



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2001

No. 133

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, October 5, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our mighty fortress in the past, our hope for years to come, be with us now as a House truly representative of the people of this great Nation.

As we approach this holiday weekend and rejoice in the risky adventure, as well as the discoveries of Columbus, shield us from fear and guide our destiny to stabilize the future.

May our national undertakings of this new millenium, as dangerous as they may be, lead us to new understandings of a globalized world and our place within it. Let the fragile ships of freedom and justice and the strong winds of patience and resolve take us to hidden shores of peace.

Grant again safe travel for Your people. Protect our families here and our military forces abroad. Lord, on this Columbus Day, help us discover new depths to America's spirit, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAHOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1417. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1418. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military construction, and for other purposes.

S. 1419. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1465. An act to authorize the President to exercise waivers of foreign assistance restrictions with respect to Pakistan through September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution memorializing fallen firefighters by lowering the United States flag to half-staff on the day of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Messrs. SUNUNU, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, TIAHRT, SWEENEY, SHERWOOD, YOUNG of Florida, and HOYER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Messrs. PRICE of North Carolina, ROTHMAN, VISCLOSKEY, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 252 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 252

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 3(c) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6383

not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 or rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend and colleague on Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for purposes of debate only on this matter, as is customary.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly traditional rule for this type of legislation. As far as I know, it is not controversial in any way. Given the September 11 terrorist attacks, some may have wondered why we might not have responded with a closed rule on intelligence on a hurry-up basis, which would have precluded the opportunity for a lot of extensive deliberation under the extraordinary circumstances of the moment, as we all recall them, tragically.

But on the contrary, we felt that in these tumultuous times, we thought it best to allow Members the opportunity to fully review the bill and debate the issues that they feel are important to our Nation's security. Each of us, I know, feels that responsibility very strongly.

Therefore, as in past years, the rule is a modified open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill, which shall be considered by title as read.

In addition, based on consultation with the Parliamentarian, the rule waives points of order against the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI, the germaneness rule. It also waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 3(C) of rule XIII (requiring the inclusion of a statement of general performance goals and objectives.)

The rule further provides for the consideration of only pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate and those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration, which may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee, and shall be considered as read.

This has allowed for vetting of amendments regarding classified matters in years past, and proved to be a good practice, actually. Finally, this rule provides for one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this fair rule and the underlying legislation, as well. This is late in the year to bring this bill to the House floor, but obviously the timing has been dictated by forces well beyond the control of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: We have a new administration, a comprehensive defense and intelligence review ongoing, the delayed arrival of the budget request, and of course, the tragic consequences of September 11, to name just a few.

If there is a silver lining here, it is that in marking up this bill, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has addressed many of the immediate and critical intelligence needs in the wake of the September 11 attacks on the United States.

In the upcoming general debate, no doubt we will discuss many of the specific provisions in H.R. 2883 in some detail. That is the intelligence authorization bill. But I would like to highlight a few of the ways that this legislation seeks to tackle both critical counterterrorism challenges, as well as long-term problems facing the intelligence community in the United States in the 21st century.

To combat terrorism, the intelligence authorization increases investments for the FBI's counterterrorism efforts, increases funding for language training, promotes a more focused analytical effort against the terrorist target, and it calls for a more aggressive approach to learning the plans and intentions of terrorists through human intelligence.

The war on terrorism will be won through the acquisition of specific, accurate, and timely intelligence. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has stepped up to provide the President, the State Department, the Department of Defense, and President Bush's national security team with the intelligence tools they will need to win this war. That is one of the strong reasons I urge support for this legislation.

However, we have also addressed the long-term needs of the intelligence community, making specific changes today to avoid serious problems in the years to come. H.R. 2883 provides the resources to continue rebuilding our human intelligence capabilities; promotes investment in new technologies for intelligence collection, processing, and analysis; and it provides the committee's view on where future bold changes need to be made in the basic structure of the U.S. intelligence establishment.

I believe it is a very good bill. I think it is a fine rule. I encourage support for both the bill and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure and honor to serve with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Goss) on both the Committee on Rules and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2883, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, House Resolution 252. This is a modified open rule requiring that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, Mr. Speaker, the preprinting requirement has been the accepted practice for a number of years because of the sensitive nature of much of the bill and the need to protect its classified documents.

The bill is not controversial and was reported from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by a unanimous vote. I underscore that in these times, since the events of September 11. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is fully mindful of the extraordinary pain suffered by the victims and all of us in America as it pertains to those events. Thus, this year, this bill becomes as important as at any time in America's history.

Members who wish to do so can go to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence offices to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the programs and activities of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the national intelligence program, which includes the CIA as well as the foreign intelligence and counterintelligence programs within, among others, the Department of Defense; the National Security Agency; the Departments of State, Treasury, and Energy; and the FBI.

Also included in the classified documents are the authorizations for the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities and Joint Military Intelligence Program of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House considered and passed the authorization for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002. The intelligence bill we consider today is another critical component in our national defense.

Today, as I indicated earlier, more than ever we need to be vigilant about the myriad threats to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, while there may be debate on a few worthy amendments, this is a noncontroversial bill providing authorizations for important national security programs. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of serendipity that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and I both do serve on the Committee on Rules and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. And that is not by design, but it is a great pleasure to work with my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a distinguished member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

First of all, I want to rise in support of the rule. I agree with the two previous speakers, that this is a good rule and generally a very good bill. I want to compliment, in particular, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for the hard work that he has been doing to really improve the intelligence-gathering capability of our country.

The bill that we are going to consider today is a bill that has been fashioned by his hand and after long hours of work. I think it is an extraordinary bill that really reflects meeting the needs of the intelligence community for America.

One other purpose for rising, not only to support the rule, is to alert the House to my intention to offer an amendment to strike a section of the bill, section 306, a provision that creates a "Commission on Preparedness and Performance of the Federal Government for the September 11 Acts of Terrorism."

America has responded to terrorism attacks of September 11 with determination, compassion, and a resounding unity of purpose: the defeat of international terrorism. To achieve this goal, Congress and the administration are working to strengthen our defense intelligence capability.

Our diplomats are building an international coalition to fight al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations; and we are seeking ways to bolster first responders, such as our dedicated police officers, fire officials, firefighters, and paramedics, who will have to deal with the aftermath of any future attacks. These are all positive, necessary, and forward-looking actions.

It is my fear, though, that investing time and effort and money on a commission designed to assign blame will be a giant step backwards. There have

been at least three high-profile commissions as recently as a year ago on terrorism and homeland defense.

The problems that existed prior to September 11 have been well documented, and the solutions outlined in great detail. I do not believe that any other high-profile commission would add anything new to our understanding of the problems or the solutions. We know what the problems are, and we also know the solutions.

To compound the problem, the commission structure is flawed. It has an agenda based on calling high profile people from the intelligence community with great understanding before a group of people who have little understanding of the intelligence community. I believe this sets up potential conflicts that could do further damage to our ability to gather intelligence about terrorists and disrupt their activities.

This is a bad idea. It is a bad idea because we have a lot of information and we do not need a new commission. I hope that the Members of the House, after they hear the debate on my amendment, will support it and strike this provision.

We already possess the expertise and the authority to look at the lessons learned from September 11. The gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), have taken the right action when they designated the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, chaired by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), to coordinate congressional review of terrorist threats.

The subcommittee has the expertise, the staff, and the ability to review both classified and unclassified material, and the authority through Congress to do the job. If we want to look back, if we want to really analyze and examine, that is the subcommittee, that is the jurisdiction that has the responsibility for doing this, not some kind of an ad hoc commission with little or no expertise.

So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I will offer. This is a good rule. I support the rule. This is a good bill. It is a bill that, again, has been fashioned by one of the most distinguished Members of the House, the chairman of our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and I applaud him for that. I hope consideration will be given to my amendment. I thank the chairman for his consideration of my remarks.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the rule. We have worked together to put together a bill which had consensus under the leadership of our chairman, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

I think we should just move on to that debate about the bill and about the commission and other considerations; but the rule is a rule that is appropriate for this intelligence bill. It is in keeping with past rules on the intelligence bills which were designed to protect classified information, but to give every Member an opportunity to see the classified part of the bill, although that is not part of the rule, but to have their amendments printed in the RECORD in advance to protect classified information.

I do not want to take any more time. It is Friday. We want to move on to a full discussion of the bill and to general debate. I urge our colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, America's soft underbelly was shown on September 11. Now is the time to get down to business. I believe the CIA and the FBI have been not only negligent; but, by God, I do not think we have much of an intelligence program.

That is no slight or offense to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), or our intelligence apparatus here in the House. I believe the editorial that says that Mr. Tenet should step down is absolutely correct.

My amendment today deals with an issue that has been controversial, to say the least. Mr. Speaker, we have one border patrol agent for every two miles of border, and that does not include the Canadian border. My God, a guerrilla force could cross our border with a nuclear device and kill millions of Americans; and we have taken it lightly.

I think Congress had better take a close look at the national security checkpoint of the United States, which is our border, and take a look. A lot of people, I believe, are on the payroll who are not doing their jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 252 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2883.

□ 0928

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, let me thank the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, each and every one of them, both sides of the aisle, for their very hard work, especially over the past 3 weeks, which have been extremely trying for all of us and certainly for our committee. The hard work in the last 3 weeks have allowed us to get to this point where we have, I think, an excellent piece of authorization legislation to bring to the House.

Mr. Chairman, we will hear from many of our Members over the next hour. I would especially like to thank our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for extraordinary efforts in ensuring that our thorough review of the President's budget put the good of the Nation first in a manner that has been truly bipartisan and, perhaps more appropriately, we should say nonbipartisan.

There are many other people to thank, of course, including our amazing staff, and we will get to that by and by.

□ 0930

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is part of our normal annual authorization by which by law must be passed in order for the intelligence community to spend appropriated dollars. But the setting in which we find ourselves today as we debate the bill is hardly normal.

Over the debate, we surely will hear several references to the infamous events of September 11 and the efforts to handle these and other types of threats to Americans at home and abroad. There is no way to overemphasize the importance of the demoniacal acts we witnessed. They do bear tragic witness to how the world has changed and how critical it is to have knowledge about our surroundings, about those who have made it their life's quest to destroy American freedoms, rights and values. That knowledge

comes from intelligence, pure and simple and we have to have it.

No one can seriously doubt that we need the best possible intelligence to prosper and be safe at home and abroad in today's world. There are some who believe that the September 11 terrorist acts were successful because of, quote, "intelligence failures." I will certainly agree there are intelligence community shortcomings, that must be reviewed and fixed. That is what we do.

What went wrong relative to September 11 goes well beyond the intelligence community however. Moreover, those who have complaints often do not understand what threats we actually face today, what capabilities we really do have and do not have, and, more importantly, what vital distinctions exist between intelligence and law enforcement and how we cope with those distinctions.

The intelligence community operates overseas and cannot arrest anyone. Law enforcement is domestic and does not do spying; and somehow we have to have a good marriage of the two. If we look back over the past 6 years worth of our authorizations, we will see that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have consistently highlighted shortfalls and concerns calling on the administration to take action so that risks to our security could be reduced, not removed but reduced.

Certainly our committee was stunned and deeply saddened by the events of September 11 as we all were. We were aware homeland America was vulnerable to terrorist attack of some type from some quarter, and we were and are aware of limitations of our intelligence system to provide specifics or better early warning or 100 percent guarantees.

This bill again addresses ways to overcome some of those limitations. The solutions that get us the intelligence community that we need to protect our future must be new and it must be innovative. This bill starts us on that course while sending I think a good message to the administration about how to do it. We are working closely with the administration to translate these ideas into real capabilities which will protect Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of H.R. 2883.

At the outset I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), our distinguished chairman, for the manner in which he conducted the committee's business. His willingness to be sensitive to the views of committee Democrats and to ensure they are reflected in the work of the committee is much appreciated. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was prepared in the aftermath of the horrific events of September 11, but it is not a comprehensive response to them. Some additional resources in areas where these

events demonstrated an obvious need are provided, but it will take more time and more facts before we can, or should, go further. At this point one thing is clear. We did not know about the plans of the terrorists who attacked our country with sufficient specificity to prevent those attacks. What is not clear is why.

In the weeks ahead much time will be devoted in the intelligence community and elsewhere in trying to determine why we did not know, but, more especially, to prevent anything like this from happening again.

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for the men and women who serve in our national security agencies, whether they be diplomats, military personnel, intelligence officers, law enforcement officials or those who protect our borders and our skies. They perform with great courage and dedication under conditions which are routinely challenging and frequently dangerous, and they have had much successes combatting terrorism. They just cannot talk about their successes.

As the events of September 11 demonstrate, however, more needs to be done. Determining the best steps to take to lessen the chances that last month's events could be repeated will require critical and innovative thinking. I am hopeful that the independent commission established by Section 306 of the bill will play a constructive role in that regard.

For intelligence needs generally the bill provides several billion dollars more than appropriated last year and several hundred million dollars more than requested by the President for fiscal year 2002. It continues several initiatives begun earlier, among them an effort to ensure that the technologically complex and expensive information collection systems that have been developed are paired with effective systems to process, exploit and disseminate intelligence to those who need it to make decisions or to take actions.

There is currently an imbalance between collection and processing, exploitation and dissemination that, if not addressed, will greatly lessen the value of some extremely capable collection systems.

To be effective, our human intelligence officers need to have a better grounding in the languages and cultures of the regions where difficult targets, like terrorists, are most comfortable. A much greater emphasis needs to be placed on recruiting and maintaining a workforce with diverse skills, backgrounds and ethnicity. This is an area in which the intelligence community as not been as aggressive as I would like. I hope for measurable improvement in the future with the encouragement and resources provided by the bill.

There have been suggestions in recent years that an insufficient emphasis has been placed on human intelligence. That has certainly not been

true with respect to the work of this committee. Funds have been consistently provided above those requested for this intelligence discipline, and the committee has sought to ensure that the added funds were used exclusively to enhance the performance of clandestine collectors in the field.

Human intelligence was once again the focus of our work this year, and that would have been true even if the events of September 11 had not occurred.

There have been concerns that case officers have been discouraged from taking the risks necessary to recruit assets with access to important information, particularly in areas like narcotics trafficking, weapons proliferation and terrorism.

Attention has centered on guidelines promulgated in the CIA in 1995 which require headquarters-level approval before an individual with a record of human rights abuses or violations of U.S. criminal law may be recruited. These guidelines were intended to protect officers in the field from charges that they had committed the United States to a relationship with unsavory individuals without adequate consideration. Despite repeated assurances from senior CIA officials that these guidelines had not had a negative impact on the quality or quantity of assets, it has become clear that the perception that the opposite was true has taken root.

Section 403 of the bill deals with that perception by directing the guidelines be rescinded. It is very important, however, that there be some rules in this area, not because anyone is so naive as to believe that we can get more information about the plans of drug traffickers or terrorists without associating with individuals involved in those activities, but because decisions about committing the United States to those kinds of associations are too important to be made exclusively by relatively junior officers in the field.

They should be made, instead, by senior managers better able by virtue of their experience and their access to reporting from a wide variety of sources, to weigh the potential value of the information to be provided by a possible recruit against the potential harm to the United States should the fact of our association with that person become known.

That kind of risk versus gain analysis is essential if human intelligence activities are to be seen as consistent, rather than at odds with, U.S. policy and values.

Section 402, besides rescinding the current guidelines, directs that new guidelines be established. It is my expectation these new guidelines will streamline the approval process without weakening the protections that process is meant to provide. I especially want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his leadership in this area and his willingness to reach consensus

with us on it. I think the language of this bill is an improvement on the past and I thank him for his leadership and his cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, intelligence is a risky, dangerous and expensive undertaking. It is also crucial to our security as a Nation. I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of one of our subcommittees of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, as vice-chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the chair of the Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security, this Member rises in the strongest possible support for H.R. 2883.

This Member congratulates and commends the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for his extraordinary leadership in preparing a bipartisan bill that was approved unanimously by the committee. Under his guidance, this body is preparing to move rapidly to address a number of long-standing deficiencies in our intelligence collection and analysis.

The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has not suddenly awakened to the very real inadequacies of the intelligence agencies and programs of our government and the financial resources and legislative tools they need. As Chairman Goss has said on numerous occasions: "The message is not new; the audience is new."

The American people understand now, through tragedy, that our intelligence and counterterrorism programs are extremely important. With that in mind, this Member congratulates the chairman and my colleagues on the committee for the clear and decisive message sent by this legislation. I also congratulate the ranking member of the committee, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for her assistance in crafting this bipartisan legislative product.

The committee comes before this body today in an amazing degree of unanimity regarding our concept of the terrorist threat, among other threats to our national security, and for the necessary intelligence community response. This level of bipartisanship is a tribute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Mr. Chairman, the cowardly and horrific terrorist attack of September 11 highlighted for our citizens and the world the fact that we live in a new world, a world where many of our commonly held assumptions about security and safety are being re-examined. Even before the attacks on the Pentagon and

the World Trade Center, the Bush administration had embarked upon a comprehensive review of U.S. intelligence policy, led by the retired Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft and the deputy director of Central Intelligence for Community Management, Joan Dempsey.

Obviously, this intelligence review has assumed an even greater importance and urgency, for ultimately the outcome in this war in which we find ourselves will be determined by the quality of our intelligence. The review is not yet complete, and the executive branch has not firmly established the criteria and emphases that will guide us in the 21st century. However, this bill provides much of the important guidance to ensure that its policies can quickly be implemented.

This committee's task has been made particularly difficult because in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks, there naturally is, in some quarters, a desire to find a simple solution, a quick fix. Certainly the legislation before this body today provides much needed additional funds to improve our intelligence capabilities and to wage the war against terrorism.

At a more fundamental level, H.R. 2883 seeks to respond to serious policy and structural problems. In some cases, these are problems that have been years in the making and will take a long time to turn around. For example, there is, within the intelligence community, a critical shortage of language specialists that are particularly relevant in a war against terrorism. The legislation before this body today seeks to further address the language shortage and to facilitate the recruitment of native speakers drawn from the various relevant ethnic American communities.

Similarly, this bill continues the committee's longstanding and urgent needs for increased support for human intelligence collection. Human intelligence, or HUMINT, is the placement of highly trained, language capable officers into positions where they can acquire information vital to our national interest. Our HUMINT capability was decimated by former Director Stansfield Turner, and in the years following the end of the Cold War.

Also, our human intelligence collection effort was understandably directed during the Cold War period at collection on the Soviet Union and its client states, not on Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, South Asia, and especially not on the problems of terrorism and narcotics trafficking. This is a resource problem, while long emphasized by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it is a problem now all too apparent. This legislation continues the committee's effort to address this deficiency but with more emphasis.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2883 also reverses the 1995 limitations on asset recruitment. These restrictions, called "the Deutsch guidelines," were promulgated

as a means to limit our association with unsavory characters with human rights or other criminal problems. While the concern underlying these guidelines was certainly understandable, the reality is that the Deutsch guidelines have had a chilling effect on the recruitment of people who can actually and effectively penetrate the inner circle of the terrorist cells and networks and the narcotics rings.

The recruitment of assets with unique knowledge or access to these terrorists and drug cartels is the key to successful HUMINT in this area. The regrettable real world reality is that, certainly in the crucial battle against terrorism and drug rings, we must allow our foreign officers to recruit assets that are some rather unsavory characters. To break the back of the al Qaeda terrorist network, we will, in all likelihood, have to recruit individuals who are already influential members of al Qaeda, who themselves have committed acts of terror.

To win the war on terrorism we have to end the cycle of risk aversion. Recruiting the equivalent of A-1 grade boy scouts or straight arrows will not give us the penetration and the intelligence we need.

In many cases, there will be difficult decisions to make, but the United States has professionals and intelligence and law enforcement fields who can and must make those decisions. This legislation makes it clear that the foreign intelligence personnel can recruit those individuals who possess the information the United States needs to defend its people and its interests. There will be checks and balances put in place, but even though some of these assets will go bad, we need to be careful about our criticism. If the risks are realistically weighed against the chances of operational success, this body must not rashly second-guess those decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and again, I commend the Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for their leadership and all of my colleagues who have contributed so much to this legislation.

Our staff, of course, is outstanding. Certainly it continues to be among the very best in the Congress, and we owe a great deal of our success in bringing this legislation to our staff. They are crucial. They are competent. My colleagues should have every confidence in them as we do.

□ 0945

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a distinguished member of our committee and a ranking member on the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

No one yet knows why we did not receive warning of this tragedy, and indeed whether such warning could have been acquired in this instance short of some stroke of luck. We must answer those questions in order to do better. But that will take time of course.

I commend the chairman and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, as well as all my colleagues on the committee for thinking hard about what steps should appropriately be taken in this bill in the short time available between September 11 and today, and as the executive branch prepares for its upcoming global campaign. I believe the committee took sensible steps to mandate changes where needs and solutions seemed clear, and to inform the executive branch of issues and problems that as of now we think must be addressed in the coming months and years.

Intelligence is clearly important to every step in the counterterrorism campaign: trying to detect plans and preparations, attempting to interdict the terrorists and their equipment and funds, helping the recovery from an attack, tracking down the perpetrators and striking back at them. I serve as the ranking member of the subcommittee overseeing the intelligence community's technical collection systems, such as satellites and aircraft and other means to take pictures and listen to communications. These systems contribute to all phases of counterterrorism.

Besides human intelligence, signals intelligence offers the greatest potential to discern the plans and intentions of terrorists. It is well known that NSA, the largest and most important element of our SIGINT system, is handicapped by technical and management problems. The committee, for several years, has been trying to work with the executive branch to overcome these problems. It remains to be seen whether NSA's present difficulties played any role in our ability to get wind of this attack. The bill before the House sustains our emphasis on instilling rigor in NSA's program management processes and improves significant increases in resources.

Imagery can provide good information on terrorists' infrastructure and training activities, but not on plans. Imagery also provides critical support to operations against terrorists because it can help to track them, to target them, to assess the effects of military strikes. The National Imagery and Mapping Agency, like NSA, has for years suffered from lack of expertise and program planning and management, and inadequate support from the DCI and Secretary of Defense. In particular, NIMA clearly has insufficient funds to meet even the minimum performance goals set for it by the intelligence community and the Defense Department. The committee, once again, is recommending steps to help remedy these changes.

I point out also that NIMA and its predecessors have always helped in re-

covery from disasters, whether natural or man-made. The relationships with FEMA and the State and local governments are strong and efficient. Contributions to homeland security in the future will be very substantial, in partnership with the Geological Survey.

Before September 11, the administration was exploring new approaches to satellite intelligence collections. The committee agrees that these ideas need to be looked at carefully, especially in light of new changes.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I will confine the balance of my remarks to border security.

As I think all of us understand by now, there is virtually no inspection of cargo entering the country by ship, rail, and truck. It is in practice very difficult to expand inspections substantially using current methods. We must instead use new information technologies and sensing technologies and forge new ways of inspecting and securing cargoes in cooperation with industry and trading partners.

The bill begins to address this issue. It adds money to begin acquiring a capability to identify and track merchant ships. It also provides funds and direction to various executive branch agencies and Departments, including the Department of State, to expand cargo tracking capabilities. Finally, the bill would authorize funds to test new technology to detect dangerous and illegal material and any kind of container rapidly and automatically.

The bill does not provide explanations or a cure for the crisis we are in, but it does provide the basis for conducting the coming campaign, sustaining our position with respect to all our other intelligence requirements, and preparing for future improvements. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), who is the chairman of our Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his work that he has done on this bill, and to our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). It has been a great bipartisan effort. I rise in support of H.R. 2883, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

As chairman of the committee's new Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security, and as a former firefighter, I have had a particular interest in ensuring the swift passage of this critically important bill before us today. There is much in this bill that enhances our Nation's counterterrorism capabilities, and I will address some of these provisions in just a moment.

In the aftermath of the tragic terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the President came here and told us that America is at war. He mentioned

the new battlefield we have now to navigate as a Nation. It is a battlefield that is not clearly defined and that will often be devoid of clear targets. It is a battlefield that stretches across the globe and involves a complex support network, false documents, illicit financial transactions, and fanatical individuals who are willing to commit suicide to further their twisted causes, whatever they may be.

