

Krystal studies patterns and follows instructions.

"Mother is a unique woman," Krystal's mother, Beth Mahoney, wrote as she nominated Allene for the Golden Thimble award. "She has the ability to make that sewing machine create anything. "Taking advantage of her skills, I never learned to sew. She has taken on the task of teaching my 11-year-old daughter to sew. Mother's patience has paid off. Krystal has won blue ribbons on her blouse, skirt, and other 4-H projects. For her grandchildren, Mother has designed and made costumes, doll clothes, and even sheep blankets for their show animals. For the community's haunted house, she made a gorilla suit and a werewolf costume and others."

"I have three chairs in my living room that she upholstered for me. She also knits and crochets afghans, stocking caps, doll clothes, stuffed animals, and Christmas stockings. We are very proud of the handmade tablecloths and quilts she has made us. In addition to the fun things, she even does my patching, and when patches are not available, she reweaves wool garments. This 72-year-old is a quiet, sweet lady, and I love her dearly."

Allene remade countless sports uniforms so that her grandsons would look neat on the field and court. She continues to make prom dresses for her daughter, Beth, who is no longer a student, but attends school proms with her husband, who is a school board member. A Roosevelt Roughrider pillow, an afghan, and window shades personalize grandson Jeff's room. Other grandsons have received crocheted tablecloths, place mats, and afghans. Each of her three children, seven grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren has one or more treasures made by Allene. Her family treasures a flower garden quilt Allene made in 1934.

Beth describes Allene as a perfectionist who usually has two projects going simultaneously—while she attends basketball and baseball games and sheep shows.

Allene is a devout Christian who is much loved by her family. We wish her the best for her 90th birthday with many more to come.

## ECONOMIC SECURITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

**HON. KAREN MCCARTHY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 24, 2001*

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for enacting an economic stimulus package, and to voice my opposition to H.R. 3090, the Economic Stimulus and Recovery Act in its current form.

A more fiscally responsible approach to induce economic growth would combine tax cuts and increased spending within the confines of Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan's cost recommendations. Mr. Greenspan recommended a total package not to exceed 1 percent of GDP or \$100 billion including the relief measures already enacted by Congress. The tax cuts must contain taxpayer rebate checks for those who did not receive them last

summer, enhanced expensing for business capital purchases, and marginal tax rate adjustments to foster spending. The elements of the package should be limited to those projects which will provide immediate economic impact, such as extended unemployment benefits, health care coverage for furloughed workers, and increased security measures. In order to continue bipartisanship in our Congress, Democrats and Republicans should work together to enact a measure containing these provisions.

An effective plan must focus on the people most impacted by the economic downturn. Immediate relief and direct payments through rebate checks for the 30 million Americans who were omitted from the tax relief provided earlier this year must be an integral part of the stimulus package. These individuals are most in need and most likely to spend their rebates, making both common sense and economic sense.

Tax cuts should be temporarily targeted to induce investment and encourage cash flow in the economy. The temporary nature encourages individuals and business to immediately take advantage of proposals rather than wait several years to invest in new infrastructure or capital markets. Changes in expensing and capital loss will meet these goals by proving short term investment incentives to businesses and individuals. H.R. 3090 contains many unnecessary provisions, such as the repeat of the corporate alternative minimum tax retroactive to 1986. This will give 50 of the wealthiest corporations \$20 billion in refunds.

Sufficient funds should be available to ensure continued health coverage and unemployment benefits in the case of a prolonged recession. Providing COBRA health—insurance should be a top priority to guarantee the continued health for those unable to purchase their own coverage, such as victims and their families or displaced workers. H.R. 3090 is inadequate to address the nation's needs in these areas. We must increase security infrastructure spending. We should also include additional investments, such as those contained in the Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2001, in our nation's public health system to better respond to bioterrorism threats. Not only does this protect our country from future attacks, it provides jobs and cash flow into the economy. Irresponsibly spending too much without offsetting the cost will lead to future long term budget deficits and interest rate increases.

Mr. Speaker, I support a bipartisan economic stimulus package that will effectively and responsibly improve our economy and win the war on terrorism without raiding Social Security and Medicare.

## WORKING WITH REPRESSIVE REGIMES IN CENTRAL ASIA

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 25, 2001*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for United States policy in our war on terrorism. The President has my full back-

ing in what will clearly be a long and arduous battle to track down and stamp out terrorist organizations. In the end, I am confident that we will prevail over these forces of evil and barbarism.

