. McCann, and she has always been very cooperative and always walks the extra mile to get things done properly. I was very impressed by her knowledge of the immigration laws and rules and her superior ability to approach a difficult case like mine. . . . She is a superb case-worker.”

I have another letter from a retired lieutenant colonel regarding Jim McCann. It says, “Dear Congressman Pallone, I am writing to thank you and a member of your staff, Jim McCann, for responding so quickly and effectively to my family in time of need.

My wife's brother recently died after a long illness. He was a retired Navy Chief Petty Officer and wished to be buried at sea. Because of Jim McCann, who made the arrangements with the Coast Guard in New Jersey and who personally appeared at dockside on the day of the burial, the occasion proceeded smoothly.

I was struck by how quietly and efficiently Mr. McCann coordinated the details without intruding on the grief of the immediate family. He is a very considerate individual who gave up a good portion of his Saturday to represent your office. I am personally very grateful.”

Mr. Speaker, Jim and Betty epitomize the best in congressional service. Working long and hard and not seeking the limelight, they loyally served the residents of the Sixth Congressional District by walking that extra mile to get things done properly.

I want to thank them deeply, and wish them a happy and productive retirement.

WHICH CANDIDATE WOULD ENSURE THE CONTINUED SOLVENCY OF SOCIAL SECURITY?

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, I was just on an interview with the Wall Street Journal asking me what I thought would happen after the election of the President, and which person might move ahead to make sure that we save social security.