On this new battlefield, conventional weapons and conventional thinking will not be sufficient, nor will a fortress mentality ensure adequate protection for our citizens both here and abroad. We can better secure our embassies and our military bases, and we have been and should continue to do this. But as we saw on September 11, the terrorists will always search for and find that weak spot, that chink in our armor that makes us vulnerable; and in a free society, there will necessarily be weak spots. Therefore, we need to recognize what the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has recognized for some time, and that is that intelligence rules this battlefield like never before.

Intelligence is the only way in which we will get at this problem. It is the only way in which we can discover the plans and intentions of the enemy, thwart his efforts to attack us, and locate him so that we can punish him swiftly and decisively when he manages to get through our defenses.

H.R. 2883 addresses a number of key shortfalls in the capability of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to combat terrorism. The bill substantially increases investments for FBI counterterrorism capabilities. It increases funding for language training across the intelligence community. A lack of linguists with fluency in languages spoken by most terrorists has plagued the intelligence and law enforcement communities and must be addressed more decisively than ever before.

H.R. 2883 also promotes a more focused analytical effort against the terrorist target. More and better threat analysis needs to be applied to all forms of threat reporting to give us the maximum chance for piecing together the puzzle that might help us to avert attacks such as occurred on September 11. This bill makes analysis a top priority.

The capabilities of CIA's counterterrorism center, our first line of defense overseas, also have been significantly augmented by provisions contained in this bill. Our subcommittee, headed by myself and my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), has been working very hard, very diligently, not only on the September 11 incident but on other issues involving international terrorism and homeland security, and this bill gives us more flexibility. I urge support for 2883.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very

distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), just praised by her colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS). She is the ranking member, as was mentioned, on the Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time and for her graciousness, and also thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security for their bipartisanship and professionalism at all times on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, intelligence is a field in which I have worked for many years and in several different capacities. I was privileged to serve on this committee during my prior tenure in Congress and welcomed my reappointment. I represent a district where the Nation's sophisticated intelligence satellites are built, and served on the congressionally mandated National Commission on Terrorism, which made important recommendations in June of last year.

I have long been critical of the ad hoc ways in which our intelligence community has operated; how a community built with Cold War priorities was ill prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century. On September 11, everything and everyone changed. But let me be clear: the men and women in our intelligence agencies are as devastated as the rest of America by the horrific attacks against our homeland. These are good and talented people who work in an organizational structure and under a Cold War-era culture that needs to change. Today, we take the fundamental steps necessary to change both the structure and the culture.

As my committee colleagues have said, the bill directly addresses shortfalls in the intelligence community's counterterrorism efforts, intelligence collection and analysis, and threat reporting. It revamps and reinvigorates our intelligence agencies. The bill provides new tools and resources for preventing terrorism and supporting our Armed Forces in future conflicts. This bill authorizes aggressive recruitment of human assets, makes significant investments in foreign language capabilities, and unravels the knots that have impeded the sharing and integration of intelligence information and analysis across all levels of government.

We have removed many of the stovepipes that have characterized the organizational structures of our intelligence community and worked to substitute a more seamless integration of responsibilities and missions.

Mr. Chairman, once this bill passes, we still have more to do. The Working Group on Terrorism and Homeland Security, of which, as you heard, I am ranking member, has an aggressive

agenda of public hearings, classified briefings/hearings, visits, and possibly legislative action. I believe we must pass the legislation that six committee Members introduced yesterday to give Cabinet-level status and budgetary authority to Pennsylvania Governor Ridge, who assumes his new job as Director of the Office of Homeland Security on Monday.

Mr. Chairman, the events of September 11 will be an ever-present reminder of the threats we now face. Reform starts today. I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who is chairman of our Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also rise in strong support of the intelligence authorization bill.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, I have had the opportunity to closely review the President's intelligence budget request and participate in the creation of this bill. I should note that our review occurred both before and after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

There is no question that in the wake of these heinous attacks on America and the world there were some significant changes made to this legislation and some additional funds that are recommended. However, I would offer that, on the whole, this bill changed very little from the direction it was headed prior to September 11. Even before the attacks, the committee had taken some very tough positions with respect to the form and function of the United States intelligence community. Indeed, the committee has, over the past 6 years, tried to persuade the administration to more properly fund the Nation's first line of defense, that is, its intelligence community.

However, the fact is since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union, too little funding priority has been given to our national intelligence functions. Many intelligence needs have been left wanting for lack of funding, and the Congress has been forced to intercede in an effort to begin to rebuild our human and technical intelligence collection and analysis capabilities.

□ 1000

Our focus was on changing the Cold War footing to one that is more flexible and adaptable to the new world order threats.

Prior to the attacks, our funding efforts were limited to working "at the edges" of many the problems, because we had to live within a set of artificial constraints. After the attacks, however, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Goss) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), had to "take off the gloves."

With their superb leadership, we crafted a bill which took on tough and

seemingly intractable problems with additional funding authorizations necessary to begin to make a real difference.

Mr. Chairman, the post September 11 bill before us makes a real difference. It recommends significant funding to gain, train, and maintain a quality workforce. There is increased funding for language instruction and follow-on maintenance training. It recommends: Additional funding for counterterrorism analysis and focused regional studies; significant additions for processing, exploiting, and disseminating the vast amount of data that we collect around the world; investments in a more dynamic and flexible technical collection architecture for the future; and a down payment on replacing one of our most critical, but aging, ballistic missile intelligence collection systems.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill; and I recommend support of it by everybody in this Chamber.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT) who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Policy and National Security, a new subcommittee of our committee.

(Mr. CONDIT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan authorization act. In the wake of the tragic attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, nothing is more timely than addressing the needs of the intelligence community.

Nothing is clearer to me than the need to increase our resources in the area of human intelligence and highly skilled analysts and people with specialties in foreign languages. The bill encourages the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to invest in the intelligence capital by pushing recruitment efforts and funding advanced training programs. It will help increase our ranks of human intelligence collectors, the critical key in gaining precise information on terrorist organizations. It is critical that we not only increase the number of intelligence gathering analysts, but we must also provide them with the tools to do the job.

This bipartisan bill will provide our intelligence community with the assets that they need to wage an aggressive campaign against terrorism. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership in this area. I would like to thank the chairman for his openness to take suggestions from our side of the aisle and to make this a strong bipartisan effort. I would commend both of them for their efforts.

I rise in strong support of this bipartisan authorization act. In the wake of the tragic attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, nothing is more timely than addressing the significant issues facing the intelligence community. We must provide direction, resources and guidelines to carry out the crucial

mission of providing intelligence to policy makers and our armed forces.

As the ranking member of the Intelligence Policy and National Security Subcommittee nothing is clearer to me than the need to increase our resources in the area of human intelligence and highly skilled analysts. We are experiencing an information revolution. Events transpire today on a global scale faster than we ever imagined making our need to collect, interpret and exploit gathered intelligence paramount.

This bill encourages the intelligence community to invest in intellectual capital by pushing recruitment efforts and funding advanced training programs. It will help increase our ranks of human intelligence collectors—the critical keys to gaining precise information on terrorist organizations. Alarming as it may seem, we currently are in a situation where there is more information available than our analysts can review. Given the most recent attacks on the United States, that is an unconscionable position to find ourselves in. It is critical that we not only increase the number of intelligence gatherers and analysts but we must also provide them the tools to do their job.

In May, the subcommittee reviewed intelligence sharing with our NATO allies. I would add this review was very useful after Operation Allied Force—the 1999 Kosovo air campaign. During that campaign, the intelligence community shared critical information such as bomb damage assessment and force protection intelligence with our NATO allies. We investigated the sharing process and procedures to ensure both the protection of classified material and a timely, seamless sharing of intelligence with our allies. In the current campaign against global terrorism, these procedures will continue to be vital to NATO military operations and our own national security.

In June, in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, we heard testimony on terrorism. As a member of the Terrorism and Homeland Security subcommittee, we are currently holding a series of open meetings on this important topic.

Make no mistake, though we have been aggressively pursuing the terrorist threat—and in fact, our intelligence community has disrupted many planned acts of terrorism—it is clear the threat is growing at an alarming rate in terms of its infrastructure and in its sophistication. This bill supports key efforts by our national security agencies to counter these realities.

I commend Chairman GOSS and Ranking Member PELOSI for their leadership and for producing a bipartisan bill that will strengthen our national security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I came on this committee thinking I was going to show them something. They have taught me. It is a bipartisan committee. It works very, very well; and I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I should have known better, one can always learn something from a good woman.

On this particular committee, there is so much information out there that

a Member can always learn a lot. I also want to thank the staff. Many of the staff were former members from our intelligence community. Twenty-four hours a day they will sit and brief Members on any area in the classified area, and I recommend that Members do that more.

I would also like to talk about the defense budget. It is about \$200 billion in the deficit primarily because of the 124 deployments that our services were asked to go on during the last administration. If one transposes that over to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, they had to deploy 124 times along with the military. That funding deficit caused them the inability to modernize the systems and equipment that all of us say that they need to do their job.

When I hear some Members, especially from the other body, criticize our intelligence agencies, remember that they did not have the assets. They were denied modernization. Personally, I think they are doing a good job.

I would like to speak to the chairman of the committee. I understand that block 5, long-lead funding for Global Hawk, was eliminated in this, but the chairman has full commitment to support the Global Hawk and Predator programs. Is that correct?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Those assets, to know where the enemy is, is very, very important. In January 1972, we were told that there were no SAM sites over the hourglass just south of Hanoi. We did not have the reconnaissance assets that we needed. We went in to strike that target by the hourglass. We lost six airplanes because we did not have that knowledge. The Predator and Global Hawk gives us that knowledge.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a valued member of our committee.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, before even September 11, I want to applaud the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for working in a bipartisan way even before that tragic event. I also thank the very talented staff that we have in this committee for working in a bipartisan manner as well.

Francis Bacon once said, "He who will not apply new remedies, must expect new evils." I have encouraged, as this committee has encouraged, new ways to reorganize and restructure our culture and our targeting in the intelligence community. In the culture, we

need to push reforms and new ideas even more, to move from a culture that targets sometimes too often nation states, militaries, to a culture that will promote targeting sinister and seamless cell groups of terrorists. We need to move a culture from guards and guns and gates to a culture of targeting tents and terrorism and technology. That is the kind of reform that we need in this bill.

We are moving in that direction. We have an independent commission in this bill. We have emphasis on foreign language skills. We have more emphasis on HUMINT, human spies telling us where people's motivations and targets are; and we have more money for counterterrorism.

I have worked hard on the foreign language skill area, and on page 19 of the report we state, "Written materials can sit for months, and sometimes years, before a linguist with proper security clearances and skills can begin a translation."

We are providing aggressive recruiting for new employees, particularly those with ethnic and language backgrounds needed by the intelligence community. We are providing additional language incentives, especially in the toughest, most critical languages. We are providing increases in funding in counterterrorism for the FBI counterterrorism program, the DCI's counterterrorism program, and HUMINT collection.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do more. While I applaud the bipartisan nature of this committee, while I warmly applaud some of the reforms in this bill, I will be reserved as I watch the process go through the conference later with the Senate to encourage, to push reform, not to lay blame, not to blame individuals where we have so many brilliant and talented people in the CIA and other communities, but to push the reforms needed to change the culture, the target, and the organization that is so critical for us to defend our homeland.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to offer my strong support for the fiscal year 2002 intelligence authorization bill. I believe it is a good, bipartisan product that addresses both the urgent short-term needs, as well as the long-term rebuilding requirements in human and signals intelligence.

As a relatively new member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I would like to address just a portion of the bill which I think is very, very critical. It comes out of the tragic incident of April 20, 2001 when the Peruvian military, relying on information provided by the U.S. Government, mistakenly shot down a civilian airplane as part of a drug interdiction operation. Two innocent Americans, constituents of mine, lost their lives due to this error.

In an effort to ensure that this type of incident does not occur again, I have

worked closely with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the committee to secure greater accountability from the executive branch with respect to the oversight of these counternarcotics activities. Section 504 amends current law relating to the immunity of employees and agents of the United States and foreign countries engaged in the interdiction of drug trafficking aircraft. Under this section, the President will annually certify to Congress both the existence of a drug threat in the country at issue and the existence in that country of the appropriate procedures to protect against innocent loss of life.

If our drug interdiction efforts in Latin America are intended to protect the American people from the threat of narcotics, we need to be sure that the methods we use do not create more innocent victims like the Bowers family.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) on an excellent bipartisan bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for developing a bill that is designed to meet the intelligence challenges that our Nation is facing at a critical point in our history. Their leadership on critical intelligence issues has been extremely important to all of us on the committee, in particular to those of us that are on the committee for the first time.

The gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have recently been the focus of the press. However, it is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that everyone here knows that both the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman GOSS) have been working behind the scenes for years on critical intelligence issues. I thank them for their continued commitment to our Nation and the intelligence system that we rely on so heavily.

In a number of hearings that we have had in the committee, I expressed two very important observations. First, the intelligence community needs to pay attention to the diversity that is so critical and representative of our Nation. Both the chairman and the ranking member have been very supportive on that issue.

Secondly, as some of the other Members have mentioned, the emphasis on language diversification is vitally important as we face the challenges in today's intelligence gathering and analysis world.

We need analysts and case officers with language skills and expertise in

many foreign areas. At the NSA and the CIA, thousands of pieces of data are never analyzed or analyzed after the fact because there are too few analysts and even fewer with the necessary language skills. This is a deficiency that must be corrected immediately.

Our bill provides bonuses to intelligence employees of the CIA and the Pentagon who are fluent in languages of the toughest and most important targets that we face as a Nation. It is clear that we must do more, and this bill takes the necessary steps to provide the tools necessary for the intelligence community. I urge all Members to support a strong bipartisan bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained, and understandably so, in dealing with the specifics of this bill in terms of dollars and numbers. I would urge all of my colleagues to follow the suggestion of the chairman and the ranking member to visit the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to get the classified briefing and to examine the figures for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress this to my colleagues. This is a very good bill because it provides more resources for people, for our human intelligence, for our eyes and ears around the world. More resources to add to their numbers and their training, with particular emphasis in language capabilities.

Our dedicated and well-trained linguists who are case officers and covert operatives and intelligence operatives are critically important to operations. They are the essential people part of the equation.

□ 1015

They are the essential people part of the equation. All the sophisticated technical means in the world, the satellites in the heavens and the specialty electronic devices all over every place are important, but there is no substitute for people. And, quite frankly, with linguistic skills, there simply are not enough of them. This bill recognizes that and supports additional funding directed to the Defense Language Institute. This funding is targeted for linguistic training, not just for the training, but also for the recruitment and retention of proficient instructors. It promotes computer-based training to keep those skills honed, and aims at keeping those classes fully populated with the best and the brightest.

Let me stress, there is no substitute for the people part of this equation. The dedicated men and women in the intelligence community who are serving this Nation at distant points in the globe are to be applauded and supported and we do just that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr.

BOSWELL) who serves as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to whoever is listening that it is my observation in my few months on this committee that we have outstanding leadership with our chairman and ranking member, and I really appreciate it, and I hope all America does. In my former life as a teacher at the command general staff college at the Department of Tactics, I want to assure you that I am aware and I want you to be aware that intelligence is something you have to have. You have to have reliable information before you act.

And I want to tell you this, that I have made also the observation that we have dedicated and professional men and women who work in this community. Nevertheless, the horrendous attacks acts of September 11 require us to think hard about how U.S. intelligence is gathered, analyzed and disseminated so that we are sure intelligence is providing the very best first line of defense for our country.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, I believe we need better global coverage, allowing us to collect more human intelligence in more places worldwide. As we all are now too well aware, we face terrorist networks with global reach. We are forced into a serious situation regarding our security. We must ourselves place overt and covert collectors in every corner of the world to fight back and utilize well the assistance of our international allies. In addition, for our HUMINT collectors to be effective, their language skills and foreign area expertise overall must be improved and maintained. Career paths for specialists must be fostered. This bill provides the resources and encourages the efforts in the intelligence community to increase the number of front-line field officers and improve their skills.

Furthermore, we have to get smarter at using effectively, across the agencies of the Federal Government, all available information that bears on terrorism. Different agencies of the government have different roles to play, and no one agency can do the job alone. Currently, our capacity to collect information outstrips our ability to exploit what we have. Furthermore, we have not always given proper weight to the most predictive sources of information. The analytic effort in the fight against terrorism must be an all-inclusive effort, with sufficient numbers of analysts deployed where they are needed to make a difference. The Congress may soon vote to authorize new methods and procedures for sharing information. This is all well

and good, but the agencies now expected to share information must have state-of-the-art information technology tools and the personnel they need to process, analyze and disseminate critical intelligence to make new authorizations effective.

I urge your support of this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a former member of our committee.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, in the front of this report, the unclassified version which is really worth reading for my colleagues, it says that intelligence is our first line of defense, but too often it is an afterthought. This document and this bill explains why we must have a renewed focus on intelligence. I commend the chairman and the ranking member and the committee for their excellent work on this bill in providing some direction for the future.

The one thing I do want to highlight, and we have discussed this among ourselves, is the need to move forward with the problem of homeland intelligence. It is the most obvious, gaping hole in our protection against terrorism, the ability to prioritize, direct, collect, analyze and inform about activities within the United States and to share information among agencies, much of it completely unclassified, in order to make sure we can defend the homeland of the United States.

I look forward to working with the chairman and my other colleagues in the House to make sure that the intelligence capability of the United States remains strong.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) whom I see a lot in the Committee on Rules and to the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), thank them for a very excellent legislative initiative. The American people understand the word intelligence, and I think as we have reflected on the enormous tragedy of September 11, they will be more informed about the importance of our intelligence community.

This legislation advocates the enhancement of the intelligence community. Let me thank both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the new commission to find out the facts of the September 11, tragedy. Many might say that we give out too much information, but I believe this commission will help us understand better the necessity for enhanced funding, resources, technology for our intelligence community.

I had thought of offering an amendment as the ranking member on the Immigration Subcommittee to deal with seeking to promote collaborative

efforts between the INS and the intelligence community. Two days ago, we in the Committee on the Judiciary passed an antiterrorism bill unanimously with a balance between the rule of law and tools for law enforcement. I believe it is important that we realize that though immigration does not equate to terrorism, it is important the INS be able to be advised on intelligence that would help them further thwart those trying to enter the country with the purpose of terrorist activities.

I hope we will have a chance to discuss that issue so that we can work together for homeland security, we can balance our committee's work and provide the necessary collaboration to secure our Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), a man who has had great experience in the intelligence business.

(Mr. SIMMONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chair and the ranking member and the members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for their bipartisan work on this legislation.

Specifically, I want to state my strong support for provisions in section 105 that codifies the U.S. Coast Guard as a National Foreign Intelligence Program agency under the National Security Act.

Fifteen years ago, the Coast Guard was primarily a consumer of intelligence. Now and into the future, it can be a collector, a processor and a producer as well as a consumer of intelligence. The Coast Guard is involved in counternarcotics, counterterrorism, illegal alien smuggling, maritime drug interdiction, sea enforcement of immigration laws, port security and waterways security.

The integration of the Coast Guard into the intelligence community makes them more responsive to the threats we face, and in particular, to the threats of terrorism. It also enhances the training and activities of the Coast Guard intelligence program and professionalizes their activities.

On this basis, I am very pleased to see that this bill codifies the Coast Guard as an element of the intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Intelligence Authorization Act of FY 2002. I commend the chairman, ranking member and members of the House Intelligence Committee for their bipartisan work on this important piece of legislation.

Specifically, I would like to state my strong support for the provisions in section 105 of this bill that codifies the U.S. Coast Guard as a National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP) Agency under the National Security Act.

Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of representing New London, CT, which is the home of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. I also serve as vice chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee of the Transportation Committee. These associations have introduced me to some of the unique activities of the Coast Guard.

Fifteen years ago the Coast Guard was an intelligence consumer. When I offered a course on the Intelligence Community at the Academy, I was told that it was not necessary. These circumstances are no longer the case today.

Now and into the future, the Coast Guard can be a collector, a processor, and a producer as well as a consumer of intelligence. On this basis, including the Coast Guard Intelligence Program (CGIP) into the NFIP is an important and timely initiative.

To a certain degree, the integration of elements of the Coast Guard into the Intelligence Community is a formality. The men and women of the Coast Guard have been taking part in homeland protection through the multitude of tasks; tasks that it performs better than any other agency of our Government.

The Coast Guard is involved in counter-narcotics, counterterrorism, illegal alien smuggling, maritime drug interdiction, and sea-enforcement of immigration laws, port security and waterways security to name a few.

Threats to our country are met and thwarted along and off our shores every day through the diligence and professionalism of the Coast Guard. The routine activities of the Coast Guard also place it in a position to collect information, disseminate information and participate in the production of intelligence. This can be a valuable contribution to the Intelligence Community.

The integration of the Coast Guard into the Intelligence Community makes them more responsive to some of the threats we face—particularly the threat of terrorist attacks. It also enhances the training and activities of the Coast Guard Intelligence Program, and professionalizes their activities.

On this basis I am glad to see that section 105 of this bill codifies the Coast Guard as an element of the Intelligence Community.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, it is not popular to say, but I believe America's intelligence network is very poor. Americans are now being killed by the thousands, and money alone is not going to solve it.

I think Congress must address our Mideast policy. I think we can and should support Israel, but we must be more objective in dealing with Arab nations. I believe the Palestinian issue must be resolved and the Palestinian people deserve a homeland, and that is not popular to say.

But, ladies and gentlemen, Americans are now being killed by the thousands, and we have exported through our policies the terrorism in the Mideast to the United States of America. I think it is time to tell it like it is, stop addressing the symptoms and look at the root causations. We can maintain our friendships and strong alliance with Israel, but by God we have to

show objectivity in the Mideast or there will be more bin Ladens and more terrorist attacks on the United States of America.

Finally, our borders are wide open. Congress better look at that issue, because we have exposed a very vulnerable, soft underbelly.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), also knowledgeable on matters of national security.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak as a Naval Reserve intelligence officer who knows the value of linguistic abilities in intelligence. The United States Government has two large institutions dedicated to international languages used by many countries, the Foreign Service Institute and the Defense Language Institute. But the real reserve of linguistic abilities among tribal and less-used languages across countries is the Peace Corps.

I think the United States needs to develop in the national security community an ability to speak these other languages, especially obviously in Central Asia and countries where terrorist threats might emerge. This is going to require a huge effort, focusing on some of the abilities and the institutional knowledge in the Army's foreign area officer expertise. I think it is necessary for the Navy and Air Force and intelligence agencies to develop this FAO capability in other services, especially so that there is a full career path for such officers and that the United States looks to the long term.

I also want to commend the committee on the recruitment guidelines and hope that when we look to the Director of Central Intelligence, that he reports back on those guidelines early and gives the Chief of Station the ability to set the guidelines in unique circumstances.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage Chairman Goss in a brief colloquy on the matter of border security. The State Department has the legal responsibility to issue visas at our U.S. embassies and consulates. Over the years, we have vastly improved the process by which visas are issued. Name check systems are now computerized, allowing the consular officer at a post to have a reliable method of vetting a person's entry into the United States.

This system of name checking is only as good, however, as the information that is entered into the system. I would like to ask the chairman that in the course of the intelligence bill conference, that he work to ensure that the best cooperation is received from relevant agencies to be sure that current information is provided on a timely basis to the State Department for

purposes of securing a better name check system. I would note that all 18 of the suicide hijackers were granted visas. Something is wrong and we need to fix it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would certainly agree that the gentleman raises an excellent point with regard to the full need for cooperation among agencies for purposes of strengthening our border security programs. I will work in conference to come up with appropriate language to direct that such information sharing occurs among the intelligence agencies and the State Department so that we have the best and most secure visa issuing system possible. I will further pledge that we will try and improve the handoff between the other law enforcement agencies that are involved as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to address another point in the bill that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) referenced, and, that is section 504, relating to official immunity for employees and agents of the United States and foreign countries engaged in the interdiction of aircraft used in illicit drug trafficking. This springs from the unfortunate, and that is a very mild word to use, shooting down of the aircraft in Peru. Under this section, the President must make an annual certification to Congress concerning both the existence of a drug threat in the country at issue and the existence in that country of appropriate procedures to protect against innocent loss of life. An annual report to Congress by the President concerning United States government assistance to such interdiction programs is also required by this section.