At the same time, we must strike a balance between our need for allies in the region and our commitment to advancing the cause of freedom and human rights. In Central Asia, for example, I support our efforts to work closely with Uzbekistan and appreciate that the fact that we have received permission from that nation to use its military bases. However, Uzbekistan is an authoritarian state which has also reportedly imprisoned over 7,000 political prisoners in poor conditions. Next door, in Kazakhstan, the repressive and corrupt regime of Nursultan Nazarbayev has also offered to provide as yet unspecified assistance to the coalition.

All of us welcome support from the nations of Central Asia and hope to welcome them someday into the family of democracies, but I am concerned that there may be an implicit quid pro quo in such assistance. I hope that these countries do not expect the U.S. to ease the pressure to end human rights abuses and to promote democratic reform. In this connection, both the Financial Times and the Washington Post have recently printed editorials warning about the pitfalls of cooperation with repressive regimes in Central Asia and elsewhere.

The Financial Times, for example stated on September 17 that "the US must be careful not to align itself too closely with authoritarian regimes that have dreadful records of suppressing minority groups. An anti-terrorist campaign must never be used as a convenient excuse for repressing political opponents . . ."

Similarly, a Washington Post editorial of September 24 warned that "In forming tactical bonds with such nations, America must not forget what it is fighting for as well as what it is fighting against." The editorial goes on to say that "in the long run, democracy will be the best antidote to religious extremism." In this connection, it is important for the U.S. to be seen as clearly promoting the freedoms that President Bush championed in his address to Congress on September 20: "our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other."

I believe that as we work with the governments of Central Asia to destroy the al-Qaeda terrorist network, we should also caution that repression and corruption are creating ideal conditions for Islamic extremism to flourish within their borders. Islamic extremist groups will never run out of recruits as long as the Soviet era dictators in Central Asia continue their repressive and corrupt ways. In this regard, I am particularly concerned about Kazakhstan, which is the crown jewel of the region because of its oil, gas and mineral wealth. I shudder to think what an Islamic extremist government would do with that country's wealth.

As we have done in other regions of importance to the United States, we must expand our efforts to promote pluralism, tolerance, and openness in Central Asia. The people of these nations deserve a political avenue to express their opinions and grievances. Extremist

Islam must not be the only outlet for Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tajiks, and other Central Asians as it unfortunately has become for so many other people in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full texts of the Financial Times and Washington Post editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Financial Times, Mon., Sept. 17, 2001]

#### DOUBTFUL ALLIES IN CENTRAL ASIA

Colin Powell, the US secretary of state, has said that the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington create a new benchmark by which the US will measure its allies. Just as Washington's relations with other states during the cold war were determined by their alignment towards the Soviet Union, so the US will now judge nations by how fiercely they oppose international terrorism. This tilt of the prism could lead to some surprising—and potentially disturbing—new alignments.

So far, the US has done an impressive job in marshalling international support. It is now trying to court the countries near Afghanistan, including Pakistan, Russia, and China, which Washington has previously accused of giving succour to rogue states. The US is also trying to win support from the five former Soviet central Asian states. All these countries realise that they have a common interest in pre-empting terrorism in a world in which every commercial airliner has been turned into a potential bomb. But some may also see domestic tactical advantages in backing any forthcoming US offensive.

In prosecuting its new war against terrorism the US must therefore be careful not to align itself too closely with authoritarian regimes that have dreadful records of suppressing minority groups. An anti-terrorist campaign must never be used as a convenient excuse for repressing political opponents or turned into an anti-Muslim crusade.

#### FOCUS ON PAKISTAN

The immediate focus is on Pakistan, which is one of the few countries to recognize the Taliban leadership in neighbouring Afghanistan. As it shelters an estimated 2m Afghan refugees, Pakistan well knows the tragedies of its troubled neighbour. The US provided strong support to Pakistan during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan but has since distanced itself from the military regime of General Pervez Musharraf. Washington continues to uphold sanctions against Pakistan first imposed after Islamabad exploded a nuclear bomb. It has also expressed concern that Pakistan supports militants in Kashmir.

#### CO-OPERATION WITH US

In spite of the presence of Muslim extremists within Pakistan, Gen Musharraf can doubtless see the advantages of co-operating with the US. But he will, in turn, surely expect the US to legitimise his regime and help persuade the International Monetary Fund to release fresh funds for Pakistan. He may also want foreign powers to tone down their criticisms of his military rule and quietly forget about his promises to restore democracy by October 2002. Washington should resist making such explicit trade-offs.

The US may also see the Shanghai grouping of central Asian states—including China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan—as natural allies in its war against Muslim terrorists. This grouping is already swapping intelligence

and considering security arrangements to combat extremism.

