

this committee, it makes a big difference knowing that some of the people on the receiving end of Harvard's poverty wages will be there to tell the other members of the committee exactly what that's like.

Perhaps most importantly, it is no longer possible for power to operate at Harvard without acknowledging the principle that people deserve a living wage. Our community has a responsibility to treat all its members decently, and we have told the people who thought they led our community that they must do that. Everyone in the Harvard Living Wage Campaign—workers, students, faculty, alumni, area residents—said no to indecent treatment, and to poverty wages. We said stop. All of us.

The past 21 days are not significant just because dozens of people occupied the President's office. The past 21 days are significant because of what happened outside of this building. Dining hall workers electrified Harvard Yard; worker-student solidarity is so strong that they want to have one of us help bargain their new contract. Faculty came together; about 400 of Harvard's famously individualistic professors together signed a letter calling for a living wage, and supporting the sit-in. Undergraduates turned out in record numbers for the largest rallies that the Yard has seen in decades, and students from every single graduate or professional school organized themselves in support in a completely unheralded way. Thousands of alumni called University President Neil L. Rudenstine, and even temporarily occupied the Harvard Club of New York. And our janitors and custodians organized rallies, trained themselves in civil disobedience and demanded decent treatment. And we all did it together. And so in the last 21 days we have won two victories; one in the form of substantive gains for Harvard workers, and the second a promise made today by this community—a promise to continue to fight for a living wage.

But our extraordinarily modest and simple demand for \$10.25 an hour makes a world of difference. On this campus, in this country, people have long fought for the principle that people should be treated without regard to race or to gender or to sexuality. That's because respecting the dignity of all people is the fundamental principle of any community, especially of an educational community. We think an education is valuable because we think people are valuable enough to educate. And for the past 21 days, this whole community came together to say that every one of us is valuable. Every one of us deserves a living wage. And all of us together, in solidarity as never before, told the people who said no that they must say yes.

We—all of us—have made this a time when power stopped. For 21 days, we occupied the offices of the people who thought they could block the consensus of our entire community. We asked power to justify its operation, and power found that it couldn't. For 21 days, the people who thought they could run this place without regard for students, for workers, for faculty, for alumni and for the Cambridge-area community—those people did not have a clue what to do. For 21 days it was not business as usual in the halls of power. We should have no illusions: this sit-in was all about coercion. We all decided that we would not go along with the Corporation's coercive power any more, that we would not let them force indecent poverty wages on members of our community.

While this tremendous victory marks the end of one phase of our campaign for a living wage, we do not expect the Corporation's co-

ercive power to disappear, and we do not expect this fight to end. We do not need to harbor a utopian fantasy in order to recognize that Harvard's administrators can and must treat people better and pay them better. So today's victory cannot be anything but partial.

Recognizing that, all of us should look ahead together to the day when we have won a living wage for all Harvard workers, and to the fights beyond that. Together, we can change not just the dialogue, but the reality of the conditions of Harvard's workers. We can turn the coercive power of the Corporation with the force of our collective yes. Together, in solidarity, we can make Harvard's power productive, make it a positive force and take it for workers. We have organized and won something tremendous here in Harvard Yard, because we have organized and won each other. And to keep winning—to win a living wage for all Harvard employees—we've got to keep organizing. Workers, students, faculty, alumni, parents, all community members energized from this victory should together build from here until everyone joins us in saying: Living wage now!

TRIBUTE TO THE MUSIC AND ENTERTAINMENT COMMUNITY FOR EFFORTS IN FUNDRAISING TO BENEFIT THE HEROES AND VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11

HON. MARK FOLEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 2001

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House to congratulate the many people whose hard work and sacrifice resulted in a series of successful concerts to benefit the heroes and victims of the September 11th tragedies.

Last month, the music and entertainment worlds joined forces to raise funds to help those affected by the September 11th tragic events. On October 20th, Madison Square Garden hosted "The Concert for New York City." On October 21st, a second all-star benefit concert, "United We Stand," was held here in our nation's capital while a third concert, "The Country Freedom Concert" was hosted in Nashville.

These three concerts raised well over \$20 million in ticket sales, viewer pledges, and other donations. Proceeds from these shows will benefit the American Red Cross, the Pentagon Relief Fund, the Salvation Army and the Robin Hood Relief Fund.

This weekend of concerts joined many of the world's greatest performers with Clear Channel Entertainment to raise money in support of the recovery efforts from the September 11 attacks. These concerts in New York, Washington and Nashville featured appearances by Billy Joel, Paul McCartney, Bono, Elton John, the Backstreet Boys, James Taylor, Michael Jackson, NSYNC, Eric Clapton, James Brown, Ricky Martin, John Mellencamp, Marc Anthony, Aerosmith, Mariah Carey, Tim McGraw, Vince Gill, George Strait and countless others.

These concerts offered America another chance to help in our recovery efforts and national healing. I am proud to join these individ-

uals in standing up for America. I urge my colleagues and all Americans to watch the rebroadcast of the "United We Stand" concert tonight on ABC at 8 pm EST. Finally, I support this effort and commend the efforts of those in the music and entertainment community for their efforts.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SECURING AMERICA FOR EFFECTIVE TRANSPORTATION ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 1, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Securing America For Effective Transportation, or Safety, Act. This legislation is in stark contrast to the bureaucracy laden approaches of other bills. My bill would not create new federal spending nor new federal bureaucracies. The actions taken by this legislation fit into a few broad categories. First, it would give airline pilots the right to defend themselves, their aircraft, and their passengers by permitting them to bear arms. Second, it would clearly define the act of skyjacking as an act of piracy and provide appropriate punishment for any such act, up to and including capital punishment. Next, this legislation would provide appropriate strengthening of regulation of airline security in a fashion consistent with our constitutional framework. This would be done by requiring, for example, that law enforcement personnel be posted at screening locations rather than simply in the confines of an airport, and by requiring the production of passenger manifests for international flights. Finally, this bill would give airlines a strong incentive to improve passenger security, not by giving them taxpayer funded grants nor by creating new bureaucracies tasked with making administrative law, but rather by providing a tax incentive to airlines and other companies performing screening and security duties.

One example of my approach is how it treats employees. Rather than the Senate approach federalizing the work force or the House approach of subsidizing private security firms via federal contracts, my bill raises the take-home pay of airline security personnel by exempting their pay from federal income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the House bill, while a slight improvement over the Senate version, is still a step in the wrong direction. By authorizing a new airline ticket tax, by creating new federal mandates and bureaucracies, and by subsidizing the airline industry to the tune of another \$3 billion dollars, this bill creates a costly expense that the American people cannot afford. We appropriated \$40 billion dollars in the wake of September 11, and I supported that measure as legitimate compensation for individuals and companies harmed by the failure of the federal government to provide national defense. Soon thereafter we made another \$15 billion available to the airlines, and now we have a House bill that further victimizes the taxpayers by making them pay for another \$3 billion dollars worth of subsidies to the airline industry.