I call that to the attention of our colleagues, because many Members had concerns about that incident. And doing so gives another reason to acknowledge the cooperation of our chairman, the gentleman from Florida, for including this language. I recognize the gentleman from Michigan's leadership in this because his constituent was directly affected by it. I thank him for his leadership.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, I did want to make a couple of remarks in closing here. This bill contains an independent review of the events leading up to September 11. I believe that as we proceed to talk about anything regarding September 11, we are walking on sacred ground. We have to proceed with great dignity to honor, and out of respect for, the losses suffered by so many.

Our entire country wants us to do everything possible to stop terrorism in our country, terrorism against our interests worldwide, and, indeed, terrorism against any target, and to stamp out terrorism wherever it exists.

I do believe that it is important in light of the horrific acts of September

11 that there be an independent assessment of the performance of the agencies and departments of the federal government responsible for dealing with terrorism. That assessment must be broad in scope and conducted by individuals as free as possible of the interests of the organizations they will review.

Section 306 as approved by the committee would produce those results. I will offer an amendment to address some of the concerns expressed by some of our colleagues about the breadth of jurisdiction of the commission under the amendment time. But I think it is a mistake to just proceed without an independent review of the events that happened. For that reason I thank the chairman for his support in making the commission a part of the bill, and I appreciate the Republican majority support on that.

Sensitive to the concerns raised by some on both sides of the aisle about the scope of that commission I intend to offer an amendment as a compromise.

I wanted to acknowledge and join my distinguished chairman in acknowledging the great work of the staff on both sides of the aisle, headed up by Tim Sample as the majority chief of staff and Mike Sheehy, our staff chief on the Democratic side. We are all very well served by all the staff on both sides of the aisle. We do not think of it in a partisan way.

I also want to again thank our distinguished chairman for the manner in which he conducted the markup, indeed, the business of our committee, and for his receptivity to the concerns presented by the minority side. I want to particularly commend my minority members for the valuable contributions they have made to the debate and, again, of course, the work of every member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard over the course of the last hour or so many Members talk about our intelligence needs, and especially the need to address the shortfalls related to counterterrorism. We have also heard about the need to invest in the broader areas of intelligence. It is this investment in time, thought, funding, and actually action that I would like to address as we close on our side of the general debate.

The President, his Cabinet and Members of this body have rightly told the American people that the war on terrorism is going to be a long-term effort, and that even if we were to get Mr. bin Laden tomorrow that would not put an end to terrorist activities, sadly.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, if we only make fixes to the intelligence community to address counterterrorism capabilities, we will not fully protect our national security and other quarters

from the multitude of others threats that could befall us.

In a recent classified publication called the Quadrennial Intelligence Community Review, there are some specific unclassified trends that speak to the challenges of our future. Briefly, adversaries increasingly will target the U.S. homeland; military threats will be quantitatively and qualitatively different, involving very short-notice contingencies and a very high premium on flexibility response; warning of global crisis will be more difficult by 2015 because of the scope and complexity of requirements and the speed of events; revolutionary information technology capabilities will be available to friend and to foe; and adversaries will use new, highly-effective means to select and neutralize sensitive clandestine operations or technically sophisticated collection devices. These are just a few of the kinds of challenges out there.

Mr. Chairman, all of these points go to the fact that this country will need a vibrant, flexible, and strong intelligence community.

More importantly, however, is that these points, in my view, challenge the wherewithal of our current national security structure. Therefore, in this bill we send a message to the administration that now is not the time to circle the wagons and attempt to address the issues with a status quo approach. We must take a look at whether the structure of the intelligence community can meet the challenges that we know are out there; and I believe the answer is that it cannot in its present form, and whether our overall national security apparatus needs to be updated and revised, and I believe it should, and I do not think anybody disagrees with that.

The reason that this is so important at this time is thrown into stark relief obviously by the horrible tragic events of September 11, which I agree with my ranking member, is sacred soil. The same attacks demonstrate that the issue of the safety and security of the rights and freedoms of the civilized world as a whole are at stake.

If you do not believe me, I would like you to take a moment just to take a look at this map, which shows in the red countries, those are the countries that suffered loss during the September 11 attacks. There is a lot of red on that map around the globe; and that is what I suggest, that national security is a global issue and we indeed are looked at as the leaders.

In closing, let me again thank all the members of the committee, and I mean each and every one, especially our subcommittee chairmen and the ranking members. I know it has been a lot of hard work, and we have reorganized HPSCI this year to take on the extra load.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) particularly for her cooperation and very sincere consideration of the provisions of this bill. The management of her side of these matters has been extraordinary.

I also want to pay special attention to our committee staff, Mr. Chairman. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence staff is a group of very professional, very experienced, dedicated people who have gone through a great deal since September 11. They have worked literally tirelessly through weekends, nights to respond to several additional tasks that the Speaker and, of course, circumstances have placed on the committee, as well as to prepare this bill for Members' consideration, and other bills that are coming shortly on the subject of intelligence, as we all know.

This was always a bipartisan effort, and I am thankful we have such an extraordinary professional staff. I would name each and every one of them for citation for their extraordinary work, and I will put their names in the RECORD. I am most grateful that they work so well together and so professionally.

I also need to point out the Speaker of the House and the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), have done an amazing job of staying tuned to what our extraordinary circumstances and being there for the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and intelligence matters when we needed them; and I must also include the appropriators, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), of course, a former member of the committee; the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), of course, a former member of the committee; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), for the work they have done to understand our problems.

Finally, I want to pause for a moment to recognize those from the intelligence communities who lost their lives on September 11 in the service of the Nation at the Pentagon. Mr. Chairman, 15 people from the community lost their lives, seven from the Defense Intelligence Agency, seven from the Office of Naval Intelligence. They will be sorely missed by the community, and, of course, extremely missed by their families and loved ones.

It is in their honor we will push to ensure that the proper investments and changes are made to ensure that their comrades and Americans around the world can enjoy the rights, the freedoms, the securities at home and abroad. These are the symbols of the American culture, these are what we stand for, this is what we seek to protect and provide for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) has expired.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, we have been joined by two distinguished Members who were in markup.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and just concur in the comments that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has just made.

These are difficult times for our entire Nation and for the people who work in our intelligence agencies. They are at a disadvantage. When they have a victory, when they are able to stop terrorist activities here or abroad, they cannot issue a press release when they do their work successfully.

Obviously, we need to do a better job on the intelligence front for our Nation, and the legislation before us moves us in that direction and I strongly support it. We all need to do a better job, including what we do here on the Hill in providing the resources to our intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, I just really wanted to rise to thank the men and women who give public service to this country in the intelligence field. They do public service for this Nation, they do it in a very fine way, and they need additional support. We all need to come together so that we can make this Nation a stronger Nation.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for the legislation they have brought forward.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this valuable time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise commending the committee in their realization that you cannot have better intelligence unless we have better linguistic training. I happen to represent what we call the language capital of the world, Monterey, California, which is the home for the Defense Language Institute, the largest language school in the world. Four thousand young men and women of every ethnic background are studying in Monterey to become linguists for our military and Federal Government.

We also have the AT&T Language Line; and many of you, if you do have any language problems, can dial up and get immediate translation on that line. We have the Monterey Institute of International Studies, which is the home for the Nonproliferation Center, which we understand is where all the dangerous material in the world is located.

This emphasis on languages is the only way we are going to better understand the world we live in and better understand the communications that go on in the world. Thank you for putting it in the report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) has no time remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in the minute and a half I have remaining, I want to join our distinguished chairman in remembering those people in the defense in-

telligence community who lost their lives at the Pentagon, indeed all of the people who lost their lives at the Pentagon. Those of us who have had the opportunity to spend any time over there to extend the condolences of this entire Congress and of our own constituents know that the sorrow that we all experienced has moved to resolve.

I also wanted to mention John O'Neill, a former FBI special agent in charge of the National Security Division, who lost his life in the World Trade Center attack. His service is well known to many of us in the intelligence community; and we extend condolences to his family, and, indeed, to the families of all who lost their lives, whether it is in planes or in the buildings that were attacked.

There have been unimaginable acts of terrorism designed to instill fear in the American people, but the terrorists will not succeed in that. Their behavior is outside the circle of civilized human behavior, and I agree with President Bush that we will bring them to justice or bring justice to them; but justice must be done.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the remainder of my time be a moment of silence in honor of those that lost their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule by title, and each title shall be considered read.

No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1. The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Intelligence community management account.

Sec. 105. Codification of the Coast Guard as an element of the intelligence community.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. Sense of the Congress on intelligence community contracting.

Sec. 304. Requirements for lodging allowances in intelligence community assignment program benefits.

Sec. 305. Technical amendment.

Sec. 306. Commission on September 11 government preparedness and performance.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Sec. 401. Modifications to Central Intelligence Agency's central services program.

Sec. 402. Extension of CIA Voluntary Separation Pay Act.

Sec. 403. Guidelines for recruitment of certain foreign assets.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 501. Authority to purchase items of nominal value for recruitment purposes.

Sec. 502. Funding for infrastructure and quality-of-life improvements at Menwith Hill and Bad Aibling stations.

Sec. 503. Continuation of Joint Interagency Task Force at current locations in Florida and California.

Sec. 504. Modification of authorities relating to interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

Sec. 505. Undergraduate training program for employees of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency.

Sec. 506. Technical amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2002 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (2) The Department of Defense.
- (3) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (4) The National Security Agency.
- (5) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (6) The Department of State.
- (7) The Department of the Treasury.
- (8) The Department of Energy.
- (9) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (10) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (11) The National Imagery and Mapping Agency.
- (12) The Coast Guard.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL CEILINGS.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2002, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 2883 of the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—The Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—With the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Central Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2002 under section 102 when the Director of Central Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed two percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such section for such element.

(b) **NOTICE TO INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of Central Intelligence shall promptly notify the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate whenever the Director exercises the authority granted by this section.

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence for fiscal year 2002 the sum of \$152,776,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for the Advanced Research and Development Committee shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence are authorized 313 full-time personnel as of September 30, 2002. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Intelligence Community Management Account or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) **CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are also authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2002 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.**—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2002, there are hereby authorized such additional personnel for such elements as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

(d) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Except as provided in section 113 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404h), during fiscal year 2002, any officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the staff of the Intelligence Community Management Account from another element of the United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member may be detailed on a non-reimbursable basis for a period not to exceed one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of Central Intelligence.

(e) **NATIONAL DRUG INTELLIGENCE CENTER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), \$27,000,000 shall be available for the National Drug Intelligence Center. Within such amount, funds provided for research, development, test, and evaluation purposes shall remain available until September 30, 2003, and funds provided for procurement purposes shall remain available until September 30, 2004.

(2) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—The Director of Central Intelligence shall transfer to the Attorney General funds available for the National Drug Intelligence Center under paragraph (1). The Attorney General shall utilize funds so transferred for the activities of the National Drug Intelligence Center.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—Amounts available for the National Drug Intelligence Center may not be used in contravention of the provisions of section 103(d)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-3(d)(1)).

(4) **AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall retain full authority over the operations of the National Drug Intelligence Center.

SEC. 105. CODIFICATION OF THE COAST GUARD AS AN ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 3(4)(H) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)(H)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” before “the Department of Energy”; and

(2) by inserting “, and the Coast Guard” before the semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM**SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2002 the sum of \$212,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.**

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTING.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Director of Central Intelligence should continue to direct that elements of the intelligence community, whenever compatible with the national security interests of the United States and consistent with operational and security concerns related to the conduct of intelligence activities, and where fiscally sound, should competitively award contracts in a manner that maximizes the procurement of products properly designated as having been made in the United States.

SEC. 304. REQUIREMENTS FOR LODGING ALLOWANCES IN INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM BENEFITS.

Section 113(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404(h)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “An employee”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The head of an agency of an employee detailed under subsection (a) may pay a lodging

allowance for the employee subject to the following conditions:

“(A) The allowance shall be the lesser of the cost of the lodging or a maximum amount payable for the lodging as established jointly by the Director of Central Intelligence and—

“(i) with respect to detailed employees of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense; and

“(ii) with respect to detailed employees of other agencies and departments, the head of such agency or department.

“(B) The detailed employee maintains a primary residence for the employee's immediate family in the local commuting area of the parent agency duty station from which the employee regularly commuted to such duty station before the detail.

“(C) The lodging is within a reasonable proximity of the host agency duty station.

“(D) The distance between the detailed employee's parent agency duty station and the host agency duty station is greater than 20 miles.

“(E) The distance between the detailed employee's primary residence and the host agency duty station is 10 miles greater than the distance between such primary residence and the employee's parent duty station.

“(F) The rate of pay applicable to the detailed employee does not exceed the rate of basic pay for grade GS-15 of the General Schedule.”.

SEC. 305. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 106(b)(2)(C) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-6(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “Nonproliferation and National Security” and inserting “Intelligence and the Director of the Office of Counterintelligence”.

SEC. 306. COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 11 GOVERNMENT PREPAREDNESS AND PERFORMANCE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a commission to be known as the “Commission on Preparedness and Performance of the Federal Government for the September 11 Acts of Terrorism” (in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) **DUTY.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT OF AGENCY PERFORMANCE.**—The Commission shall, with respect to the acts of terrorism committed against the United States on September 11, 2001, assess the performance of those agencies and departments of the United States charged with the responsibility to prevent, prepare for, or respond to acts of terrorism up to and including that date. For purposes of the preceding sentence, those agencies and departments include—

(A) the Department of Defense (including the intelligence elements of the Department),

(B) the Department of Justice (including the intelligence elements of the Department),

(C) the Department of State (including the intelligence elements of the Department),

(D) the Department of the Transportation (including the intelligence elements of the Department),

(E) the Department of the Treasury (including the intelligence elements of the Department),

(F) the Central Intelligence Agency, and

(G) the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) **REPORT.**—The Commission shall submit the report described in subsection (g).

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.**—The Commission shall be composed of 10 members appointed as follows:

(A) The President shall appoint 4 members.

(B) The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint 2 members.

(C) The majority leader of the Senate shall appoint 2 members.

(D) The minority leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 1 member.

(E) The minority leader of the Senate shall appoint 1 member.

(2) TERMS.—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(B) *VACANCIES.*—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term. A member may serve after the expiration of that member's term until a successor has taken office. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) BASIC PAY.—

(A) *RATES OF PAY.*—Members shall serve without pay.

(B) *TRAVEL EXPENSES.*—Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) *QUORUM.*—6 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(5) *CHAIRPERSON.*—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by the members.

(d) DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.—

(1) *DIRECTOR.*—The Commission shall have a Director who shall be appointed by the Chairperson.

(2) *STAFF.*—The Chairperson may appoint and fix the pay of additional personnel as the Director considers appropriate.

(3) *APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.*—The Director and staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(4) *EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.*—With the approval of the Chairperson, the Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(5) *STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.*—Upon request of the Chairperson, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(e) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) *HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.*—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(2) *POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.*—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(3) *OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.*—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information, including classified information, necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(4) *MAILS.*—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(5) *ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.*—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Com-

mission to carry out its responsibilities under this section.

(6) SUBPOENA POWER.—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(B) *FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.*—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under subparagraph (A), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the Commission to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(C) *SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.*—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(D) *SERVICE OF PROCESS.*—All process of any court to which application is made under subparagraph (B) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(E) *IMMUNITY.*—Except as provided in this paragraph, a person may not be excused from testifying or from producing evidence pursuant to a subpoena on the ground that the testimony or evidence required by the subpoena may tend to incriminate or subject that person to criminal prosecution. A person, after having claimed the privilege against self-incrimination, may not be criminally prosecuted by reason of any transaction, matter, or thing which that person is compelled to testify about or produce evidence relating to, except that the person may be prosecuted for perjury committed during the testimony or made in the evidence.

(7) *CONTRACT AUTHORITY.*—The Commission may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for supplies and services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5).

(f) *REPORT.*—The Commission shall transmit a report to the President and the Congress not later than 6 months after the date by which the Director has been appointed by the Chairperson. The report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for legislative and administrative actions the Commission considers appropriate.

(g) *TERMINATION.*—The Commission shall terminate on 30 days after submitting the report required under subsection (g).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Goss:

Strike the heading of section 306 (page 12, lines 1 and 2) and insert the following:

SEC. 306. COMMISSION ON NATIONAL SECURITY READINESS.

Page 12, beginning on line 4, strike "Commission on Preparedness and Performance of the Federal Government for the September 11 Acts of Terrorism" and insert "Commission on National Security Readiness".

Page 12, strike lines 9 through 17 and insert the following:

(1) *REVIEW.*—With respect to the acts of terrorism committed against the United States on September 11, 2001, the Commission shall review the national security readiness of the United States to identify structural impediments to the effective collection, analysis, and sharing of information on national security threats, particularly terrorism. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the scope of the review shall include—

Page 13, line 8, strike "subsection (g)" and insert "subsection (f)".

Page 13, line 11, strike "10" and insert "8".

Page 13, line 13, strike "4" and insert "2".

Page 13, after line 21, insert the following

new paragraph and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

(2) *QUALIFICATIONS.*—(A) A member of the Commission shall have substantial Federal law enforcement, intelligence, or military experience with appropriate security clearance.

(B) A member of the Commission may not be a full-time officer or employee of the United States.

Page 16, beginning on line 5, strike "hold hearings".

Page 16, beginning on line 8, strike "The Commission" and all that follows through the end of line 9.

Strike paragraph (6) of section 306(e) (page 17, beginning on line 7 through page 19, line 3) and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly.

Page 19, line 10, strike "6 months" and insert "one year".

Page 19, beginning on line 17, by striking "subsection (g)" and insert "subsection (f)".

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to section 306 regarding the establishment of an independent commission to review the national security readiness of the United States, to identify structural impediments to the effective collection analysis and sharing of information on national security threats, particularly terrorism.

□ 1045

By way of explanation, in its markup, the committee debated the purposes, mandate, and composition of this national commission that we talked about that would review our Nation's readiness to address the national security threat posed by terrorism in the wake of events that we all witnessed on September 11 in New York and Pennsylvania and the Pentagon. There was some disagreement among members as to whether there was an immediate need for such a commission and how broad its scope should actually be. Some members argued that there should be no commission at all as it might fall into the trap of focusing only on who was to blame for events of September 11, which is hardly the time to do that. Other members were concerned about the independence of commission members. Some of our members felt that the role of such a commission overlapped substantially with the responsibilities of our own Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, and there were other thoughts as well.

I know that we all recognize that it is important to understand what happened on September 11 and how our government can defend our Nation better in the future. That is a given. At

the same time, it was my hope to find some common ground between the varying views who are opposed to the establishment of a commission, assessing the performance of U.S. Government agencies responsible for safeguarding our country, and those who are seeking immediate answers as to what we can do to strengthen our defenses against terrorism. I was looking for that common ground.

So we have come up with this amendment. Incidentally, this amendment also has some minor fixes for some of the inadvertent problems we found down in the Justice Department in the hand-off with law enforcement. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) in particular, who has already spoken on the rule in this matter, was planning to offer an amendment to strike section 306 in its entirety, which was to remove the commission out of the bill. He and several other members expressed their strongly held views on this proposal during our mark, and I want to express my appreciation for his willingness and their willingness to work with me in developing a proposal with the ranking member that will allow us to review our national security readiness with respect to terrorism with a focus on the future; in other words, avoiding the blame game and getting to the future. I am pleased to say that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) has joined as an original cosponsor of this amendment that I have, as have the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), I understand, who were those originally opposed to the provision.

My amendment establishes a 1-year mandate for a joint Presidential-Congressional commission on national security readiness composed of eight independent members, two appointed by the President, two by the Speaker, two by the Senate majority leader and one by the Senate minority leader and one by the House minority leader. The commission members would be selected based on their expertise in Federal law enforcement, intelligence, and military affairs; in other words, they have to be experienced, not political appointees. I believe that the commission as now structured will not interfere with congressional committee jurisdiction, nor undermine executive branch prerogatives, and will allow us to better get to the question of what went wrong in a positive way so that we can do appropriate things to correct what went wrong.

It is my hope that this proposal will attract the support of both sides, and because this issue is too important and too urgent to be treated as a partisan matter, and we do not do that on our committee anyway, I would urge a favorable vote on it.

I would also say that we have made every effort to work together, I am very thankful for the efforts of the gen-

tlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). We thought we had worked out this particular amendment so it would pass muster on both sides. It did pass muster on our side; apparently, it did not pass muster all the way on her side, and she is going to offer a substitute in a moment which better reflects the thinking on her side. This is the good spirit in which we do these things in the committee. We think this is a very legitimate debate; it is one that is going to happen anyway, and we think this is an appropriate time and way to open up some of this discussion.

Having said that, I think it is clear, in looking for the right way to do the right thing here on this, and we will be very happy to entertain Members' comments, and I suspect we will have a vote on it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GOSS:

Page 13, line 8, strike "subsection (g)" and insert "subsection (f)".

Page 13, line 11, strike "10" and insert "8".

Page 13, line 13, strike "4" and insert "2".

Page 16, beginning on line 5, strike "hold hearings."

Page 16, beginning on line 8, strike "The Commission" and all that follows through the end of line 9.

Strike paragraph (6) of section 306(e) (page 17, beginning on line 7 through page 19, line 3) and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly.

Page 19, line 10, strike "6 months" and insert "one year".

Page 19, beginning on line 17, by striking "subsection (g)" and insert "subsection (f)".

Ms. PELOSI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in the wake, literally in the wake, of the horrific tragedies of September 11, there are many Members in the body, indeed in the country, who want an independent review of events leading up to September 11 and an evaluation of the performance of the agencies with responsibility for counterterrorism in our country. I have a substitute amendment at the desk which strikes language in the bill in response to some of the concerns raised by our Republican colleagues.

The committee position coming to the House today establishes an independent commission to review the appropriate agencies and their performance. There were concerns raised by

some on the minority side and others even on the majority, saying that the scope of the commission was too broad, its ability to subpoena, to hold hearings, to grant immunity. Concerns were even expressed by the Justice Department.

In the interest of addressing some of the concerns raised by the majority, I am presenting this amendment, which would eliminate some of those powers from the commission, and also reducing the number of people on the commission from 10 to 8, again, addressing the concerns raised. Many of those same provisions are in the Goss amendment.

My concern with the Goss amendment and why I continue to persist with mine is that his amendment changes the scope of the commission. Our commission is an assessment of the performance of Federal agencies and departments responsible for the prevention, preparation for, or responses to acts of terrorism. That is what we are proposing. The Goss amendment proposes instead a review of the structural impediments to the collection, analysis and sharing of information on terrorism. That amendment limits the scope of the commission's activities. This would be, in my judgment, unwise.

What the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is proposing is a totally reasonable proposal, but I do not think it is a substitute for an independent review.

The Goss amendment specifies that persons appointed as members must have substantial Federal law enforcement, intelligence, or military experience, and a security clearance. One of the attributes of section 306, as approved by the committee, with bipartisan support as part of this bill, is that it stresses the desirability for the commission to have members with great independence of judgment. That is what we are offering in our proposal: great independence of judgment, thought, and experience. By requiring prior Federal experience in these areas the Goss amendment virtually guarantees that the commission appointees will be the same insiders that are usually tapped for these kinds of posts. That, to me, seems contrary to the desire for a fresh look at the performance of these departments and agencies which were evident in the committee.

So what the Members of this body have to decide is whether we want an independent review of the events preceding September 11 and the performance of the agencies. It is not about fingerpointing, it is not about assigning blame, it is just about trying to prevent such tragedies from happening in the future, and unless we know how we got to where we are now, it seems that it would be more difficult to prevent these kinds of acts of terrorism.