China fears that Muslim extremism could infect its western province of Xinjiang. Russia is fighting Muslim opponents in Chechnya and Tajikistan. To varying degrees, the central Asian states are all concerned that Muslim militants could undermine their own regimes. But many of these countries are characterised by blatant abuse of minority rights and hostility towards the Muslim opposition.

President George W. Bush has made a commendably forthright defence of Arab Americans. He should be equally strong in support of peacefully oriented Muslims throughout central Asia. In a traditional war the enemies of your enemies may be counted as your friends. But Mr. Bush has launched a new kind of war for justice that ultimately can only succeed by winning over hearts and minds.

The US should be as steadfast in its defence of Muslim moderates as it is ferocious in attacking terrorism. The natural allies of the US in central Asia may be counted more among its peoples rather than its regimes.

[From the Washington Post, Mon., Sept. 24, 2001]

#### WHAT TO FIGHT FOR

In explaining to Americans the war he would lead against terrorism, President Bush on Thursday described the enemy as heir to the "murderous ideologies" against which this country fought for most of the last century: fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism. As with those ideologies, he said, the terrorists responsible for the Sept. 11 attack sacrifice human life to their radical vision of the world and respect no value but the "will to power."

The analogy is powerful in many ways. It reinforces Mr. Bush's message that the struggle will be long; the United States fought communist totalitarianism for many decades. It bolsters also the message that the struggle will be fought on many fronts—not just military but, as in the Cold War, economic, political, propaganda and more. Above all it elevates the struggle to a seriousness that cannot be slighted, by this or future administrations; if the enemy is aiming for the destruction of civilization, no priority could be more important than that enemy's destruction. As during the Cold War, the United States might take on other tasks and causes but must never forget the long-term ideological struggle.

But precisely for that reason—because Mr. Bush has put this war at the very forefront of the nation's agenda—it is important to be careful and precise in measuring the foe and setting the goals. Is it the entire story, for example, that the terrorists target America because they hate its open society? Mr. Bush described a fight between freedom and fear, and that is part of it. But then why do the terrorists also target authoritarian regimes such as those of Uzbekistan or Saudi Arabia? It's important to recognize distinctions where they exist—among different terrorist organizations and among varying goals even within organizations. And it's important to think about the ways in which "a fringe form of Islamic extremism," as Mr. Bush described the ideology of the foe, also might differ from the hostile ideologies of the past century in tactics, goals and sweep.

As in the Cold War, the new struggle will put the United States in league with allies of convenience, unsavory ones at times. Al-

ready, to root out the terrorists in Afghanistan, the United States finds itself pondering cooperation with the despotic regime of Central Asia's Uzbekistan. Saudi Arabia, an intolerant monarchy, is sought as a partner. China, the largest remaining outpost of communism, now is suggested as an ally in the war against terrorism. Such regimes may work with the United States because they also fear the Islamic extremists, but not in defense of freedom. To the dictators of China and Central Asia, the terrorists may represent chaos, a challenge to state authority; but no one running those countries views democracy as the alternative to Islamic extremism.

In forming tactical bonds with such nations America must not forget what it is fighting for as well as what it is fighting against. In the struggles against Nazism and communism the United States allied with repressive regimes, sometimes wisely, sometimes to its detriment. In the long run, democracy will be the best antidote to religious extremism. And just as in its past struggles, the U.S. fight against this latest foe will succeed best if the country is seen to be promoting the freedoms Mr. Bush championed Thursday night: "our freedom of religion, or freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other."

IN HONOR OF THE FRIENDS OF  
DAG HAMMARSKOLD PLAZA AND  
TURTLE BAY ASSOCIATION'S  
NIGHT OF REMEMBRANCE FOR  
THE EIGHTH BATTALION ENGINE  
EIGHT AND LADDER TWO OF  
THE NEW YORK CITY FIRE DE-  
PARTMENT AND THE SEVEN-  
TEENTH POLICE PRECINCT OF  
THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE DE-  
PARTMENT

#### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 2001

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, New York City was forever changed by the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Our bonds with each other as New Yorkers and Americans are stronger now than ever before. As our compassion for our fellow New Yorkers has grown, so has our respect and admiration for New York City's firefighters and police officers. Our sense of gratitude cannot be fully expressed in words.

This crisis has touched the heart of the nation. It has engendered unprecedented acts of altruism and a remarkable outpouring of support and coordination to assist the city of New York.

The heroic men and women of the New York City Fire Department and New York City Police Department must be commended for their tireless and heroic rescue and recovery efforts. Each firefighter and police officer in their own way, acted quickly and decisively, saving thousands of lives in the face of extreme danger on September 11, 2001.

Every fire station and police precinct in New York City contributed to the rescue work. Most lost friends, partners, and colleagues. New