

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 4108(a)), I transmit herewith the seventh biennial revision (2002–2006) to the United States Arctic Research Plan.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 15, 2001.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

□ 1715

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO MEL AND SUG HANCOCK ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us who are fortunate enough to serve in this House consider it a great privilege to do so, and we are very grateful to our constituents for giving us this privilege. I think most of us feel that the best part, the most gratifying part of our job is that we are able to help many people, and we receive many very kind thank you notes and letters. But certainly a close second is that we are each able to make some very close friendships with other Members from around the country, people we probably never would have met if we had never been able to serve in this House.

I consider myself very lucky to have become friends with former Congressman Mel Hancock of Missouri. Mel came to Congress just a short time after I did, and this was only because I was sworn in the day after the 1988 election, and he came in in January. I rise today to pay tribute to Mel because he and his wonderful wife, Sug, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary in Springfield, Missouri, this Sunday.

Mel was one of the best examples of a citizen legislator that I have ever known. He was as honest as it is possible to be. He was a straight shooter. He always told the truth. If he could not support a bill, he told the people who were for it that he could not support it. He was one man who was never swayed by any special interests. He was and is a patriotic man who loves this country. His life has been the American dream come true. He did not have everything handed to him on a

silver platter. He lived and worked for a while, for about a year and a half, in my hometown of Knoxville as a representative of International Harvester; and he and Sug had a son born there in 1954. I guess I am glad that he left, though, because both of us could not have been elected to Congress if he had stayed there.

Mel started a bank security business and built that small business up from nothing to become one of the most successful small businesses in the State of Missouri. Probably from his small business background he became a staunch conservative, very much opposed to Federal rules and regulations and red tape, and absolutely horrified by waste and high taxes. He believed that the people of Missouri knew better how to spend their own money than Federal bureaucrats could spend it for them. He believed in a government of, by, and for the people, rather than one of, by, and for the bureaucrats. He led the fight in Missouri for the Hancock amendment to limit taxes because he knew it is not possible to ever satisfy government's appetite for money or land.

He did not win every race or every election, but Sug stood by him through thick and thin, the losses as well as the victories. He won his seat in Congress running on the slogan of "Give 'Em Mel," and he did just that in his 8 years of service here. He served from 1989 to 1997 and always won overwhelming re-elections. He could have been easily re-elected in 1996; but he had committed to an 8-year term limit, and he was a man of his word. In fact, probably about the only issue that Mel and I ever disagreed on was that of term limits. Mel started something called the Hancock Poll for those of us who had come to Congress with him, always rating us compared to his votes, and some of us always thought it was a great honor if we came out very close to Mel in the Hancock Poll.

Shortly after the first election in 1988, Mel went with other freshmen to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard; but because he found that there is not really true academic freedom in this country on our college campuses, and particularly in a place like Harvard, Mel got fed up and walked out on Harvard after just a short time there.

In his service here in this Congress, he became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and he was a leader on the Committee on Ways and Means on all the major issues that that very powerful committee acts on. He was a pilot, and he was very much interested in aviation issues; and during my 6 years as Chairman of the subcommittee aviation, he always had good suggestions and comments to make in regard to the very important aviation issues facing this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mel Hancock was and is a true-blue American who believes in

free enterprise, private property and individual freedom, the things that made this country great. He voted that way here in the House. Mel Hancock helped make this Nation great, and our country is a better place today because of men and women like Mel and Sug Hancock. Mel Hancock is one of the finest men I have ever known, and I know that all of my colleagues who served here with him and got to know Mel join me in wishing him and Sug a wonderful and a happy 50th wedding anniversary this coming Sunday.

#### VISIONS FOR A NEW AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I led a bipartisan delegation to Europe that met with the exiled King of Afghanistan in Rome, and I want to say up front one of the most common questions we had was, is United States policy tilted towards the King, or is it tilted towards the Northern Alliance? And one thing we continually made clear and we need to continually make clear is that many of us here in Congress supported the Northern Alliance and wanted additional funding to go to them, and many of us in Congress support the exiled King. We support both, and we believe there should be a coalition government.

In fact, today's papers, in The New York Times, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, all are running stories suggesting that the Northern Alliance is suddenly wanting to go it alone, now that after months of not moving or actually retreating, were able to advance with American bombs, all of a sudden they want to go exclusive. Our policy needs to be balanced.

I would like to share a few comments of our exchange with the King and then some thoughts on the direction of where we may head. Clearly, the King is 87. He is of strong mind and will, but he has been in exile for years. His role would be more of a coordinator and peacemaker, not necessarily a dominant leader. After all, he is 87, not 57. His heart hurts for his people and country. He expressed sorrow because of the terrorism that brought the bombing. He stated that that bombing was a necessary evil. He stressed the need for meetings with the Northern Alliance as soon as possible. We pushed him hard in part on that point, and clearly they need to get to those meetings. Unfortunately, one of the dangers here is if one group gets in a dominant position, particularly if they are in the minority population, a dominant governing position over the others, we will not have peace in Afghanistan; we will descend into further chaos.

We stressed Afghan solutions. But that does not mean just warlords who