I have no problem with the Goss amendment for what it seeks to do.

But it is a substitute instead of an addition to what this committee, the Select Committee on Intelligence voted as part of the chairman's mark, and then it was challenged in committee, it survived that challenge, and now comes to the floor. I want to defend the committee's position, but be sensitive to the concerns raised about subpoena power, holding of hearings, and granting of immunity. The amendment strikes those from the bill.

My objection is that our approach is preferable in that it is independent and does not turn to the same people who have been involved in all of these activities, reviewing these activities again; thus, depriving them of the independence that we want them to see.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support an independent review, and I hope that they will support my amendment.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in support of the chairman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do support the Goss amendment. I was one of those as a member of the Committee on Intelligence that spoke out very vehemently against this idea. I think it is a bad idea. But I have been around here long enough to know that under our process, no one of us gets their own way; and obviously, I am not going to get my way on this issue, and that is the reason I support the chairman's amendment. I think it is reasonable, I think it makes sense. I think the notion that we want to turn over the responsibility of the Select Committee on Intelligence to some outside group to take a look at what went wrong on September 11 is a very bad idea, but apparently, we are going to do that. I think the way to do it is through the amendment that is being offered by the chairman, which is reasonable, it is common sense.

No one in this House knows more about intelligence-gathering, no one in this House knows more about the intelligence network; no one knows more in this House than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss), about the whole network that is used to gather intelligence. He is the man when it comes to intelligence. He is a former CIA agent. So my point in saying that is, we ought to adopt his amendment.

The fault that I find with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and I know this will irritate people on the other side, but the fault I find is that it is the blame game amendment. The Pelosi amendment wants to point a finger. The Pelosi amendment wants to lay blame with someone. The gentlewoman does not like the Goss amendment, but in reality, it is a good amendment. It appoints a commission, it gets professional people, it is going to look at what happened.

As I said during the markup of this bill, we do not need to lay blame. It is our responsibility as the committee to find out what happened. That is why

the Speaker of the House and the Democratic leader appointed a subcommittee on terrorism with the distinguished member from California and the distinguished member from Georgia chairing that, so they could look into these matters too, and some of us are members of that. That is a good subcommittee. It has standing. It is a subcommittee now of the full Select Committee on Intelligence. We are going to do good work. We have already had two public meetings. We have brought a lot of experts in.

The other point I will make is this: we have had three commissions, distinguished Americans serving on those commissions. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) was a member of one of those commissions. They have made a lot of recommendations. But in the end, it is up to the Committee on Intelligence, with the intelligence community, to figure out these things. I think it is a slap in the face at the intelligence community for those people who want to get their pound of flesh against whomever, the CIA director, the FBI director, people in the defense intelligence community, to drag them before the public and require them to fess up with whatever happened.

I think many of us realize that this is a good bill that we are going to pass here on the floor. It gives the kind of resources and the kind of language and ability to really help the intelligence community. Appointing a commission is not going to do that.

But I give up on the idea, I throw up the white flag and say pass the Goss amendment, defeat the Pelosi amendment; and we can move on and lay blame where we want. But this is a good bill. It will be a good bill even with the Goss amendment. I urge the House to pass it. I urge the House to defeat the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for politicians to lay blame. We are partly responsible. We are trying to fix that in this intelligence authorization bill that we are passing today. We do not need another commission to do it. I know it sounds like I am talking out of both sides of my mouth, but as I said, under our process, not one of us gets our own way. Support the Goss amendment. He is the man when it comes to intelligence. Nobody in this House knows more about it, and I think he has put in place the amendment to do what we need to do to assuage the concerns that people have and to give people their opportunity to get their pound of flesh. And if we have to do it, let us do it with his amendment.

□ 1100

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment; but I also want to express my great affection for and agreement with much of what the last speaker said. The only thing I do not agree with is his conclusion.

Let me state how I get to my conclusion. First, I had misgivings about the language in the underlying bill, and I believed that the structural piece of the commission was overbroad. That misgiving has been addressed by both the Goss amendment and the Pelosi amendment. We need to be clear, neither amendment will permit subpoena power and hearings, and some of the things that were in the underlying bill. That is gone. Whichever version of this we approve, we are not approving that, so I am very comfortable about that change.

Secondly, I would like to say that in offering her amendment, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who was the author of the language in the underlying bill, went a long way to address the concerns many of us have expressed. I think we have to respect that. She has made a great accommodation to the rest of us, and that has a lot to do with my support of her amendment.

The language in the two amendments is quite close. The mandates are somewhat different, but the language is close. The difference is that, at least as many perceive it, the Pelosi version would permit a more independent look at what I believe are the structural changes we need to make in our intelligence-gathering.

I just spoke a minute ago in favor of the authorization bill and said that it is not about the people, and it is not the blame game; it is about the way we have structured our intelligence agencies. They are an ad hoc group of agencies that have grown up since World War II that now need to be reorganized and integrated. That is what we need to do. That is what our bill does.

My bottom line is, we may not need another commission. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) may be right about that. But if we are having another commission, let us be sure that it is independent and it has appropriate powers. I give the edge on that to the Pelosi amendment. I urge us to come together in the bipartisan, unified way we have on this committee always and support one concept.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is my 9th or 10th year in this Congress, and this is the first time I have sat and listened to this entire debate on this authorization. Obviously, our world has changed; and each of our jobs as Members of Congress has also changed since September 11.

There is no more important bill that this Congress will adopt than this authorization today. I think that is a realization that each of the 435 Members of this body need to acknowledge; and I think at some level we have acknowledged, because I think what we all realize now is that this is, in fact, as has been said, our front line of defense as a society.

As great as the work that has been done, and we have talked about the

successes, unfortunately, at this point in the debate, in a sense we have not addressed what really is a colossal failure, to speak in any other way about September 11 is just sticking our heads in the sand, a colossal failure of unparalleled proportions.

We have talked about the difficulty of the job and the successes, but I think what we need to strive for and, in fact, achieve is literally zero tolerance for failure. No one said it will be easy, but that, in fact, is what we need. It is something that effectively the American people are demanding, but we need.

I do not know how many of my colleagues have tried to imagine what 6,000 dying means. I do not dwell on it, but I have tried to think about it. And it is beyond my ability to even imagine what 6,000 deaths in an instant means.

We do not know the financial calculations of the World Trade Center attacks, what they are at this point. We literally do not know; in the trillions, tens of trillions, hundreds of trillions of dollars; fundamental changes in our economy. We do not know yet. But what we do know is that had these terrorists had biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons and the ability to deliver them, they would have used them; and in fact, what we do not know is their ability at this point to use them.

We do know that there are states that have sponsored terrorism. We know this is a fact, and we knew that as of more than 10 years ago, that states that have sponsored terrorism have biological and chemical weapons. Unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that those states who are, in fact, state sponsors of terrorism have not provided methods of mass destruction to terrorist organizations.

In fact, the 6,000 deaths in an instant, unfortunately, we know could become 6 million deaths in an instant. As impossible as 6,000 deaths are for us to imagine, I do not think any of us could imagine 6 million.

Mr. Chairman, people have talked about the fact that it was impossible to predict the World Trade Center attacks. The intelligence community could not think outside the box, never thought about it. I am not a big fan of Tom Clancy, but maybe I should become one, because as many of us have learned since September 11, Tom Clancy predicted it. One of his novels has exactly this attack, an airplane commandeered by hijackers hitting a building.

As some of us have learned since the attack of September 11, the people involved, the students involved, the high school students involved in the Columbine massacre, spoke about this type of attack.

For no other reason than those two that I just gave as examples, we need to be thinking outside the box. To limit the ability on this type of committee to people inside the box is, unfortunately, part of the reason why we have gotten to where we have gotten.

What I have just said is outside the box, also. Everyone on the committee who has spoken today has said we need to do everything we can. No one has said zero tolerance. That is why I support the substitute. We need the substitute. We need that type of commitment in our society.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi amendment and somewhat reluctantly in support of the chairman's amendment.

I was one of those folk within the committee and markup who voted against this provision. I did so for a couple of reasons. We get elected to Congress not just to make the easy decisions. The easy decisions anybody can make. We are elected to Congress to make the very toughest decisions that are put forth to any Americans, and this situation that we are dealing with now, the instance of September 11, is going to involve some very tough decisions being made by Members of Congress.

We do not need to shirk that responsibility. By creating a commission, I think we are shirking that responsibility and putting it on somebody else. I think that is wrong. We have had a number of commissions who have done great work on the issue of terrorism over the last 6 or 8 years.

All of those commissions have made a number of recommendations to Congress. Frankly, Congress has looked at them with a very jaundiced eye until September 11. We can create another commission if we want to. I suspect they will come forward with some recommendations, and once again, we will do what we think is right, irrespective of what that commission concludes.

Secondly and probably most importantly, the incident on September 11 was a very tragic and terrible incident, one of the worst, obviously, that we have ever seen domestically in this country. But as I read the paper this morning, and those who work within the intelligence community know, the likelihood of another attack is very great. In fact, the words this morning of somebody in a leadership position said it is probably a 100 percent possibility it will occur.

So if we are going to create a commission to study the incidents of September 11, how many more commissions are we going to create down the road to investigate subsequent incidents? I think it is wrong. I think we as Members of Congress, and particularly within the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, have the duty to be objective in our oversight responsibility, we have the duty to look at the deficiencies that took place in this situation that may or may not have allowed the September 11 incidents to occur, and we need to come forward and make the right, responsible decisions and not give that duty to somebody outside of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pelosi amendment, even though I have great respect for the gentlewoman, and reluctantly I support the chairman who is the man, in this case. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. I ask that his amendment be supported.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment. I am confused as to why our committee cannot continue our work and still have an independent group come in and take a look at what happened. It seems to me to be somewhat irresponsible for us not to want to have an assessment by an independent group of exactly what happened.

This is a good bill. It does a lot of good things. But if we take out this commission and the independence that it has, it is not as good a bill as it was before.

I think it is important for the American people also to know that there is an independent observation or an evaluation of what occurred. I think we really need to know exactly.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDIT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I normally would not do this, but it is my understanding that the difference in the language here is really very small. Indeed, the Goss amendment would bring in an independent group. The difference is that there would be some requirement that the people on the commission have some experience. It strikes me that in this arena, it is pretty obvious that we need people with some experience.

I further would suggest to my colleague, I understand last night, like at 9:30 or 10:00 the two sides were essentially in agreement in the middle of the night. For some reason, we have to come out here optically and have a partisan vote. It should have been taken care of.

The conference is ahead of us. The gentlewoman has the responsibility to work out that kind of compromise. I do not understand why we find ourselves in this position.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time.

I am not aware of the events of last night. I am simply saying to the gentleman that I do not think this House ought to be frightened, fearful of an independent evaluation of what occurred.

If there was any major accident happening in any of our cities or any parts of the country, we would ask people to come in and make assessments about what happened. We would have insurance companies coming in and making assessments. We would have local law enforcement people coming in and making assessments.

We need to know what happened, and we think that independent people can give us some kind of different view. It does not mean that they do not have the knowledgeable people on the commission. As a matter of fact, I think there is room for a placement of knowledgeable people, people with a background in this area, on the commission.

I do not know what was said last night. I do not know anything about that. But I do know, we ought not to be fearful to have an independent look at this. We think it is good for the American people to have a clear understanding about what happened. We think it is good for the agencies to have a clear and different kind of look and view of what happened in this instance.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield just a moment further, I am sorry to do this, but I think the gentleman knows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I deal with some pretty sensitive areas in our defense responsibilities. We are able to come together and work in a nonbipartisan way without having a public display that suggests there is some partisan difference.

There is not a partisan difference here. They are both independent commissions. It just seems to me that the ranking member should have been able to work this out between now and conference without a display that suggests there is some division in the House, and there is not a division in the House.

Mr. CONDIT. I will let the ranking member speak to this when she gets up to speak about this. But I thought when this left the committee, it left it in a bipartisan way. It left with the Pelosi language in it, which was an independent commission. That is the way it left. We got to the floor today and it is different. If Members take the Pelosi language out, in my opinion, we make the bill weaker.

The bill does a lot of good things, but we as a Congress, we as a nation, the intelligence community, should not be fearful to allow someone to come in and do an assessment of exactly what occurred here. It does not mean we have to agree with it, but we ought to have an independent view of what happened here. The American people need to know that, and I think that that would add confidence to us all, to have people on the outside come in and take a look.

□ 1115

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to have an exchange with the gentlewoman. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

It seems from the remarks of the gentleman there should be some clarification about how events proceeded. We had suggested on the minority side as a result of concerns expressed to us by Members of Congress that there be an independent review. We brought that to the majority side. They accepted that. It was part of the chairman's mark. There was challenge to the chairman's mark in the full committee in which our position prevailed. Again, our bill comes to the floor with an independent review in it.

Our chairman had wanted to have Congress work its will and have a debate on this. We do not see anything wrong with having a debate. I do not think there is anything unhealthy or unwholesome about that. The spirit of the debate is to make a distinction between whether we want an independent review of these events and the performance of the agencies or whether we do not? I would like to hear from the chairman on it. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, but this was the wish that the Congress do debate it and work its will and respect the results.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, and I will be willing to yield, is the gentlewoman suggesting that the language of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) does not provide for an independent review of people with some expertise?

Ms. PELOSI. That is one of the things. There are a couple of points.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes or no?

Ms. PELOSI. What I am saying is the scope of the review is different. What we are talking about is an independent review by those outside the community, in some cases. The difference between our two bills is the Goss amendment does not have an independent review of the events leading up to or the performance of the agencies. What his amendment does is to say let us go forward, which is a good thing, to analyze the collection, dissemination and sharing of intelligence and that is a very important point. It is not a bad thing.

It is just that it is not an independent review. We could do both.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, it is my understanding that as late as 9:30 or 10:00 in the well of the House in a discussion, the differences here were that close because both presumed there was independence in review. One had required more expertise than the other approach apparently. But the important point I would make is that optically, the gentlewoman is presenting a picture. So there is some big difference here in terms of review.

Ms. PELOSI. There is.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentlewoman and I have had differences on this subject before. I no longer serve on the committee, as we all know. I do spend a lot of time there because of my work. Having said that, I remember our debates on the floor regarding whether our budget should be public or not. The gentlewoman wanted to do that.

Ms. PELOSI. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would submit to the gentlewoman that there probably are messengers from the Taliban who would love to see the adjustments that the committee is making at this point. I do not notice a Member on the floor in connection with that at this point in time.

I must say optically we are presenting a difference with no difference. It is a bit disconcerting to me that the leadership of the committee has not been able to handle this in a way at this very delicate time that does not provide such an appearance of difference.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. First, I want to recognize the standing of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) on these issues. He is a former member of the committee and as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, probably knows more, or as much as anyone else. I defer to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) on this issue. We all respect his expertise.

The point is in response to the concerns raised by others about the scope of the commission, we made a proposal last night that said we will take out the subpoena power, we will take out the hearing process, we will take out the granting of immunity. But the independence of the commission is something we can not yield on; A, and, B, the scope; how we can collect and disseminate information better in the future is too narrow. We should do that too. But we should not ignore the opportunity to have those people who are not all, according to the Goss amendment, of the community, but rather have some independent thinking on it. So we did try to make accommodations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, it certainly is disconcerting to this Member that it would appear as though at least somewhere down the line we would like to be able to find a mechanism, independent commission or otherwise, to point the finger at somebody and say someone else was to blame besides us. Indeed, it really is fundamental in the important work of this committee that the leadership on both sides be willing to come together and solve these kinds of problems before they provide an appearance of difference when there truly is no difference.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to our esteemed chairman who has provided such great leadership for our committee, and I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment for an independent review of the events leading up

to September 11, which provides broad scope across a host of difference agencies as to how we try to prevent the next attack. Not to lay blame, not to blame agencies, not to roll heads, but to put eight independent, thoughtful Americans together from both parties and look at better ways to prepare for and protect the homeland of the United States of America. I think we could do that.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also to discuss this on the House floor. I think the chairman said very eloquently and very wisely, this is the place to do it. This is the place to have these debates in a thoughtful and articulate and hopefully diplomatic manner.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Pelosi amendment for two reasons that I want to reiterate: independent review, and two, the scope of what we want to accomplish. First the independence. In our committee report, which is available to the general public and is not classified, we say on page 16, and I quote, "The committee believes it critical that a comprehensive examination be conducted independently of the Federal Government."

The committee, in a bipartisan way, says on page 17, and I quote, "The Committee continues to believe that there is a need for a fundamental review of the Intelligence Community's authorities, structure, funding levels, procedures, areas of mission emphasis, security procedures, depth and breadth of analytic expertise, and interagency relationships."

On page 26, in a bipartisan way, the committee again states in our report, "Section 306 of the bill establishes an independent commission to review the performance of those Federal public safety, law enforcement and national security departments and agencies responsible for preventing and/or responding to acts of terrorism in the period prior to and including September 11, 2001."

We go on to talk about why we think it is so important for these eight members to be thoughtful, independent, wise, have good reputations for working in these areas. So we voted as a committee, in a bipartisan way, to establish this independent review. Now, it is on the floor and there is some debate as to what we should do.

Secondly, the debate now is over the scope. The gentleman from Florida's (Mr. Goss) language reads, and I will quote the following with respect to the acts of terrorism, and he goes on to say what we need to look at. "The Commission shall review the national security readiness of the United States to identify structural impediments to the effective collection, analysis, and sharing of information on national security threats, particularly terrorism."

That is well and good. Our independent review, however, says, let us look at a host of government agencies, not to lay blame, not to fire people, not to roll heads, but to look at the roll of the Customs, the INS, the border con-

trol, the CIA, the DIA, the State Department, the Department of Justice, the FBI and put eight thoughtful people, Democrats and Republicans, in a room and give us an independent analysis.

Some people have mentioned a commission or commissions that have done this, and we have a host of them. None of them have been done since September 11, when we had 6,000 people die in New York City. That was an attack not on New York, not on America, on the world, with hundreds of people from lots of countries being killed.

So let us look thoughtfully at an independent review. Let us look at a vast scope and let us not look to blame people but to protect the homeland of the United States from future attacks. I support the Pelosi language.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have been on this committee now for a number of years, and in my work on the committee I have gotten to know a number of people in the intelligence community, and they are very, very fine people. I have a great deal of respect for the men and women who work to provide the best real-time information for our policy-makers and war fighters.

The events of September 11, however, have caused Americans and people all over the world to ask the questions, to ask the committee members, to ask the Members of the Congress as they go back to their districts, how did this happen, how did we allow our guard to go down such that this could happen.

We do not have the answers yet, but one of the vehicles to give the American people the understanding that we are seriously looking to find the real answers is to have a commission that is independent and that can give the clear perception that we are trying to get the truth. The way to do that is not, in my opinion, to have a closed club, a closed community reviewing itself and its performance. As we would say in Georgia, not to have the fox guarding the hen house.

Instead, we need to have an open, independent group of well-thinking people who can, as Ms. PELOSI's amendment suggests, go about this work in a way that will give credibility and meaning and give reassurances to the people of our country and the world that we are sincerely going after the truth so that we can make sure that nothing like this will ever happen again.

I would urge my colleagues to please let us have an independent commission that can do the work, the scope that needs to be done so that our people will have assurances that they need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues and thank them for their support of this amendment.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a number of inquiries into the circumstances surrounding the September 11 terrorist attacks. Committees of the Congress will rightfully conduct some of these inquiries. Elements of the executive branch will conduct others. In the judgment of a majority of the committee, and after the vote was taken, our bill was reported out unanimously, it was important to assure that at least one of these inquiries be as independent as possible of the interests of the departments and agencies whose performance is being assessed.

This is not to be an inquiry focused exclusively on the intelligence community. It is to examine across the board the performance of the national security establishment in preventing, preparing and/or responding to acts of terrorism.

There is a tremendous concern in the country, great questions about what went terribly wrong on September 11, and the nation was not as prepared as it should have been. Everybody could have been doing his or her job perfectly well, but the lack of coordination or collaboration may be the weakness that we need to find. I think we need to respond to the concerns of the American people in a responsible way, and the independent review as outlined in the bill is the appropriate response.

Who appoints this? The President and the leadership of the Senate and the House are to appoint the members of the commission. I have confidence in the President and his intention to appoint two members of the highest quality and independence of thought who will fairly but thoroughly discharge their responsibilities on this.

We must focus on the future. That is understandable, desirable, necessary, but I would submit that it is difficult to make wise decisions about future actions unless we understand what worked and what did not in the past. It seems to me that it is even more important in light of the horrific events which occurred on September 11.

□ 1130

The unimaginable has now become the predictable. We must look to ourselves to see what exposure we have, what vulnerability we have in the systems, in the agencies that deal with terrorism. I think an independent review is what will give the American people the confidence that they seek, that we are in the best possible position to prevent future attacks.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, as I say, we cooperated as fully as possible but would not give up on the issue of independence.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I will be very brief.

As I said earlier, I am a newcomer to the committee, but the chairman is doing a great job, and he has good help from our ranking member, and all of us.

We had this discussion not too long ago, and I understood that the chairman was supportive of this at that moment, and I think that he is. There is some difference here.

I remember one of our Members, and I do not think he would mind, I certainly respect him as a close personal friend and ally, a colleague from the chairman's side of the aisle, that said we do not need this, we can do it. And he was right. We could do it. We could, with extra pieces there. Between the chairman and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) there, I have no doubt we could do it. But that is not the question. Something terrible has happened in our country. This is America, and the people of the country want to know.

So I do not feel threatened that we would do this. I do not have a problem with doing it the chairman's way. I think that would be fine. And then as I listen to the discussion and debate in committee and in here today, to do the amendment of our ranking member, I am not troubled with that. I have the confidence in our country and our people, in this institution, that we can do that. America wants answers and we can do this.

This opens up an independent review appointed by the President and the leaders of these two Houses. It is not a threat. We can do it. This is the United States of America, a democracy, the leading democracy in our history. Let us do it. Let us just get it done. I support the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

My colleagues, I raced to the floor as I heard the discussion of the Pelosi amendment; and although I was not able to speak before the final vote, I just wanted to rise briefly in strong support of the Pelosi amendment.

As a New Yorker, as we go from one funeral to wakes, to vigils, to the site to see the pain, to see the suffering of the families, of the children, and as we work hard to do what we have to do to rebuild our great city, I think we would be remiss if while we are moving forward, and I have confidence that the best minds in this country are focused like a laser beam on what we have to do to move forward to ensure that this kind of horror, the incomprehensible, does not happen again. I think we would be remiss if we did not ensure that there was an independent review.

The amendment of the gentlewoman from California emphasized the independence of the review and the scope of the review. Again, my colleagues, while we are moving forward and doing what we have to do to prevent the horror of this kind of incident ever occurring again, I think it is absolutely essential that we look at what happened. We can only learn from the past. In order to move forward, we have to evaluate the past and we have to be sure that all the information is in place. If the same

people are doing the review, in my judgment we are missing the strength and the power of an independent analyst really looking at the agencies and seeing what perhaps we can do differently.

So I just wanted to make that point again. If we are going to move forward and truly understand the future, my colleagues, it seems to me we have to truly understand what happened in the past. And I just wanted to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for offering that amendment.

I appreciate that there was a compromise worked out between the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); but I wanted to emphasize again that I strongly supported the amendment, and I thank her for bringing it to my colleagues' attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 5, the Buy American amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of title III (page 19, after line 18), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT, PRODUCTS, AND SERVICES.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—No funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act may be provided to a person or entity unless the person or entity agrees to comply with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c) in the expenditure of the funds.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In the case of any equipment, products, or services that may be authorized to be purchased using funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act, it is the sense of Congress that recipients of such funds should, in expending the funds, purchase only American-made equipment, products, and services.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I do plan to withdraw this amendment, and I would like to thank the chairman for a good bill. I do agree with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is certainly our intelligence expert here.

Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my Buy American amendment because the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI)

have put in stealth language, which is Trafficant procurement language in a different form. And being that it is a stealth bill, I do appreciate their including my stealth amendment into the bill.

I thank the chairman for that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Buy American amendment pending at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 19, line 15, strike the period and insert the following: “, and shall include a comprehensive assessment of security at the borders of the United States with respect to terrorist and narcotic interdiction efforts.”.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say a couple of things, and I do not want to belabor the House; but I thought I would take time on my amendment.

I listened to the words of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who is certainly one of our outstanding leaders; and he made a lot of sense. I agreed with the gentleman.

I was prepared to vote with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), but I wanted to make a statement today. In the back of the room is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) came to the floor and he made a point about true bipartisanship. I can remember when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), now the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense and he worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). They came to the floor and they had their problems worked out. The world was not confused with what America was going to do militarily. And we cannot be confused with what we are going to do with our intelligence program.

Let me just take one minute now and give some of my views. Pollard, Hansen, USS *Cole*, Pan Am 103, the first attack on the World Trade Center, that we were warned about. My colleagues, we had anonymous reports and warnings that Pan Am 103 would be blown up.

Now, look, it is not about laying blame. No one in this Congress, with all of our duties, has enough time to see and oversee all of these problems. That is why we have fine leaders, like the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The commission is wise, but I will say this: we have to be better, and we have to look not only at September 11 but we must now start looking at root causations. I have offered, over a period of years, legislation on an issue dealing with our borders that politically has been shot down. It has been shot down because it has been looked at as an ethnic measure.

Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned about poor people from Mexico running across the border trying to better their lives. But, my colleagues, the soft underbelly of America is wide open. And if we do not take a look at our borders, God forbid, there will be more Americans that will die. I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) made an excellent point. We have got to do better. We must have a zero tolerance on terrorism.

The Traficant amendment, Mr. Chairman, calls for a study on that border. Give us a complete analysis of what is happening. And if we are prepared to put the military at our airports, by God, let us protect our borders.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for an affirmative vote on my amendment, which calls for a comprehensive assessment by this new commission relative to the security of our borders with respect to terrorism and narcotics. And let me say this: narcotics and narcotic traffickers are terrorists.

One other thing. We now have seen planes, we have seen ships, and, my God, there are subways and metros all over America. Literally an army of guerrillas could penetrate our shore with, in fact, a nuclear device; and as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) said, perhaps 6 million Americans could die.

Colleagues, when will we address the soft underbelly of our national security which is our border?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to a gentleman who I have tremendous respect for, and I compliment him on his bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I want to simply say that I know of the gentleman's work on behalf of the support for the men and women in our intelligence community. I think he has it exactly right on this question of the borders. The gentleman has already heard one colloquy today with our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), on the subject. I certainly accept this amendment as timely and reasonable; and on behalf of the committee, I would be prepared to accept it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to comment that the amendment focuses the attention of

the commission to be established by section 306 on U.S. border security. Although I believe that important issue would receive appropriate attention under the charge to the commission either as approved by the committee or as amended by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the increased emphasis provided by the Traficant language may be helpful.

We are prepared to accept the Traficant amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. WOLF:

At the end of title III (page 19, after line 18) insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Central Intelligence, in cooperation with the heads of the departments and agencies of the United States involved, shall implement the recommended changes to counterterrorism policy in preventing and punishing international terrorism directed toward the United States contained in the report submitted to the President and the Congress by the National Commission on Terrorism established in section 591 of Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277; 112 Stat. 2681-210).

(b) REPORT.—(1) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, if the Director of Central Intelligence determines that one or more of the recommended changes referred to in subsection (a) will not be implemented, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a detailed explanation of that determination.

(2) In this subsection, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for allowing and accepting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of the legislation which created the National Commission on Terrorism, or what some are calling the Bremer Commission, I want to offer this amendment. In light of the tragedy of September 11, I believe it is imperative the U.S. Government be responsive and proactive in combating terrorism. As we mourn the loss of life of the terrorist attacks, 27 people from my congressional district, we must be resolved to do whatever it takes to win the war against terrorism.

The National Commission on Terrorism was established by Public Law 105-277. No Member, I believe, voted against it in 1998.

□ 1145

Congress gave the commission 6 months because they wanted this thing done quickly to review the laws, the regulations, the directives, the policies, and the practices for preventing and punishing international terrorism directed against the United States, assess their effectiveness, and recommend changes to improve U.S. counterterrorism performance.

The commission issued its recommendations in June of 2000. Given that the commission was comprised of the Nation's leading terrorism experts, including L. Paul Bremer, President Reagan's counterterrorism czar; former CIA Director, James Woolsey; and retired Army General, Wayne Downing, just appointed with a high position with this administration, one would think that their recommendations and advice would have been taken seriously by those in government.

Unfortunately, it appears that some in government either ignored or actively worked to discredit the work of the commission. A recent article in *The New Republic* alleges that some worked to discredit the findings of the commission report by spinning, by inferring that it did certain things that it did not do. This is troubling, particularly in the wake of the events of September 11, and is why I am offering the amendment today, and for those who do not serve on the committee, to have some mechanism to find out whether any of these recommendations are being followed. Because the director of the CIA is the lead government official, the director has wide-ranging responsibilities in directing the Nation's policy on combating terrorism.

The amendment says not later than 90 days after the enactment of this legislation, the director of Central Intelligence, in cooperation with the heads of the departments and agencies involved, shall implement the recommended changes to counterterrorism policies in preventing and punishing international terrorism directed towards the United States contained in the report submitted to the President and the Congress by the National Commission on Terrorism.

In addition, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment, if the director of Central Intelligence determines that one or more of the recommended changes will not be implemented, the director shall submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence a report containing a detailed explanation of that determination.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to go through all of the recommendations; but there were a couple of recommendations, some of which are being carried out in this bill. For those who are interested, Members can view

the commission's report at www.fas.org.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that this amendment be adopted; and I ask the gentleman, the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that we keep this in, that this not be dropped in conference. I morally would not be able to support the conference report if this language were dropped.

Having been at a town meeting last week where two families lost loved ones, knowing the work that was put into the commission, the Congress has to know what has been adopted and what has not, and there very well may be good reasons why they have not been. I am not on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I would trust the committee to know. I ask the gentleman to keep this in so I can comfortably and morally vote for the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, of course we will do that in conference; and we will do more. We have a special subcommittee that is working on some of the matters, as is the whole committee. I thank the gentleman for his efforts to enhance our national security.

I especially appreciate the amendment that urges the full information of the counterterrorism recommendations offered recently by the Bremer Commission. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) was on that commission. I share the gentleman's concern that the intelligence community has failed to adopt the recommendations of the Bremer Commission. We understand that there is work to be done, and we have noted it in this bill.

As reflected in the committee's adoption of section 403 rescinding the CIA's 1995 guidelines on foreign asset recruitment, the committee as a whole has acted on the Bremer Commission's most urgent recommendation. There is full committee support on that. Given the tragic events of September 11, this amendment is timely and reasonable; and I will accept it on behalf of the committee and thank the gentleman for his innovation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I thank the staff and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Wolf amendment. As I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to ensure that the DCI formally responds to the recommendations of the Bremer Commission on Terrorism by indicating which of those recommendations make sense to implement and which do not.

As such, a response would be a useful contribution to the work of our Subcommittee on Terrorism; and we are, therefore, pleased as the full com-

mittee on the minority side to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

SEC. 401. MODIFICATIONS TO CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY'S CENTRAL SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403u) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (g)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking "December" and inserting "January"; and

(B) by striking "conduct" and inserting "complete".

(2) Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking "(3)" and inserting "(2)"; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking "(2)" and inserting "(1)".

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF CIA VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PAY ACT.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 2(f) of the Central Intelligence Agency Voluntary Separation Pay Act (Public Law 103-36, 50 U.S.C. 403-4 note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2002" and inserting "September 30, 2003".

(b) REMITTANCE OF FUNDS.—Section 2(i) of that Act is amended by striking "or 2002" and inserting "2002, or 2003".

SEC. 403. GUIDELINES FOR RECRUITMENT OF CERTAIN FOREIGN ASSETS.

Recognizing dissatisfaction with the provisions of the guidelines of the Central Intelligence Agency (promulgated in 1995) for handling cases involving foreign assets or sources with human rights concerns, the Director of Central Intelligence shall—

(1) rescind the provisions of the guidelines for handling such cases; and

(2) provide for provisions for handling such cases that more appropriately weigh and incentivize risks to achieve successful operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SIMMONS

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. SIMMONS:

At the end of title IV, page 21, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 404. FULL REIMBURSEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE OF COUNTERTERRORISM EMPLOYEES.

Section 406(a)(2) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-567; 114 Stat. 2849; 5 U.S.C. prec. 5941 note) is amended by striking "one-half" and inserting "100 percent".

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I have what I believe is a friendly amendment to the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2002. The purpose of the amendment is to require that the Central Intelligence Agency assume 100 percent of the cost of personal liability insurance

for certain CIA employees involved in counterterrorism activities.

For 10 years, I served with the CIA. During that period, 5 of which were spent overseas, I was engaged in intelligence collection, counterintelligence and counterespionage activities, and on occasion counterterrorism activities. The work was difficult and the work was dangerous; but at no time did I ever doubt that my government would not protect me from personal liability if I encountered a lawsuit as a consequence of my professional duties.

Today I understand that CIA officers engaged in counterterrorism activities are virtually required to buy liability insurance, but the CIA only pays 50 percent of the cost. What incentive does a CIA case officer have to do the job if he or she is subject to liability lawsuits? Why would they take any risks in their professional duties if the government was unwilling to cover the cost of their liability.

I realize I served at a different time and in different places, but I still had 100 percent of the backing of my government. And I think it is time that we extend this backing to agents today engaged in counterterrorism activities.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a new idea; and it is not an original idea. In fact, it was a recommendation of the same commission that my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), referred to a few minutes ago. That report said, "The risk of personal liability arising from actions taken in an official capacity discourages law enforcement and intelligence personnel from taking bold actions to combat terrorism." Discourages intelligence personnel from taking bold actions to combat terrorism.

The tragic events of September 11 have changed us all, and it is apparent from those events that we must do better in our counterterrorism activities. We must have case officers and agents who are bold in their actions to combat these activities. The least we can do is provide them with the liability coverage they need to ensure that they have the full backing of the government.

I believe my amendment provides this backing, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment and his work in the area of the intelligence community. I know that he brings a value-added contribution because of his experience, and we value that.

The provision improves on language and authority that was included in last year's intelligence act. As does the gentleman from Connecticut, I believe giving the DCI discretionary authority to provide full insurance liability protection to CIA employees is a small but important benefit that we can provide

to public servants who are putting their lives at risk for us. This amendment is timely, and I accept it on behalf of the committee and congratulate the gentleman for it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I, too, commend the gentleman. The amendment ensures that those CIA employees for whom the Director of Central Intelligence determines that there is a need to carry professional liability insurance, the full cost of that insurance will be borne by the CIA, and as the distinguished chairman mentioned, the determination of the need is left at the discretion of the DCI. The amendment serves a very useful purpose. We accept it as well.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE ITEMS OF NOMINAL VALUE FOR RECRUITMENT PURPOSES.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Section 422 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **PROMOTIONAL ITEMS FOR RECRUITMENT PURPOSES.**—The Secretary of Defense may use funds available for an intelligence element of the Department of Defense to purchase promotional items of nominal value for use in the recruitment of individuals for employment by that element.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§422. Use of funds for certain incidental purposes”.

(2) Such section is further amended by inserting at the beginning of the text of the section the following:

“(a) **COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OFFICIAL RECEPTION AND REPRESENTATION EXPENSES.**—”.

(3) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 21 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“422. Use of funds for certain incidental purposes.”.

SEC. 502. FUNDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND QUALITY-OF-LIFE IMPROVEMENTS AT MENWITH HILL AND BAD AIBLING STATIONS.

Section 506(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-93; 109 Stat. 974), as amended by section 502 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-107; 111 Stat. 2262) and by section 502 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-120; 113 Stat. 1619), is further amended by striking “for fiscal years 2000 and 2001” and inserting “for fiscal years 2002 and 2003”.

SEC. 503. CONTINUATION OF JOINT INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE AT CURRENT LOCATIONS IN FLORIDA AND CALIFORNIA.

(a) **MAIN LOCATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall continue to maintain the Joint Inter-

agency Task Force at Key West, Florida, with the responsibility for coordinating drug interdiction efforts in the Western Hemisphere and with such additional responsibilities regarding worldwide intelligence for counterdrug operations as the Secretary may assign.

(b) **COMPONENT LOCATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall convert the Joint Interagency Task Force located at Alameda, California, to be a component site of the main location specified in subsection (a).

(c) **DIRECTOR.**—The Director of the Joint Interagency Task Force shall be a flag officer of the Coast Guard.

SEC. 504. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO INTERDICTION OF AIRCRAFT ENGAGED IN ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING.

(a) **CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR IMMUNITY.**—Subsection (a)(2) of section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2837; 22 U.S.C. 2291-4) is amended by striking “, before the interdiction occurs, has determined” and inserting “has, during the 12-month period ending on the date of the interdiction, certified to Congress”.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—That section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—(1) Not later than February 1 each year, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the assistance provided under subsection (b) during the preceding calendar year. Each report shall include for the calendar year covered by such report the following:

“(A) A list specifying each country for which a certification referred to in subsection (a)(2) was in effect for purposes of that subsection during any portion of such calendar year, including the nature of the illicit drug trafficking threat to each such country.

“(B) A detailed explanation of the procedures referred to in subsection (a)(2)(B) in effect for each country listed under subparagraph (A), including any training and other mechanisms in place to ensure adherence to such procedures.

“(C) A complete description of any assistance provided under subsection (b).

“(D) A summary description of the aircraft interception activity for which the United States Government provided any form of assistance under subsection (b).

“(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.”.

SEC. 505. UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT TRAINING PROGRAM.**—Subchapter III of chapter 22 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§462. Financial assistance to certain employees in acquisition of critical skills

“The Secretary of Defense may establish an undergraduate training program with respect to civilian employees of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency that is similar in purpose, conditions, content, and administration to the program established by the Secretary of Defense under section 16 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402 note) for civilian employees of the National Security Agency.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“462. Financial assistance to certain employees in acquisition of critical skills.”.

SEC. 506. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 2555 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1203(a) of the Floyd D. Spence

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-324), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “CONVEY OR” in the subsection heading and inserting “TRANSFER TITLE TO OR OTHERWISE”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “convey” and inserting “transfer title”; and

(ii) by striking “and” after “equipment”;

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) inspect, test, maintain, repair, or replace any such equipment.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “conveyed or otherwise provided” and inserting “provided to a foreign government”;

(B) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking “; and” at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3).

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. Goss:
Strike section 503 (page 23, lines 1 through 16).

Strike section 506 (page 26, line 1, through page 27, line 5).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 503 and 506.

By way of explanation, 506 is a technical amendment which I understand has now been incorporated within H.R. 2586, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002. With respect to section 503 on the status of intelligence fusion centers in Florida and California, I have been asked by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to defer further action on this provision pending consultations between our committees.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly am prepared to honor the gentleman's request and would like to do so.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that issues raised by 503 will be addressed in the conference report. With that understanding, I am pleased to agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I believe that is accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 252, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1200

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2883, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2883, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes as necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 2883) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2646.

□ 1200

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 4, 2001, amendment No. 34 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) had been withdrawn.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment may be offered except one pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate.

There being no further amendments in order under the order of the House, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, during my service in Congress, I have consistently opposed agricultural welfare programs. This Farm Bill, for the most part, represents business-as-usual for our nation's heavily-subsidized farmers. It's unfortunate to know that at a time of such advances in every other area of our lives, our agriculture sector has all the sophistication of a Soviet commune.

But there is something to smile about, because this Farm Bill contains one vital reform: the abolition of the federal peanut quota program. This program is truly a relic of the Great Depression, and today it's put on notice that its days are numbered.

The General Accounting Office has found the peanut program provides substantial benefits to a small number of producers who hold most of the quota, restricts peanut production by other farmers, and increases consumer costs by between \$300 million and \$500 million annually.

For years, I've had a hard time understanding why our government favors one group of American peanut farmers—those who own quotas—over other American farmers who don't own this privilege. This program harms so many for the benefit of such a select few.

My partner in reform, Congressman PAUL KANJORSKI, and I have always maintained that it was not our intention to pull the rug out from under our nation's peanut farmers. Rather, our goal has always been to bring peanuts in line with other commodities, and the legislation we introduced replaced quota restrictions with the same non-recourse loan system enjoyed by other commodities.

Some of my colleagues may be concerned with the Farm Bill's approach, which shifts the burden from consumers to taxpayers.

I agree this compromise isn't perfect, but it does meet two essential criteria we've set for

reform. First, and most important, it repeals the quota system. This is the key to making the peanut industry more market-oriented, providing a level playing field for farmers, and promoting international trade.

Second, as GAO confirmed in correspondence I will submit for the record, this bill "Would essentially bring the peanut program in line with other commodity programs."

Why is this important? Because taking peanuts off a separate track will ultimately make it easier to enact future reforms. It also exposes the hidden costs of the existing program by putting it "on the books."

There are still some concerns I have with what we're accomplishing today. First, this legislation compensates quota holders for the loss of their asset, which I must confess I think is fair. While those of us who want reform are willing to accept this provision, it is only under the understanding that the Chairman shares our commitment to let it expire after five years specified in this bill.

Second, at a cost of \$3.5 billion over 10 years, these reforms will come at some expense. With a rapidly shrinking budget surplus and tremendous needs in other areas, we are going to have to reexamine whether this is the best use of taxpayers' dollars.

Finally, I'm concerned about findings by the GAO that several of the new subsidies for peanuts may be identified as "trade distorting" under the 1994 Uruguay Round of trade talks. If we expect other nations to lower their trade barriers, we need to ensure we're not erecting barriers of our own.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of debate on this bill, I'm going to continue to express reservations about our overall agriculture policy. But at this moment, I want to commend the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COMBEST, for bringing us closer that we've ever been to ending the Byzantine system of price supports for peanuts.

I would also request unanimous consent to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a September 26 letter from the General Accounting Office reviewing the peanut title of this Farm Bill.

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING
OFFICE,

Washington, DC, September 26, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,
House of Representatives.

Hon. PAUL E. KANJORSKI,
House of Representatives.

Subject: Peanut Program: Potential Effects of Proposed Farm Bill on Producers, Consumers, Government, and Peanut Imports and Exports.

The current federal peanut program, administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), is designed to support producers' incomes while ensuring an ample supply of domestically produced peanuts. To accomplish these goals, the program controls the domestic supply of peanuts and guarantees producers a minimum price for their crops. This price substantially exceeds the price of peanuts in world markets. The program uses two mechanisms to control the domestic supply of peanuts: (1) a national quota on the number of pounds that can be sold for edible consumption domestically and (2) import restrictions. While anyone can grow peanuts, only producers holding quota, either through ownership or rental of farmland, may sell their peanuts domestically, as "quota" peanuts. Generally, all other production, referred to as "additional" peanuts, must be exported or crushed for oil and meal.

The program protects producers' incomes through a two-tiered system that sets minimum support prices for quota and for additional peanuts. Producers of quota peanuts are guaranteed a support price of \$610 per-ton, called the "quota loan rate." Producers of additional peanuts are guaranteed a lower support price of \$132 per-ton, called the "additional loan rate." Producers may sell their peanuts at or above these loan rates, or they may place their peanuts under loan with USDA and have the government sell them. This program, while long-standing, has been criticized by GAO and others because, among other things, it provides substantial benefits to a relatively small number of producers who hold most of the quota, generally restricts nonquota holders from producing peanuts for the U.S. domestic market, and increases consumers' cost. The program is, however, designed to operate generally at "no-net cost" to the government. Additionally, since the \$610 per-ton quota loan rate is substantially higher than the estimated world price—\$321 to \$462 per-ton from 1996 through 2000—the quota loan rate provides incentives for exporting countries to maximize the quantity of peanuts the U.S. allows to be imported under recent trade agreements. These imports could displace domestically produced peanuts that otherwise would enter U.S. food marketing channels.

To address these and other concerns about the peanut program, you asked that we review its structure and operations under the 1996 Farm Bill, and its impacts on producers, consumers, the federal government, and imports and exports of peanuts. However, on July 27, 2001, before we completed our review, the House Committee on Agriculture approved the 2002 Farm Bill, for 2002 through 2011 (the Farm Security Act of 2001, H.R. 2646). If enacted, this bill would fundamentally alter the peanut program's structure by, among other things, eliminating the national poundage quota and allowing peanut buyers to purchase domestically produced peanuts at the prevailing market price. Because of your interest in making the program more market-oriented, you subsequently asked us to report on the potential impact of this bill on producers, consumers, the federal government, and imports and exports of peanuts.

MAJOR CHANGES TO THE PEANUT PROGRAM UNDER THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE'S BILL

Beginning in 2002, and for the next 10 years, the bill passed by the House Com-

mittee on Agriculture would eliminate the national poundage quota and replace the current two-tiered price system with several new support mechanisms for peanut quota owners and producers. These changes would essentially bring the peanut program in line with other commodity programs. The bill would establish the following new types of support for peanut producers:

A "counter-cyclical" payment. This payment would provide financial assistance to producers when prices are below a legislatively established target price. Peanut producers would receive a payment based on the difference between a USDA-calculated price and a \$480 target price—known as a counter-cyclical payment. The payment amount would be calculated on 85 percent of a producer's peanut acres and the average yield for crop years 1998 through 2001. A producer's production during these years would be the producer's base production. Since the payment would be calculated using historic yield and acreage, producers would receive it even if they choose not to plant peanuts. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the counter-cyclical payments would cost an estimated \$1.24 billion in government expenditures over the life of the farm bill.

A "fixed, decoupled" payment. This payment would provide peanut producers with compensation similar to the production flexibility contract payments provided for other crops, such as cotton and wheat, in the 1996 Farm Bill (Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996). Producers with base production would receive support—known as a fixed, decoupled payment—in the amount of \$36 per-ton on the base production. This support is called "decoupled" because it would be paid whether or not a producer chooses to grow peanuts and regardless of market prices. Since the payment would be calculated using historic yield and acreage, producers would receive it even if they choose not to plant peanuts. According to CBO, the fixed, decoupled payments would cost an estimated \$0.63 billion over the life of the farm bill.

A marketing assistance loan. This loan would provide producers with interim financial assistance at harvest, when prices are usually lower than at other times of the marketing year. Producers could pledge their stored peanuts as collateral for up to 9 months at a loan rate of \$350 per-ton. Producers would then repay the loan at a rate that is the lesser of (1) \$350 per-ton plus interest or (2) a USDA-calculated loan repayment rate, which was not specified in the

bill. If producers were to redeem the loan at less than the loan amount, they would realize a marketing loan gain. Alternatively, producers could receive an amount equivalent to the marketing assistance loan gain, referred to as a loan deficiency payment, by agreeing to forgo a loan. Producers would also be able to forfeit their peanuts to the government as payment for their loan, regardless of the market value of peanuts at the time. According to CBO, the marketing loan payments will cost an estimated \$0.44 billion over the life of the farm bill.

A "buy-out" payment. Quota owners would receive compensation for the lost asset value of their quota. This "buy-out" payment would be made in five annual installments of \$200 per-ton during fiscal years 2002 through 2006. The payment would be based on the quota owners' 2001 quota. According to CBO, payments would total \$1.18 billion to quota owners for the 5-year period from 2002 through 2006.

All peanut producers would be eligible to receive a marketing assistance loan or a loan deficiency payment. However, only those who produced peanuts during crop years 1998 through 2001 (the base production period) would be eligible to receive counter-cyclical and fixed, decoupled payments.

ALL PEANUT PRODUCERS WOULD BENEFIT UNDER THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE'S BILL

New and existing peanut producers would benefit from the support mechanisms contained in the House Committee bill. Table 1 shows the estimated amounts producers would receive from peanut sales and government support under the current peanut program compared with the House Committee bill. Because the peanut provisions of the House Committee bill would essentially establish minimum guaranteed prices—a target price of \$480 per-ton for base production and a \$350 per-ton marketing assistance loan for all other production—the amounts shown in the table generally represent the minimum amount producers could expect to receive for their production.

The table assumes that a peanut producer has 100 acres under production, a yield of 2,500 pounds per acre, and receives a market price of \$325 per-ton. These production and yield assumptions are based on national averages contained in USDA's 1997 Census of Agriculture. The \$325 market price is an estimate based on conversations with shellers and area marketing associations in August 2001.

TABLE 1.—MINIMUM ESTIMATED AMOUNTS PRODUCER WOULD RECEIVE UNDER THE CURRENT AND PROPOSED PEANUT PROGRAMS, ON 100 ACRES OF PRODUCTION

Types of program supports	100 percent quota producer with base production	100 percent additional producer with base production	New producer without base production
Current program:			
Quota support price	¹ \$76,250	Not applicable	Not applicable
Additional support price	Not applicable	² \$16,500	² \$16,500
Total amount	\$76,250	\$16,500	\$16,500
Proposed program:			
Market revenue	² \$40,625	³ \$40,625	³ \$40,625
Counter-cyclical	⁴ \$9,988	⁴ \$9,988	Not applicable
Fixed, decoupled	⁵ \$3,825	⁵ \$3,825	Not applicable
Marketing assistance loan gain	⁶ \$3,125	⁶ \$3,125	⁶ \$3,125
Lost asset value	⁷ \$25,000	Not applicable	Not applicable
Total amount	\$82,563	\$57,563	\$43,750
Difference between current and proposed program	\$6,313	\$41,063	\$27,250

¹ Represents the product of the \$610 per-ton quota support price times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres. Because this is considered a "no-net cost" program to the government, this is paid by the consumer.

² Represents the minimum amount an additional or new peanut producer would receive, calculated as the product of \$132 per-ton additional loan rate times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres. However, these producers may receive higher amounts if they sell their peanuts for export rather than placing them under loan.

³ Represents the \$325 per-ton market price times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres.

⁴ Represents the \$480 per-ton target price minus the \$350 loan rate and the \$36 per-ton fixed, decoupled payment times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres times 85 percent. Producers would receive this payment even if they choose not to plant peanuts since it is calculated using historic yield and acreage.

⁵ Represents the \$36 per-ton fixed, decoupled payment times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres times 85 percent. Producers would receive this payment even if they choose not to plant peanuts since it is calculated using historic yield and acreage.

⁶ Represents either a marketing loan gain or a loan deficiency payment. It is the product of the difference between the \$350 per-ton marketing assistance loan and the \$325 per-ton market price times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres. If the market price decreases, these government support costs would increase to make up the difference between the lower market price and the marketing assistance loan rate.

⁷ Represents the product of the \$200 per-ton compensation for the lost asset value of quota times 1.25 tons (2,500 pounds per acre) times 100 acres. This "buy-out" payment is only paid during fiscal years 2002–2006.

Note.—Under the proposed program, producers with base production could also receive support as a new producer if they expand production.

Source: GAO's analysis of USDA's data and the House Committee bill.

As the table shows, most of the government's payments under the House Committee bill would go to quota peanut producers with base production, followed by payments to additional peanut producers with base production. This is because quota holders and additional producers would be eligible to receive the counter-cyclical payment, the fixed, decoupled payment, and a marketing assistance loan payment. In addition, quota owners would be compensated for the value of their lost asset.

Nevertheless, current additional and new peanut producers potentially gain the most under the House Committee bill because they could (1) market their peanuts in the domestic edible market and (2) receive a minimum guaranteed price of \$350 per-ton under the marketing assistance loan. For example, as the table shows, producers of additional peanuts with base production on 100 acres would have been guaranteed \$16,500 per year under the existing program, compared with \$57,563 under the proposed bill.

Peanut production would be expected to increase to the extent that the House Committee bill would provide increased returns to producers that are higher than the returns they would have received under the old program or that are higher relative to other commodities that they produce. If production increases, it is likely to cause market prices for peanuts to fall and government payments to increase.

CONSUMERS SHOULD PAY LESS FOR PEANUTS, BUT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD PAY MORE

Under the House Committee on Agriculture's bill, the burden of supporting peanut producers would shift from consumers to the government. Consumers—defined as shellers, manufacturers, and the general public—should pay less for domestically produced peanuts because the proposed legislation would eliminate the \$610 quota support price, which is substantially higher than the estimated \$321 to \$462 per-ton world price over the past 5 years.

While consumers should benefit under the House Committee bill, government costs would increase. For example, the current peanut program is intended to operate with no net cost to the government, while the House Committee bill would provide direct government support payments to peanut producers. CBO estimates that these direct support payments would cost \$3.5 billion over the next 10 years. This cost estimate includes counter-cyclical and fixed, decoupled payments, marketing assistance loans, and the buy-out payments for the lost asset value of the quota. To the extent to which producers expand production beyond CBO's estimates, increases in government costs could be greater than estimated.

PROPOSED PROGRAM PROVISIONS MAY BE CONSIDERED TRADE DISTORTING BUT SHOULD DECREASE INCENTIVES FOR IMPORTS

Several of the new support mechanisms contained in the House Committee bill may be identified as "trade distorting"—altering free trade of peanuts—under the 1994 Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture. For example, gains resulting from loan deficiency payments and marketing assistance loans for other crops, such as corn and cotton, have previously been identified as trade distorting by USDA. Our obligation under the Uruguay Round Agreement is to hold the amount of such U.S. trade-distorting government support below \$19.1 billion annually by 2000. In 1998, USDA notified the World Trade Organization that 12 commodities received support identified as trade distorting, but the amount remained within the cap. Negotiations are under way, however, to further reduce trade-distorting government support.

Although some of the new support mechanisms may be considered trade distorting, to

the extent to which they lead to lower domestic peanut prices, these supports should reduce incentives for imports, primarily from Argentina and Mexico. According to peanut shellers, domestically produced peanuts would be purchased at prices that are less than the current \$610 per-ton quota loan rate. The shellers also hope that a lower U.S. peanut price will help them increase exports.

AGENCY COMMENTS

We received oral comments on a draft of this report from USDA's Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service and the Economic Research Service and the U.S. Trade Representative. They generally agreed with the substance of the report and provided technical and clarifying comments, which we incorporated as appropriate. FSA officials also informed us there are certain items in the House Committee bill that will require technical clarification. USDA has sent a letter to the House Agricultural Committee requesting guidance and clarification of these issues and was awaiting a response from the Committee as of the date of this letter.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

In order to respond to your request, we obtained and analyzed the Farm Security Act of 2001, testimony provided by producer and industry officials to the House Committee on Agriculture in June 2001 and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in July 2001, the World Trade Organization and the USDA Economic Research Service reports on domestic supports, the USDA's 1997 Census of Agriculture, and other information pertaining to domestic and international peanut production. We also interviewed representatives from USDA, peanut area marketing associations, peanut shellers, and a product manufacturer concerning the bill's provisions and potential impacts. To estimate the minimum amount of producer receipts, we reviewed the applicable provisions of the House Committee bill, obtained and examined data on peanut production, yield, and price.

We conducted our work from July through August 2001, in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We will provide copies of this report to the congressional committees with jurisdiction over farm programs; the Honorable Ann M. Veneman, Secretary of Agriculture; Ambassador Robert B. Zoellick, U.S. Trade Representative; and other interested parties. The letter will also be available on GAO's home page at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact me at (202) 512-3841 or Assistant Director Robert C. Summers at 404-679-1839. Other key contributors to this report were Carol Bray, Mary Denigan-Macauley, and John C. Smith.

LAWRENCE J. DYCKMAN,
Director, Natural Resources and Environment.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001. Today's farm bill is the result of two years' work by Chairman COMBEST and Ranking Member STENHOLM.

On September 18, 1999, eight other members of the House Agriculture Committee, Republicans and Democrats, came to Hutchinson, Kansas for a field hearing on the State of the Farm Economy. The hearing came at a time when Congress was poised to act on its second emergency assistance bill in as many years.

With the passage of a disaster package in October of 1998, the Chairman of the committee saw it appropriate to come to Kansas

the next year and begin to hear from farmers and ranchers on suggested changes for farm programs. For the next two years, farmers continued to struggle, and Congress continued to respond with additional emergency spending bills to help producers cope with the sustained period of depressed commodity prices.

During this time, the House Agriculture Committee was not satisfied with simply passing disaster bills with no end in sight. The Chairman of the Committee took the lead in getting new ideas from farmers, ranchers, economists, and other policy experts concerned about U.S. agriculture.

Now, over two years and 40 hearings later, we are here to consider the House version of a new farm bill, H.R. 2646—the Farm Security Act.

The bill before the House today represents a bipartisan compromise, worked through the full committee process. The concepts of the bill were initially released as a draft for members and producers to comment on the proposal. Legislation was drafted, a two-day mark-up was held, and on August 2nd, the Farm Security Act was reported favorably by voice vote of the full House Agriculture Committee.

CONSERVATION

This bill responds to producers, consumers, and the American public as a whole. First, I would like to speak to an area that has recently been discussed at length: conservation.

As the Vice-Chairman of the subcommittee on Conservation, I am proud to support this bill. Originally, I introduced my own version of a conservation title, H.R. 1938—The Conservation Enhancement Act. I am pleased that many of the provisions of my bill are included in the Farm Security Act. The bill includes an 80 percent funding increase in conservation spending and gives the largest increase to a program for working lands that remain in production agriculture, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP).

The EQIP program is instrumental in protecting watersheds, improving environmental practices, and addressing some of the most difficult environmental problems we face today. However, as we heard in hearings from producers and conservation groups, EQIP can't work if it doesn't have adequate funding or flexibility. This bill goes a long way to address both of those important issues.

For small producers, we heard that contracts were too long to be practical and that financial assistance was not made available until all the work, and costs, were already paid by the farmer. For farmers with extremely limited resources, the best intentions can not overcome economic realities of farming. In this bill, we address those issues by allowing costs to be reimbursed earlier and reducing the length of contracts to allow more small farmers to participate.

We also heard from livestock producers about their need to access technical assistance and other the resources available to meet the demands of an increasingly regulated environment. This bill reserves 50 percent of the EQIP funds for livestock producers. If we truly want to fix the problems that exist today, we must allow livestock producers to access the programs that are designed to help address environmental problems.

In addition, the bill creates a water conservation program. While we often focus on water quality issues, for many parts of the

country, water conservation is the first step that must be taken to improve the environment.

There are many other provisions of the Conservation title, but I just want to touch on a couple of programs to help explain to my colleagues the sheer size of the work farmers and ranchers are doing today.

The Conservation Reserve Program is one of the most important programs at the United States Department of Agriculture, in terms of reducing water and wind erosion. According to the USDA, each acre of CRP reduces erosion by 19 tons per year. The program has also been extremely successful in enhancing wildlife habitat for many species. Under this bill, CRP is expanded to 39.2 million acres. 39.2 million acres is hard for most of us to conceive. My own yard is about 4 tenths of an acre, and for my lawnmower, that is plenty.

However, the amount of land under the protection of the Conservation Reserve Program is truly enormous. If CRP was a state, it would be the largest state East of the Mississippi. If the area covered by CRP ran along the eastern seaboard, it would entirely cover Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Delaware. For those of you out west, CRP is almost as big as the entire state of Washington.

The Committee bill also increases wetlands conservation by adding an additional 1.5 million acres to the Wetlands Reserve Program. This increase brings the total land in this program up to 2.5 million acres. The total amount of land protected under these two programs and removed from production agriculture is over 41 million acres—an area almost as large as the state of Oklahoma.

You will likely hear today that we need more conservation spending, and at times, it is hard to find a reason to say no, but within the Committee we worked hard to balance demands with the resources available. Conservation and the protection of the environment are important priorities, but they are not the only issues before the committee. There are nine titles in this bill, and each one represents an important part of our policies to help rural America.

FARM PROGRAMS

Finally, I would like to speak directly on the changes made to farm programs. Farmers and ranchers are experiencing difficult times, but they like several features of the current farm program.

The proposed farm bill retains the flexibility farmers need. The bill retains a market-oriented structure that allows farmers to decide what to plant. The bill also answers the single largest concern we heard from producers throughout the hearings of the last two years—the need for a counter cyclical program.

While no single consensus from all the producers was developed, the Committee heard, loud and clear, that some type of a counter cyclical assistance program was needed. When prices fall dramatically, there does need to be a safety net, and it should not take an act of Congress to kick in. This bill provides farmers with a simple, effective counter cyclical program.

Kansas net farm income dropped by 39.9 percent, last year. This is the fourth largest drop of net income from agriculture of any state in the nation. Clearly, this bill is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. Conservation and farm pro-

grams are two of the largest titles of this farm bill, but there are 7 others and all 9 titles have been carefully crafted to address the concerns we heard from constituents across America during our committee hearings.

This is a balanced bill that continues important programs and create new ones to address emerging needs, while still remaining within budget constraints.

The bill is important for this nation's farmers and ranchers, it is important for all of us concerned about a clean environment, and it is important security and safety of this nation's food supply.

Mr. Chairman, with these points in mind, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Farm Bill is an opportunity to help American farmers meet the challenges of a new century. We are the strongest farming nation in the world, with abundant food at reasonable prices and we export far more than we import. However, this comes at a very high price. Our environment, despite some impressive improvements, still suffers. The structure of our current farming industry uses too much water, generates too much pollution, and too much of our best agricultural land is lost due to sprawl, erosion, and misuse. Smaller farmers continue to be forced to sell while entry into the business is prohibitively expensive and difficult.

Perverse programs mean more farmers are dependent on ever-increasing subsidies. The complex web of loans, credits, quotas, and direct payments is expensive for Americans both as taxpayers and consumers. The support system tends to obscure financial impacts while it distorts decisions farmers make regarding type and quantity of crops, often to the detriment of the long-term productivity of the land and the health of the environment. At a time when we seek to open foreign markets to more American production, we are still sheltering ours in ways that violate the spirit, if not the letter, of our own trade agreements.

The United States has been able to survive and some farmers thrive under this system because we had seemingly inexhaustible supplies of fertile land, abundant water, tolerance for cutting environmental corners, and generous financial support. That world is changing. Our environmental standards are getting stronger. Due to the threats of sprawl, water pollution, pesticides, fertilizer, and the excesses of factory farms, the public will never tolerate backsliding. Environmental standards will only get stronger still.

Past practices and government policies have too often stressed our water supplies and the ecosystems that depend upon them. Water systems are depleted far beyond their ability to replenish supply. The inevitable result is more controversy and conflict between competing users. The sad plight of the Klamath Basin in the Pacific Northwest is one example of an emerging pattern all over the West, which will only get worse over time.

American agriculture and our public that depends on it can do better. We must begin now to shift from subsidies that encourage production of some crops, regardless of need, to the protection of land and the people who farm. Paying the farmer to be able to do the right thing is the most cost-effective solution. It is also the only solution that is sustainable for the environment and the taxpayer. Over the course of the next 10 years, we must implement this new vision of agriculture for the new

century. In the meantime, we must protect the farms and farmers who choose to take advantage of this opportunity.

Until we have a bill that makes this transition, I must withhold my support.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, pursuant to House Resolution 248, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 120, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

YEAS—291

Abercrombie	Brady (TX)	Cubin
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Cunningham
Akin	Bryant	Davis (FL)
Allen	Burr	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Buyer	Davis, Jo Ann
Baca	Calvert	Deal
Baird	Camp	DeGette
Baldacci	Cannon	DeLauro
Ballenger	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Barcia	Capito	Dicks
Bartlett	Capps	Dingell
Barton	Carson (IN)	Dooley
Becerra	Carson (OK)	Doyle
Bentsen	Chambliss	Edwards
Bereuter	Clay	Ehlers
Berkley	Clayton	Ehrlich
Berry	Clement	Emerson
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Engel
Bishop	Coble	English
Blagojevich	Collins	Etheridge
Blunt	Combest	Evans
Boehner	Condit	Everett
Bonilla	Cooksey	Farr
Bonior	Costello	Filner
Bono	Cramer	Fletcher
Boucher	Crenshaw	Foley
Boyd	Crowley	Forbes

Ford	Lantos	Rogers (KY)
Frost	Largent	Rogers (MI)
Gallegly	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Ganske	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Gekas	Latham	Rush
Gilchrest	LaTourette	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	Leach	Sabo
Gilman	Levin	Sandlin
Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Goode	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer
Gordon	Lowe	Schakowsky
Graham	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
Granger	Lucas (OK)	Scott
Graves	Luther	Serrano
Green (TX)	Manzullo	Sessions
Greenwood	Mascara	Sherman
Grucci	Matheson	Shimkus
Gutierrez	Matsui	Shows
Gutknecht	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McCollum	Simpson
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Skeen
Hansen	McGovern	Skeltion
Hart	McIntyre	Smith (MI)
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Smith (TX)
Hayes	Meek (FL)	Snyder
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Solis
Herger	Millender	Souder
Hill	McDonald	Spratt
Hilleary	Mink	Stenholm
Hilliard	Moore	Strickland
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Stump
Hobson	Napolitano	Stupak
Holden	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Holt	Ney	Tanner
Hooley	Norwood	Tauzin
Horn	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Hostettler	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Hoyer	Osborne	Terry
Hulshof	Ose	Thomas
Hunter	Otter	Thompson (CA)
Hyde	Oxley	Thornberry
Inslee	Pallone	Thune
Isakson	Pascarell	Thurman
Israel	Pastor	Tiahrt
Issa	Payne	Tiberi
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Towns
Jackson-Lee	Pence	Trafficant
(TX)	Peterson (MN)	Turner
Jefferson	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Jenkins	Phelps	Vitter
John	Pickering	Walden
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Walsh
Johnson, E. B.	Pombo	Watkins (OK)
Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy	Watson (CA)
Jones (NC)	Portman	Watt (NC)
Keller	Price (NC)	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (MN)	Putnam	Weldon (PA)
Kennedy (RI)	Radanovich	Weller
Kerns	Rahall	Whitfield
Kildee	Rangel	Wicker
Kingston	Regula	Wilson
Kirk	Rehberg	Wolf
Knollenberg	Reyes	Woolsey
Kolbe	Reynolds	Wu
LaHood	Riley	Wynn
Lampson	Rodriguez	Young (AK)
Langevin	Roemer	

NAYS—120

Armey	Deutsch	King (NY)
Baldwin	Doggett	Klecza
Barr	Doolittle	Kucinich
Barrett	Dreier	LaFalce
Bass	Dunn	Lee
Berman	Eshoo	Linder
Biggert	Fattah	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Lofgren
Boehlert	Flake	Maloney (CT)
Borski	Fossella	Maloney (NY)
Boswell	Frank	Markey
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	McDermott
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	McHugh
Capuano	Goss	McInnis
Cardin	Green (WI)	McNulty
Castle	Harman	Meehan
Chabot	Hefley	Menendez
Conyers	Hinche	Mica
Coyne	Hoeffel	Miller (FL)
Crane	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Honda	Miller, George
Davis (CA)	Istook	Moran (VA)
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Morella
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Murtha
Delahunt	Kaptur	Myrick
DeLay	Kind (WI)	Nadler
DeMint		Neal

Northup	Royce	Stearns
Oberstar	Ryan (WI)	Sununu
Obey	Sanchez	Tancredo
Owens	Sanders	Tauscher
Paul	Schrock	Tierney
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Pitts	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Quinn	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Ramstad	Shays	Velazquez
Rivers	Sherwood	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Simmons	Waters
Rothman	Slaughter	Weiner
Roukema	Stark	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus	Houghton	Smith (WA)
Baker	Kilpatrick	Thompson (MS)
Burton	Lipinski	Visclosky
Callahan	McCarthy (MO)	Waxman
Cox	Mollohan	Wexler
Duncan	Oliver	
Gibbons	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1225

Messrs. SHAYS, QUINN, HONDA and MCNULTY and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 371, final passage of H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to District business which required my attention, I am unable to be present for final passage of H.R. 2646, The Farm Security Act, rollcall No. 371. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2646.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2646, the Clerk be authorized to correct the table of contents, section numbers, punctuation, citations and cross-references and to make other such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2960

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, the schedule for the remainder of the day and for the following week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am pleased to announce the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later today. On Tuesday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures, subject to rules being granted: the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002; and H.R. 2975, the PATRIOT Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, appropriators are also working hard on many bills now in conference, and it is my hope that the appropriations conference reports will be available for consideration in the House at some point next week.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I might inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Texas a couple of questions. Can the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished majority leader, tell us what appropriation conference report might in fact surface next week for our consideration?

□ 1230

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to respond. We believe that Interior is the most likely appropriation bill to come back from conference next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if we could just review for a second where we are through the appropriation process. There are two left here in the House to do, the Labor-HHS and the Defense bill; is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, they have four or five left; is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly, but it is four or five, yes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we should expect these conference reports to start

to flow with some rapidity here within the next couple of weeks so that we can finish them by the end of perhaps October; is that a fair assessment?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is my expectation. I am told by the appropriators who are, in fact, negotiating bicamerally and bipartisanly with the White House that things are going well, and we should have every reason to expect that we could complete our work by the end of the month.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the Aviation Security bill possible for schedule next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman for the inquiry. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the negotiations on that bill continue. I believe they are really down to one issue, and it is possible that we might see that bill on the floor next week. And as soon as it is agreed to, we will bring it to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I could just make a brief comment on that to the gentleman from Texas. We believe that those who protect and screen our airports should be professionally trained and hired by the Federal Government, and we hope that that will be a part of the bill that moves through this body. And, if not, we hope to have the opportunity to provide the body with a chance to support that concept and that proposal.

The second thing that I want to point out about this bill to the gentleman from Texas is that we believe it is essential that workers who have been laid off be given relief. We passed, the Congress passed, I should say, this \$15 billion bill for the airline industries and a \$70 billion farm bill. It seems to me we certainly can take care of the literally hundreds of thousands of workers now who have been affected by the results of what occurred on September 11, so I am hopeful that the workers are a part of a relief package.

If we are moving together, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, as a country, as Americans, through this very difficult period of ours, everyone has to move, everyone has to be brought together, everyone has to be a part of resolving the problems that beset us and are before us. American workers who have borne the brunt of this catastrophe, who are there cleaning up the sites, who will be there reconstructing the sites, and who are fighting for our country today and wearing our uniform, those Americans deserve to have the consideration of the support they need in a time of economic layoffs.

So I want to really emphasize how important that is and how strongly we are going to push that measure as we move ahead in the next week or so. I would ask the gentleman, what is the likelihood of this economic piece being included in the Aviation Security bill?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman again for the in-

quiry and let me express my sincere appreciation for the points the gentleman has made. On the first point of airline security, there is no doubt about it. Airline security is important; in fact, the security of all transportation in America is important, and that is why indeed we are working so hard. Like the gentleman from Michigan, we believe that the people who are charged with these responsibilities should be professionally trained and competent in the manner in which they carry out their duties. That is why indeed we are working so hard to complete the Airline Security Act which, frankly, would be better understood as a Transportation Security Act for all of America.

Again, the second point that the gentleman raises, the workers that have been finding themselves out of work are, indeed, weighing heavily on the President's mind; and he has sent up a Workers Compensation bill that is being looked at as we speak.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps even on a larger sense of importance, it is our desire to get every American who wants work and who is able to work back on the job as soon as possible. And that is why so much time and effort is being put into this economic stimulus package which, hopefully, we can find its way working through the Committee on Ways and Means in the near future, in which case we should be able to work together to address these concerns of all of these good, deserving American citizens.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The President made the first step on this worker compensation package yesterday in his announcements. I understand his position; but I do not agree with it. I think it is woefully inadequate. I do not think there is enough resources there.

The whole unemployment compensation picture is very cloudy in this country. Very few people are eligible for it today. People will be shocked to know that less than 40 percent of the workers in this country are eligible for compensation. In my own State of Michigan, we have a freeze of \$300 per week; it has been there since 1995. There are all kinds of reforms that are needed in unemployment compensation.

I know we are moving very quickly to take care of the needs of workers in this country, given what has happened and what was happening before September 11, but we have some very major reforms that are needed. And I hope we can work together to embody these reforms as we move ahead with a transportation security package and with the stimulus package as such in the next week and month ahead.

Finally, if I could just raise this one other point with the gentleman from Texas, my friend, and then I will finish. The markup on Fast Track has been now scheduled for Tuesday. I understand it was postponed today. Is that bill coming to the floor soon? If the

gentleman from Texas could help us with that, I would certainly like to know when.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for asking. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the Fast Track or Trade Promotion Authority bill will be, I am told by the chairman of the committee, marked up on Tuesday. I understand this is by agreement with both the Republicans and Democrats in the committee. We would obviously be looking for an opportunity to schedule that bill for the floor as soon after it is reported as possible. At this point, though, until they actually have the markup, I cannot make any pronouncements about its actual floor schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will just share this final comment with my colleague. I have done it before with him, he knows it, and I just think it is important to reiterate it, and that is that is a very, very divisive issue.

I am sure that it would not be wise to bring that up at this point in this session. To the extent that I could be heard over there, and I know I am talking to people who believe deeply in a concept that is different from mine; I think it would be wise not to raise this issue in this Congress and certainly in this session. I would advise my colleague so. But if it is brought up, we are prepared to have a vigorous debate on it.

I would just say one final thing; I am sounding like a Baptist preacher here, excuse me, I am doing a lot of conclusions and finals, but just let me say in the final conclusion, let me just say to the gentleman from Texas that the industrial heartland of this country has been rocked very hard over the, not just since the September 11 tragedy that has occurred, but prior to that. We have huge numbers of folks in steel and auto and iron and hotel and restaurant and you name it that have been affected by this economy. I really think that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the aisle really has to think hard about whether or not we want to have this debate at this time.

We can go ahead and have it, and we will have a vigorous debate and a vigorous argument and we can respect each other's opinions. But Members need to know that it will be an enormously vigorous, difficult issue. I do not think that is the kind of division that the country is looking for right now. I do not think it would be helpful, and I just hope that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the aisle, including the distinguished majority leader, will factor that in in his decision-making. And I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for listening to me this afternoon.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman again. If I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one of my favorite parts of my week are these weekly exchanges with the gentleman from Michigan. The

gentleman is always very well focused and to the point in the points he makes. I do appreciate the point the gentleman makes, and I do also look forward to what will be a good floor debate and one that I think we will all enjoy participating in.

But if I might, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to indulge me, it has been brought to my attention that the gentleman from Michigan and, very likely, the gentleman from St. Louis, Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) might find some time, and I would hope very much, to get together Monday night to enjoy the Monday night football game. I have no doubt that one or the other will enjoy it more than one or the other, but I do wish the two gentlemen from Michigan and Missouri an opportunity to watch that game, perhaps together, put down their bets, and maybe just take one evening to have a little bit of good, relaxed companionship around a good sporting event. And we will be back to work with rigorous debate soon after that, but I do not think it hurts any of us to indulge ourselves in what is America's favorite full-time pastime.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan share more in common with their respective teams than the gentleman from Missouri; I only wish we had as great a success as the Rams this year. But I appreciate the gentleman's comment and I will take him up on it.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House join me in wishing my favorite nephew, Ryan, a happy 4th birthday on Saturday next.

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

There was no objection.

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.

MEDICARE DRUG DISCOUNT SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to talk about a very important issue for American seniors and that is a Medicare Drug Discount Security Act that myself and Senator CHUCK HAGEL introduced some time ago.

The President of the United States recently announced his own plan that mirrored many of the things we tried to accomplish. We are very proud of our approach to providing seniors with discounts on prescription drugs. The President announced it in a ceremony at the Rose Garden and we were quite pleased that he had taken the direction by Executive Order. As many of my colleagues know, there was a lawsuit filed by the chain discount drugstores opposing the measure, and it resides now in Federal court.

One of the interesting mythical dynamics that followed the President's announcement was groups saying that it was nothing more than window dressing. It was smoke screen. It was political posturing. It would not amount to much. It is insignificant. It is immaterial. It is not necessary, nor is it helpful. We heard that from a number of groups and a number of citizen and senior advocates. We were quite shocked because we thought, in a free society, a free market economy, when you are able to leverage the number of people participating, thereby getting them a discount on the prices they pay, that is a pretty simple and superb way in which to get seniors discounts now.

□ 1245

Others have objected to the plan saying it was not a good scheme. I questioned at the time if it is such a bad scheme, why do millions of Americans sign up to be AARP members? Usually it is because they get a discount on motel rates and other things.

It was interesting, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, September 25, there was a headline, a new Kennedy campaign on drug cause, former House Member Joseph Kennedy, a Member of this body now in Boston, Massachusetts, has been using now and creating a drug delivery system under his Citizens Energy Corporation. This allows people to join together as members of that group in order to get a discount on prescriptions.

It is interesting, when a Democrat, Mr. Kennedy, announces the plan, AARP says, it certainly is needed, says John Rother, policy director at AARP, a senior citizens advocate group advocating a prescription drug benefit for Medicare recipients. It goes on to talk about the discounts people will be able to receive. It goes on to suggest in this plan that although Citizen Help hopes to target the needy, Kennedy says the group does not have an elaborate screening process. He assumes well-to-do people will opt to stick with private insurance plans which charge on average 5 to 25 copayment for the prescription.

That therein lies the political conundrum. When we announce it as Republicans, Senator HAGEL and myself, and the President enunciates it from the White House, it is met with skepticism, scorn, and outright laughter. When a Democrat announces the plan, it becomes the focal point of how to save seniors money.

Last year during the campaign season I remember Democrats taking a bus and taking seniors up to Canada because they could buy prescription drugs cheaper. Yes, I applaud that. I think it is great when you find a discount, even if you have to cross the border, but they used that as a political campaign and tool in which to defeat senators, by saying our seniors have to go to Canada to get a discount.

Our plan, on the other hand, now mirrored by former Member Kennedy allows people to get discounts here in their own country. They do not have to get on a bus, they do not have to travel to Canada, and they can go to their local pharmacies. They can go to their local plans and get these kinds of discounts.

So I would hope in the spirit of this wonderful new bipartisanship that has emanated out of this Chamber, since September 11 we get down to the business of helping seniors, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, get prescription drug coverage and get it more affordable, without creating a government scheme that will oftentimes be more complicated and more difficult for average seniors to access.

I salute former Member Kennedy. I salute AARP for making the positive comments about our plan. I thank him for introducing it in the community where I was born in Boston, Massachusetts, and I just hope other Democrats now listening to this and reading the newspapers will finally suggest that President Bush was right in announcing from the Oval Office, or at least from the Rose Garden, that he intended to help seniors today, not next year after debate, not the following year after debate, not 5 years from now when the political process winds itself up into a lather trying to provide it, but instead, doing it through the free enterprise system which Mr. Kennedy has done here in this plan.

I urge my colleagues to look at our bill, Senator HAGEL's in the Senate and

mine in the House. It is called the Medicare RX Drug Discount and Security Act. It is worthy of your attention. It will provide discounts up to 30 to 40 percent. It is easy. It is much like Price Club and Costco that so many Members probably use here today because they can buy in volume and buy at discounts. It is why people pay a card fee, \$25 a year, to belong to that club. It lets them shop, buy by volume, by discount, and that is what we are trying to achieve here today. It works in real life.

AARP has millions of members, using discount as an enticement. It has worked in the real world. It can work in the political world if the sides will not engage in negative attacks, but rather constructive dialogue in order to see this come to a fruition.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FARM SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed an important measure that was part and parcel my reason for coming to the United States Congress. Today, this Congress passed a farm bill, meeting an obligation that comes upon us in this Chamber every 5 years to pass a measure that will protect farmers while making the right investment and contribution to conservation in America.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to tell the Hoosier farmers that I serve all across eastern Indiana that the Farm Security Act and the passage of that Act in this Chamber today ought to be a source of encouragement and enormous pride to them, not because we in this Chamber wrote a farm bill, but because in every sense, farmers and ranchers across the United States of America, for perhaps the first time, truly wrote farm policy in this country.

In the past 2 years the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a proud member, held field hearings with agricultural interests across the country, 47 hearings in all, in preparation of a farm bill. Hearings were held over a 16-month period of time on H.R. 2646. There were 368 witnesses who testified before our committee during that 16-month period.

The vision of the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), to ask commodity groups and organizations and farm groups across the country to come before our committee and actually offer their own version of a farm bill was, to say the least, visionary.

From my own part, we held nearly a dozen town hall meetings across eastern Indiana in barns and in warehouses and in feed stores, asking farmers who know much better than this Hoosier what ought to have happened in this bill, and they gave us that input. So the first thing I would brag about today is the job that the American farmer and the American rancher did in the preparation of the Farm Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, let us be candid, the passage today was not altogether certain. It was not altogether ensured, with some opposition from the administration to the timing of this bill, and even some opposition from the leadership in both political parties. Those of us who worked hard on this bill knew we had our work cut out for us.

People argued that with USDA projections that net cash farm income in 2001 will achieve record levels that we did not need a farm bill now. I would argue that given the realities of the farm economy and given the circumstances on the international scene now was precisely the time for the House Committee on Agriculture and the leadership of the House of Representatives to rise to the challenge.

Even the USDA's economists agree that net farm cash income is not a good tool to base farm policies on, that livestock receipts are the driving force for the increase in net cash farm income in 2001, and that affects very few of the farmers that I serve. The increase in crop production expenses more than offsets the increase in crop cash receipts.

Without a new farm bill this year, net cash returns from major field crops would be 5.8 billion lower for 2002 crops than for 2001, and the Farm Security Act that we passed today, of course, does not happen in a vacuum.

I know that some in the national media sneered at those of us who suggested that bolstering the farm economy in America was not a matter of national security. The Wall Street Journal's left column that I usually admire suggested as much earlier this week.

Let me say as we turn our attention in the weeks ahead to Wall Street and to stimulating our economy with a much-needed economic stimulus package, I believe the House Committee on Agriculture, the Democratic and Republican leadership on that committee and the leadership that voted to pass the Farm Security Act today said, before we turn our attention to Wall Street, let us turn our attention to rural Main Street. We have sent a deafening message of strength to the farm economy in America today.

It has been a profound privilege for me as a first term Member of Congress to serve as the only member of the majority from the State of Indiana on the House Committee on Agriculture. It has been a challenging time. I commend, again, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and

the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for their outstanding leadership in forging a bipartisan bill long before bipartisanship was the theme of this Chamber, and I commend all of my colleagues today for putting the interests of farmers and ranchers ahead of the politics of the moment and saying and recognizing that a strong rural America means a strong American economy, and now is the time that all of America be strong as we face the difficult challenges of the days ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CALL-UP OF THE RHODE ISLAND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 our world changed forever. The United States suffered an attack unlike any the modern world has ever known. Thousands have been lost and will be forever missed by their friends and families. As we mourn this loss, we must find ways to strengthen our national homeland defense and to prevent terrorism both here and abroad.

Critical to meeting this goal will be the brave and dedicated members of our Armed Forces. I rise today to pay my respects to these brave men and women, in particular, the dedicated members of the 143rd Airlift Wing of the National Guard who will be deployed today.

The National Guard has tirelessly served our great Nation since the organization of its first units in 1636 in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The Guard fought in Korea, Vietnam, and the Gulf War. During the 1990s, the Guard's role dramatically increased to a total force partner at home and throughout the world. Today, we are relying on the Guard in our airports and communities throughout the country to guard us from a recurrence of what was unthinkable just a short time ago.

Mr. Speaker, we have entered into an era in which homeland defense is a crucial concern for which we rely heavily on our National Guard. These remarkable people stand out among ordinary Americans because they have chosen to give of themselves and help defend our country in times of need.

Many of our National Guard units are being called up and asked to leave their families, jobs and lives behind in order to serve and protect this Nation. From conducting intelligence work to being deployed to high risk regions of the world, these brave men and women will

be critical to ensuring our safety here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the 44 members of the 143rd Security Forces Squadron from the Rhode Island Air National Guard who were called up to active duty. They possess a fierce spirit which burns most brightly when it is given direction and purpose, and this is the time, more than ever, to utilize that spirit.

While I take strength in their immense abilities and know that they will help ensure America's safety, I look forward to welcoming them all home to Rhode Island very soon.

□ 1300

DR. SHIRLEY TILGHMAN ASSUMES PRESIDENCY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday in my congressional district, I had the honor along with 4,000 students, parents, dignitaries, and local residents to gather in front of historical Nassau Hall to witness Dr. Shirley Tilghman take the office as the 19th President of Princeton University.

Dr. Tilghman is highly qualified to head Princeton University. She is a world-renowned biology researcher, a beloved teacher, and a leader of vision. In her inaugural address, Dr. Tilghman spoke of the freedom to pursue ideas as an essential investment in the strength of our national character, our culture, and our material lives.

Now more than ever in America, we need institutions of higher education to perform this critical function. At this time of great national introspection and examination, the university and its defense of enduring values are more relevant than ever. This relevance resounded clearly in Dr. Tilghman's address. It is evident to me that this prestigious university has a president very worthy to join the sequence of distinguished scholars who have led it over the past few centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the full text of Dr. Tilghman's address.

DISCOVERY AND DISCOURSE, LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMY IN TIMES OF CRISIS

Faculty, students, staff, trustees, alumni and neighbors of Princeton University, distinguished guests, family and friends:

It is a deep honor for me to assume the office of 19th President of this great university. I accept with both eagerness and humility, knowing full well that I follow in the footsteps of predecessors who have provided Princeton with extraordinary leadership over the past century. Presidents Goheen, Bowen and Shapiro, all of whom are present to witness this beginning of a new presidency, have provided us with a legacy that is envied in all quarters of higher education, a legacy that we will cherish and protect, but also one that we will use as a strong foundation on which to build our future.

Our vision of that future was forever changed by the tragic events of September 11 at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania. In the aftermath of those events, I modified the address that I had been writing in order to speak with you about what is foremost on my mind. President Bush, in his address to a joint session of Congress last week, declared war on international terrorism, a war whose form and outcome are difficult to imagine. Given the enormous challenges and the uncertainty that lie ahead, what is the proper role of the academy during this crisis and in the national debate we are sure to have? How can we contribute as this great country seeks the honorable path to worldwide justice and to peace?

Today the academy holds a highly privileged place in American society because of a long-standing national consensus about the value of education. Another of my predecessors, President Harold Dodds, said in his inaugural address in 1933 that "No country spends money for education, public and private, so lavishly as does the United States. Americans have an almost childlike in what formal education can do for them." That faith is based on a conviction that the vitality of the United States, its creative and diverse cultural life, its staggeringly inventive economy, its national security and the robustness of its democratic institutions owe much to the quality of its institutions of higher education. The spirit of democracy is now reflected more than ever in our education system, with opportunities open to students of all stripes, from 18-year-old freshmen to senior citizens; from students given every imaginable advantage by their parents to students who spent their childhoods living on the streets; from the New Jersey-born to students from around the globe; from students who were ignited by learning from the first day of primary school to high school drop outs who came to formal education through the school of hard knocks. If you will forgive a biologist the impulse to use a scientific metaphor, the American education landscape is like a complex ecosystem, full of varied niches in which a rich diversity of organisms grow and thrive.

Our society's confidence in its institutions of higher education is expressed through the generous investments of the federal and state governments in basic and applied research, investments that wisely couple support for research with support for graduate education. It is also expressed through federal and state investments that subsidize the cost of higher education for those who cannot afford to pay, investments by private foundations and charities who see colleges and universities as the best routes for achieving their strategic goals, and investments by individuals and by the private sector, who see universities as the incubators of future health and prosperity. In return for this broad support, society rightfully expects certain things from us. It expects the generation of new ideas and the discovery of new knowledge, the exploration of complex issues in an open and collegial manner and the preparation of the next generation of citizens and leaders. In times of trouble, it is especially important that we live up to these expectations.

The medieval image of the university as an ivory tower, with scholars turned inward in solitary contemplation, immunized from the cares of the day, is an image that has been superseded by the modern university constructed not of ivory, but of a highly porous material, one that allows free diffusion in both directions. The academy is of the world, not apart from it. Its ideals, crafted over many generations, are meant to suffuse the

national consciousness. Its scholars and teachers are meant to move in and out of the academy in pursuit of opportunities to use their expertise in public service, in pursuit of creative work that will give us illumination and insight and in pursuit of ways to turn laboratory discoveries into useful things. Our students engage the world with a strong sense of civic responsibility, and when they graduate they become alumni who do the same. This is as it should be.

Yet the complex interplay between society and the academy also creates a tension, because the search for new ideas and knowledge is not and cannot be motivated by utilitarian concerns. Rather it depends on the ability to think in new and creative ways, to challenge prevailing orthodoxies, to depart from the status quo. We must continually strive to preserve the freedom of our students and our scholars to pursue ideas that conflict with what we believe or what we would like to believe, and to explore deep problems whose solutions have no apparent applications. This is not a privilege we grant to a handful of pampered intellectuals; rather it is a defining feature of our society and an essential investment in the continuing strength of our character, our culture, our ideas and our material lives. When the Nobel laureate John Nash developed the mathematical concepts underlying non-cooperative game theory as a graduate student at Princeton, he could not foresee that those concepts would be used today to analyze election strategies and the causes of war and to make predictions about how people will act. When Professor of Molecular Biology Eric Wieschaus set out as a young scientist to identify genes that pattern the body plan of the fruit fly embryo, he could not know that he would identify genes that play a central role in the development of human cancer. We have learned that we cannot predict with any accuracy how discoveries and scholarship will influence future generations. We also have learned that it is unwise to search only in predictable places, for new knowledge often depends upon preparing fertile ground in obscure places where serendipity and good luck, as well as deep intelligence, can sprout. Freedom of inquiry, which is one of our most cherished organizing principles, is not just a moral imperative, it is a practical necessity.

Just as we have an obligation to search widely for knowledge, so we also have an obligation to insure that the scholarly work of the academy is widely disseminated, so that others can correct it when necessary, or build on it, or use it to make better decisions, develop better products or construct better plans. In the days ahead, I hope that our country's decision makers will draw on the knowledge that resides on our campuses, on historians who can inform the present through deep understanding of the past, philosophers who can provide frameworks for working through issues of right and wrong, economists whose insights can help to get the economy back on track, engineers who know how to build safer buildings, scientists who can analyze our vulnerabilities to future attack and develop strategies for reducing those vulnerabilities, and scholars in many fields who can help them understand the motivations of those who would commit acts of terrorism here and throughout the world.

American universities have been granted broad latitude not only to disseminate knowledge, but to be the home of free exchange of ideas, where even the rights of those who express views repugnant to the majority are vigorously protected. Defending academic freedom of speech is not particularly difficult in times of peace and prosperity. It is in times of national crisis that our true commitment to freedom of speech

and thought is tested. History will judge us in the weeks and months ahead by our capacity to sustain civil discourse in the face of deep disagreement, for we are certain to disagree with one another. We will disagree about how best to hold accountable those responsible for the attacks of September 11. We will disagree about how broadly the blame should be shared. We will disagree about the ways in which nationalism and religion can be perverted into fanaticism. We will disagree about whether a just retribution can be achieved if it leads to the deaths of more innocent victims. We will disagree about the political and tactical decisions that our government will make, both in achieving retribution and in seeking to protect against similar attacks in the future. We will disagree about how and when to wage war and how best to achieve a real and lasting peace.

The conversations we will have on our campuses are not intended to reach a conformity of view, a bland regression to the mean. Rather we aim to come to a deeper appreciation and understanding of the complexity of human affairs and of the implications of the choices we make. Perhaps, if we are very dedicated, we will find the wisdom to see an honorable, yet effective, path to a world in which terrorism is a thing of the past. With generosity of spirit and mutual respect, we must listen carefully to one another, and speak with our minds and our hearts, guided by the principles we hold dear. By conducting difficult discussions without prejudice or anger, by standing together for tolerance, civil liberties and the right to dissent, by holding firm to core principles of justice and freedom and human dignity, this university will serve our country well. By so doing, we will be true patriots.

Let me now turn to the third obligation that we have to society: the education of the next generation of citizens and leaders. Princeton's view of what constitutes a liberal arts education was expressed well by Woodrow Wilson, our 13th President, whose eloquent words I read at Opening Exercises: "What we should seek to impart in our colleges, therefore, is not so much learning itself as the spirit of learning. It consists in the power to distinguish good reasoning from bad, in the power to digest and interpret evidence, in the habit of catholic observation and a preference for the non partisan point of view, in an addiction to clear and logical processes of thought and yet an instinctive desire to interpret rather than to stick to the letter of reasoning, in a taste for knowledge and a deep respect for the integrity of human mind."

Wilson, and the presidents who followed him, rejected the narrow idea of a liberal arts education as preparation for a profession. While understanding the importance of professional education, they made it clear that at Princeton we should first and foremost cultivate the qualities of thought and discernment in our students, in the belief that this will be most conducive to the health of our society. Thus we distinguish between the acquisition of information, something that is essential for professional training, and the development of habits of mind that can be applied in any profession. Consequently we celebrate when the classics scholar goes to medical school, the physicist becomes a member of Congress, or the historian teaches primary school. If we do our job well as educators, each of our students will take from a Princeton education a respect and appreciation for ideas and values, intellectual openness and rigor, practice in civil discourse and a sense of civic responsibility. During these troubled times, our students and our alumni will be called upon to exercise these qualities in their professions, their communities and their daily lives. By so

doing, and through their leadership, their vision and their courage, they will help to fulfill Princeton's obligation to society and bring true meaning to our motto, "Princeton in the nation's service and in the service of all nations."

Thank you.

SCREENING BAGGAGE FOR EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information to my colleagues that is pertinent to our next several hours of us in the House of Representatives. The reason I say that is in the next several hours probably about 80 percent of us will be getting on airplanes. We are going to go out to Dulles, some to National. We are going to get on airplanes to fly back to our districts to work with the people who have been so traumatized by our recent losses, and that is part of our duty to do it.

But what the information I want to share with my colleagues is that when we get on those airplanes in the next several hours, we will be getting on the airplanes with 100, 150, 200, maybe 300 other Americans. All of those Americans will be getting on airplanes that have not had the baggage screened for explosive devices when they are put in the belly of the jets that we get on.

The sad fact is that today I have found and many others in the last few weeks, much to our surprise, that our security apparatus does not screen for explosive devices on bags that are put in the baggage compartments of our airlines. The reason that we have not done that in the past is two-fold. Number one, the theory has been in the past that we do not have to screen for bombs in luggage. All we have to do is to make sure that the people who put the baggage on get on with the plane, under the assumption that no one would want to go down with the plane. Well that assumption is certainly moot after September 11. That basis for our strategy has greatly outlived its purpose.

The second reason that we have not screened for bombs on aircraft in the baggage compartment is that it has involved some cost. But, Mr. Speaker, I can state that I am very, very confident that the hundreds of people that are going to get on the airplane at Dulles and National today believe that the cost is worth it to screen for bombs in the baggage compartment of airplanes. The threat is too great, the potential loss is too great, and the available technology is too good not to use it. The fact is we have technology that can sniff with high level, actually not sniff, but they use another technology, a high level of probability will catch explosive devices, but we are simply not using it.

As a result of that, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and myself and 14 others introduced yesterday the Baggage Screening Act which will require that bags shall be screened for explosive devices before they go on an airplane 100 percent. Right now maybe 5 or 10 percent are screened. That is not enough. That means 90, 95 percent of our bags are not screened for explosive devices. That is not good enough security for American people.

The reason we introduced this bill is that today and in the next few days, we are attempting to reach a bipartisan consensus on a security package for airlines. We want to bring to the attention of our leadership that this feature needs to be in our security package. We need to screen for explosive devices. It is the right thing to do. We need to find a way to pay for it. If we do that, a lot of Americans will feel a lot more confident. If we take away nail clippers from passengers, let us keep the bombs out of the baggage.

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CIVILIZATION WILL DEFEAT TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been heartened by the way the Americans have pulled together after the attack of September 11. We have seen the best qualities of America at work, pride, patriotism, courage. Passengers on the plane that went down in Pennsylvania foiled their hijackers' diabolical objective by fighting for freedom. Police, fire, and rescue workers disregarded grave risks to their own lives just to save others. The President rallied America to our purpose through his determination and his grand leadership. And from across the country, we feel a wave of love and support and patriotism.

We saw the best of America after the raw hand of evil struck our Nation. We are left with a defining question. How will we best protect our way of life from those who would destroy freedom to lower an evil nightmare over the free world? It starts with our mindset. Too many people thought that threats to the United States ended with the Cold War. The first thing we have to do is to reinvigorate the idea that freedom is never free. Our way of life has a price tag.

Our founding fathers knew that price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Now we

truly understand that obligation. Now our eyes are wide open. We will never become complacent again. Complacency in the face of evil lays the foundation for the end of liberty.

The international terrorist networks are a cancer growing on the heart of freedom and a direct threat to civilization itself. The events of September 11 reminded us that we must do whatever it takes to defend freedom and root out tyranny and terrorism. That mission begins with good intelligence and a more robust military. For far too long the people we asked to defend America have been fighting our enemies with one arm tied behind their back and that must change.

Today we added to that effort by passing the Intelligence Authorization Act. We need to renew our commitment to our national defense. We must once again rebuild our military by arming our forces with the tools that they need to meet the full scope of threats to our security. We need to spend what it takes to defend America. It is time to begin upgrading our capabilities to defeat and deter those who would target freedom.

We need better human intelligence. Good intelligence is essential to protecting our Nation and our allies, and it is vital to ensuring that our military has the information it needs to safely and effectively carry out its mission. We need to cultivate and develop sources of information that will reveal the movements, activities, and identities of the people plotting evil schemes against people of freedom and civilization.

What might be the most important change, we need to provide our defenders with the flexibility to protect America effectively. The men and women working to save our freedom must have those tools that they need to defeat those who are thinking the unthinkable.

As we move forward in the campaign to save civilization, we need to remember that there is no quick victory just around the corner. We will suffer additional losses. We will lose more great Americans, and we will have to make additional sacrifices here at home. But freedom is worth it. All of us need to understand that.

This war against the cancer of terrorism is a perpetual obligation. It never ends. So we can never drop our guard again. We cannot be confused about the nature of this threat. This conflict is larger than one man or one terrorist network. It is a struggle between all of those who wish to live in freedom and those who wish to enslave the world beneath an oppressive, evil totalitarian ideology. It is a new battle between every American and all of the terrorist networks.

We also have to remind everyone that this is not a conflict over faith. Millions of people in the world draw meaning and fulfillment from the Islamic faith. The extreme views of this splinter movement do not reflect the

wishes of millions of Muslims who only seek a better life for their families.

There is additional danger in the campaign against terrorism. We have got to remember that the traditional threats have not receded. If anything, the terror networks exacerbate the long-standing threats we have always faced. One thing we could do is reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy. Our dependence, a 57 percent dependence on foreign sources of energy weakens our national and economic security.

We need to move towards energy independence and energy security. It will take weeks, months, and years; but America must reduce our dependence on energy from volatile corners of this world. This is a test. It is a test of this generation of Americans. An evil movement thinks it can extinguish that wonderful light of freedom. Terrorists send people to die because they believe we have forgotten who we are. They believe that we lack the resolve to defend our way of life. They hate America and not because we act but simply because we exist.

Americans know who we are. During World War II, America defeated the forces of fascism because that generation risked all that they had to secure freedom for their children. So today we face a crisis that is every bit as serious as that crisis in World War II. It is going to take sacrifices; and unfortunately, it is going to cost lives. But the American people retain the determination, the conviction, and the love of liberty to resist this ongoing aggression and vindicate freedom. We will defend freedom. We will keep freedom alive.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I just learned yesterday that a bill was hastily prepared 2 nights ago by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and without the opportunity to seek comments and testimonies, even to appear before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, the bill was marked up in full committee this morning. The bill passed today by a vote of 23 to 17, rejecting my good friend's, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), amendment that would have literally saved the U.S. tuna industry.

I wanted to thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for his eloquent remarks, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) for his support, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for his support. I especially want to note, the precious vote that also was received by my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the great spirit will enlighten my colleagues of the House, especially if this bill, H.R. 3009, the Andean Trade Preference Act, if this bill passes by not excluding tuna as a duty-free import from Andean countries, it will essentially mean the loss of some 10,000 jobs to tuna cannery workers in California, Puerto Rico, and my district of American Samoa.

Mr. Speaker, current trade policy with regards to canned tuna has provided significant benefits to certain Latin American countries, while at the present time has maintained an industrial tuna processing base in the United States.

Since the enactment of the Andean Trade Preference Act, a number of tuna factories in the Andean region has increased to 229 percent, production capacity is up to 400 percent, direct employment is up to 257 percent, and U.S. exports have grown from about \$15 million to \$100 million annually.

□ 1315

In addition, the U.S. tuna industry has invested over \$20 million in new facilities and vessels. However, I must repeat, extending this agreement by providing duty-free treatment to canned tuna from Andean countries, especially Ecuador, will, in my opinion, destroy the U.S. tuna industry.

I have heard the argument that Congress has included canned tuna both in the Caribbean Basin Initiative and NAFTA, and some have questioned why we are not doing the same for Ecuador and the Andean region. Well, the answer simply is that no other region, especially a country like Ecuador, once we allow duty-free canned tuna to be imported from the Andean countries, has the potential of literally wiping out or destroying the U.S. tuna industry.

For example, Mr. Speaker, Ecuador alone has the production capacity now equivalent to 2,250 tons per day production. Using a 5-day workweek, this equates to a production capacity equivalent to 48.6 million cases of canned tuna per year. And using a 6-day workweek, Ecuador's production capacity is equivalent to 58.5 million cases of canned tuna per year. Now, the interesting thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is that U.S. consumption is only 45.3 million cases of canned tuna per year. What does that mean? Ecuador could produce enough canned tuna to flood the entire U.S. market. And brand names like Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee, brands that Americans have come to trust, would be eliminated from grocery stores. It is even questionable whether tuna from Ecuador is dolphin-safe. So serious are these issues that Mexico levied a 24 percent duty last year on canned tuna exported from Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that Ecuador levies a 20 percent duty on imported canned tuna from the United States. Now, I am all for free

trade, Mr. Speaker; but I am also for fair trade. The fact of the matter is, more than 10,000 jobs in my district, Puerto Rico, and California will be lost if H.R. 3009 passes in its current form. Why? Because the minimum wage rate for workers in Ecuador is 69 cents per hour. This is why a company like StarKist Tuna Company and its parent company, the Heinz Corporation, have been pressuring Congress to allow StarKist to hire fish cleaners in Ecuador and pay Ecuadorans 69 cents per hour. Would this be considered cheap labor or slave labor, I ask, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, the Heinz Corporation, the parent company of StarKist Seafood Company, has lobbied for the inclusion of canned tuna as a duty-free import in the Andean Trade Agreement. But it must be made clear that the StarKist Seafood Company is also the only U.S. tuna processor that supports duty-free treatment for canned tuna exported from Ecuador. Put another way: StarKist is the only tuna processor willing, in my opinion, to sell out American workers in exchange for wages of 69 cents per hour to pay Latin American workers.

As my colleagues may know, Mr. Speaker, American Samoa is the home of the largest tuna cannery facility in the world. One cannery facility is operated by StarKist, a subsidiary of Heinz Corporation; and the other facility is owned by the Chicken of the Sea, a company out of California. Today, these two companies employ more than 5,150 employees, or 74 percent of American Samoa's workforce. Approximately 80 percent of the private sector jobs in my district, Mr. Speaker, are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon the tuna fishing and processing industry.

As Malcolm Stockwell, former vice president of StarKist Seafood Company recently testified, and I quote, "A decrease in production or departure of one or both of the existing processors in American Samoa could devastate the local economy, resulting in massive unemployment and insurmountable financial problems."

The chief executive officer of Chicken of the Sea has already noted that if the Andean Trade Agreement includes duty-free treatment for canned tuna, its operations in American Samoa would be forced to downsize by as much as 50 percent. StarKist has testified that if Ecuador is given the same trade preference as a U.S. territory, like my district, its production would almost immediately shift to low labor-cost areas.

Now, let us talk about labor-cost areas. In fact, I just want to share another bit of information with my colleagues this afternoon. Right now, under the Andean Trade Agreement, fish loins are exported duty free to the United States; and companies like Bumble Bee, Chicken of the Sea, and StarKist buy these fish loins from Andean countries, like Ecuador. But if

canned tuna can also be imported duty free, what is to prevent these U.S. tuna companies from laying off 800 workers from Puerto Rico and closing their facilities in my district, as well as in California, and going and operating out of Ecuador and other Andean countries?

Mr. Speaker, my people want to work. They do not want handouts. I do not know if my colleagues are aware of the fact that for the 40 years since the welfare program was implemented here in the United States, my leaders and our people have never wanted to have welfare applied to our territory. Why? Because we want to work. We do not want handouts. We want to work for what we earn. And if this happens, if this bill passes, with the destruction of the U.S. tuna industry, am I going to have to now come before the Congress and ask for subsidies in support of the 10,000 displaced workers as a result of this bad and poor legislation?

Mr. Speaker, I specifically asked StarKist and H.J. Heinz executives what financial loss StarKist would incur if canned tuna was not included in the Andean Trade Agreement, and I was told StarKist would suffer no economic loss. In other words, StarKist is only in it for the lower labor cost among the Andean countries. I also wish to note that the minimum wage rate in my own district, in American Samoa, for a fish cleaner, is only \$3.20 per hour, which is below the national minimum wage standard and which reminds me of these words offered by a good Senator from Idaho by the name of Senator Borah during the course of the Fair Labor Standards debate right here in this Chamber in 1937.

Senator Borah said, and I quote, "I look upon a minimum wage such as will afford a decent living as a part of a sound national policy. I would abolish a wage scale below a decent standard of living, just as I would abolish slavery. If it disturbed business, it would be the price we must pay for good citizens. I take the position that a man who employs another must pay him sufficient to enable the one employee to live." And Senator Pepper, from Florida, asked, "Well, what if he cannot afford to pay it?" Senator Bora responded, and I quote, "If he cannot afford to pay it, then he should close up the business. No business has a right to coin the very lifeblood of workmen and women into dollars and cents. Every man or woman who is worthy of hire is entitled to sufficient compensation to maintain a decent standard of living. I insist that American industry can pay its employees enough to enable them to live."

Quite frankly, I agree with Senator Borah, Mr. Speaker. StarKist, like any other industry, should pay its employees, whether in Ecuador or American Samoa, enough to live. StarKist should not be about the business of lobbying to suppress wages.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a bit of history also with the Members. At a

time when the national debate right here in this Chamber was about whether or not we should have a minimum standard wage rate, and this debate took place in 1937, the Members representing our fellow Americans from the South did not like the idea that if business wanted to find cheap labor they would go to the South. Industries up in the North always took advantage of the fact that they could find cheap labor if they would go to the South. Well, when this minimum wage was finally passed in the Congress, and after a hot debate in this Chamber, guess what, there was no economic chaos. There was tremendous growth that came along with it, with the increase of wages of the working men and women in our country.

When all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, tuna processing is the only industry holding together the economy of my district, the Territory of American Samoa. American Samoa's only advantage in the global marketplace is duty-free access to the U.S. market. And what price has American Samoa paid to have the U.S. trade privileges? As a territory of the United States, our men and women have paid the ultimate sacrifice in military service to our Nation.

American Samoa pledges its allegiance without question to this great Nation of ours. Ecuador and other Andean countries do not. American Samoa has been the backbone of StarKist's sales. Ecuador has not. In the past 25 years, StarKist and Chicken of the Sea have exported more than \$6 billion worth of tuna from American Samoa to the United States. Thanks to American Samoa, StarKist is the number one brand of tuna in the world today. They call him "Charlie, the Tuna." Well, I do not know about Charlie the Tuna these days with the way they are operating.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that StarKist and its parent company, Heinz Corporation, are willing to allow tuna imports to coming into the U.S. duty free from other Andean countries, a position opposed by two other major U.S. tuna companies and even the entire U.S. tuna-fishing fleet? As StarKist testified at a recent Senate hearing, and I quote, "StarKist will continue to can and sell tuna. However, the history of tuna canning in the United States and Puerto Rico has demonstrated quite clearly that StarKist will also take whatever action is required to remain cost competitive."

Is this why StarKist and Heinz Corporation support a trade agreement that the entire U.S. industry opposes? Will StarKist and Heinz Corporation sell out America at a time when our Nation is in recession and our country is under attack?

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of this esteemed body will do what is right for America. I trust that in these difficult times Members of this body will protect U.S. industries and U.S. workers, particularly the tuna industry. I trust that we will stand united

together to exclude canned tuna from this proposed bill, H.R. 3009.

I would like to share with my colleagues some additional information that was submitted to me by my good friend, the CEO of the Bumble Bee Seafood Company out of California, in San Diego. Another note to my colleagues:

The Andean Pact nations do not comply with many of the environmental regulations supported by the United States. For instance, one of the Andean Pact countries, Bolivia, does not adhere to the dolphin-safe position of the U.S. market. In addition, many of the Andean Pact countries refuse to take enforcement actions against them.

The bill also penalizes the U.S. tuna industry for being American. Not only do we adhere to minimum wage standards and provide Social Security and medical insurance for our workers, we also enforce U.S. regulations regarding the environment and trade.

The letter says, "I support the U.S. initiative to battle the drug trade." We all know that, Mr. Speaker. But I think what is most important here is that I am making an appeal to StarKist Tuna Company and its parent company, Heinz Food Corporation, to join with the rest of the U.S. tuna industry to make the U.S. tuna industry a viable and credible industry in our country for the sake of some 10,000 workers who are about to lose their jobs if the Congress does the bidding of Heinz Corporation.

I think this is most unfair, Mr. Speaker; and I will continue working on this issue in the coming weeks and months. I sincerely hope that there will be a reasonable and an equitable solution to this problem that we now have.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the full letter from the CEO of the Bumble Bee Seafood Company, to which I earlier referred.

BUMBLE BEE SEAFOODS,
San Diego, CA, August 22, 2001.

Hon. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA,
Rayburn Bldg.,
Washington DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALEOMAVAEGA: I am writing on behalf of Bumble Bee Seafoods, the number one brand of canned seafood and number two brand of canned tuna in the United States. Bumble Bee, the only American company with a financial investment in the Andean tuna industry (in Ecuador), along with Chicken of the Sea and U.S. tuna boat owners, strongly oppose the granting of NAFTA status for canned tuna products to members of the Andean Pact as contemplated in S525.

The U.S. tuna industry has been an essential part of the U.S. economy for close to 100 years. We currently provide more than 10,000 jobs in California, Puerto Rico and American Samoa. In addition, we support an even greater number of jobs in related industries and we underpin the existence of the U.S. high seas tuna fishing fleet that operates throughout the Pacific Ocean.

From a consumer standpoint, canned tuna represents the third fastest moving product category in the entire U.S. grocery business and provides a high quality, affordable source of protein for 96% of U.S. families.

As written, S.525 would significantly damage the U.S. tuna industry, threatening jobs

in both the processing and fishing sector. More importantly, it would place our business into foreign hands and benefit countries that do not abide by the same environmental, labor and safety standards imposed on U.S. manufacturers. S525 penalizes the U.S. tuna industry for being American and does an injustice to the U.S. consumer. Let me give you some key facts:

The Andean Pact nations do not comply with many of the environmental regulations supported by the United States. For instance, one of the Andean Pact countries, Bolivia, does not adhere to the dolphin safe position of the U.S. market. In addition, many of the Andean Pact countries refuse to take enforcement action against their flag vessels which have been found to be in violation of IATTC, (Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission) fishing regulations. These actions—or lack of action—threaten the conservation of the tuna stocks.

U.S. Trade policy already provides beneficial access to the U.S. market for the Andean Pact countries through the sale of frozen tuna 'loins'. The current import duty on tuna loins into the United States is less than one half of one percent, which is virtually zero. This trade policy has enabled the Andean Pact tuna industry to explode over the last ten years and supports our position that tuna should continue to be exempted from the Andean Trade Preference Agreement.

ANDEAN PACT TUNA INDUSTRY GROWTH—1990 TO 2000

Number of tuna factories has increased from 7 to 23, up 229%; production capacity has increased from 450 to 2,250 tons per day, up 400%; direct employment has increased from about 3,500 to 12,500, up 257%; exports to the U.S. have grown from about \$15 million to more than \$100 million, up 567%; European exports are up even more significantly; the Andean fishing fleet has grown to the largest in the ETP and now represents more than 35% of the ETP catch.

To put this capacity in perspective, there is enough production capacity in the Andean Pact countries to supply the entire U.S. market. This leads to the real risk of product dumping which will damage the domestic tuna industry. This Andean Pact product is manufactured utilizing labor costs of less than \$0.70/hour and a cost structure that is subsidized by their various governments. This will force the closure of U.S. tuna processing facilities and will decimate the economies of western Puerto Rico and American Samoa where 85% of public sector employment is based on the U.S. tuna industry.

The risk of product dumping has already been experienced by our NAFTA trading partner to the south, Mexico. Mexico recently imposed a 23% import duty on canned tuna products from one of the Andean Pact nations, Ecuador, due to product dumping.

S. 525 is not reciprocal. The bill provides NAFTA duty benefits to the United States market while the Andean Pact countries continue to enforce trade barriers against the U.S. tuna industry by imposing import duties on U.S. produced canned tuna as follows: Ecuador, 20%; Colombia, 20%; Peru, 12%; Bolivia, 10%; Venezuela (a possible addition to the Andean Pact), 20%.

This non-reciprocity also extends to other U.S. produced products that are essential to the processing of canned tuna such as empty cans, packaging and ingredients which are subject to import duties by the Andean Pact countries.

The bill penalizes the U.S. tuna industry for being American. Not only do we adhere to minimum wage standards and provide social security and medical insurance for our workers, we also enforce U.S. regulations regarding the environment and trade. Pro-

viding NAFTA trade benefits to the Andean Pact countries awards them for not complying with these policies.

S. 525 ignores the obligation we have to the U.S. consumer since the quality and food safety standards of many of the tuna processing facilities in the Andean Pact countries are not up to the same standards utilized by U.S. canned tuna processors.

To support the U.S. initiative to battle the drug trade, Bumble Bee has already established tuna loining operations in one of the Andean Pact countries, Ecuador. We are the only American company that has invested in Andean Pact region—close to \$25 million—and we currently provide more than 2,000 jobs.

Yet despite our presence in Ecuador, Bumble Bee does not support S. 525 due to the negative ramifications we have highlighted in this letter.

In summary, S. 525 does not recognize the current tariff benefits on tuna products enjoyed by Andean Pact countries, ignores the tariff recently imposed on tuna products from Ecuador by our primary NAFTA trading partner, will lead to "dumping" that will in turn cause significant harm to the U.S. tuna industry and has significant potential to have negative consequences on the American consumer.

We therefore urge you to exempt canned tuna products from the scope of trade benefits offered by S. 525. There is no justification for granting such trade benefits at this time.

I would like to meet with you to discuss this matter in more detail. I can be reached by phone, e-mail or mail and am happy to travel to Washington to provide any other facts or information that can help you make an informed and responsible decision on this critical piece of trade legislation.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Very truly yours,
CHRISTOPHER LISCHESKI,
President, Chief Operating Officer,
Bumble Bee Seafoods.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of urgent business in the district.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1465. An act to authorize the President to exercise waivers of foreign assistance restrictions with respect to Pakistan through September 30, 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution memorializing fallen firefighters by lowering the American flag to half-staff in honor of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 9, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4142. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Findings of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking on Section 126 Petitions for Purposes of Reducing Interstate Ozone Transport—Federal NOx Budget Trading Program, Rule Revision [FRL-7058-2] (RIN: 2060-AJ47) received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4143. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(I), Delegation of Authority to Washington Department of Ecology and Four Local Air Agencies in Washington [FRL-7057-8] received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4144. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Approval of Operating Permits Program; State of New Hampshire [AD-FRL-7064-1] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4145. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Finding of Attainment; Spokane, Washington Particulate Matter (PM-10) Nonattainment Area [Docket No. WA-01-001; FRL-7064-3] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4146. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.658(g) of The Commission's Rules—The Dual Network Rule [MM Docket No. 00-108] received September 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4147. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Swordfish Quota Adjustment [I.D. 070201A] received September 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4148. 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; Trawling in Steller Sea Lion Protection Areas in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 090701B] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4149. 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; Shallow-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 090401D] received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4150. 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; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 090701A] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4151. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); Atlantic Tunas Reporting, Fishery Allocations and Regulatory Adjustments [Docket No. 000323080-1196-03; I.D. 031500A] (RIN: 0648-AN97) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4152. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 082701D] received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4153. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Recreational Fishery [I.D. 080201B] received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4154. 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 Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Adjustments to the 2001 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass

Commercial Quotas [Docket No. 001121328-1041-02; I.D. 111500C] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4155. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery; Amendment 9 [Docket No. 010105005-1206-02; 120600A] (RIN: 0648-AO64) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4156. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; End of the Primary Season and Resumption of Trip Limits for the Shore-based Fishery for Pacific Whiting [Docket No. 001226367-01; I.D. 081501A] received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4157. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Custody Procedures [INS No. 2171-01] (RIN: 1115-AG40) received September 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4158. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans' Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans' Benefits and Health Care Improvement Act of 2000 (RIN: 2900-AK68) received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4159. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Distribution of Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset to Affected Domestic Producers [T.D. 01-68] (RIN: 1515-AC84) received September 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4160. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Request for comments on regulations that may be adopted on interest allocation [Notice 2001-59] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4161. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Date of Allowance of Refund or Credit [Rev. Rul. 2001-40] received September 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1007. The Committee on Government Reform discharged. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1408. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than October 12, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 3042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the deduction for depreciation shall be computed on a neutral cost recovery basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 3049. A bill to contribute to the defense of the United States against future terrorist attack by providing for the removal from power of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 3050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make effective as of January 1, 2001, all of the individual income tax rate reductions, and to amend the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 to repeal the sunset of such rate reductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. REYES, Mr. JOHN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. UPTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 3051. A bill to designate "God Bless America" as the national hymn of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3052. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require that non-immigrant visa applicants provide fingerprints; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BALDACC, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3053. A bill to prevent identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3054. A bill to award congressional gold medals on behalf of the officers, emergency workers, and other employees of the Federal Government and any State or local government, including any interstate governmental entity, who responded to the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and perished in the tragic events of September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma):

H.R. 3055. A bill to preserve the continued viability of certain businesses which are an integral part of the air transportation system; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3056. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to take certain actions to improve airline security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 3057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce to 3 years the depreciation recovery period for qualified technological equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. STARK, Mr. HORN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GORDON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SABO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TANCRED, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to improve the treatment of certain animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HYDE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FROST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr.

MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHEWSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BACA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. VITTER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SABO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BOYD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. OSE, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor should be presented to the public safety officers who have perished and select other public safety officers who deserve special recognition for outstanding valor above and beyond the call of duty in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr.

JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BACA, Mr. HORN, Mr. WU, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. LEE, Mr. OSE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REYES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DICKS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H. Res. 255. Resolution condemning bigotry and violence against Sikh Americans in the wake of terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 81: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 123: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 162: Mr. HOYER and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 183: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 218: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 285: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 458: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 525: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 602: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 632: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 792: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 832: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 869: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 1035: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1097: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 1212: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1233: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1254: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1357: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1360: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANK, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1375: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1405: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1431: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1436: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1475: Mr. BAIRD, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1556: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 1609: Mr. NUSSLE and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1780: Mr. WOLF, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1816: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1822: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCINNIS, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1887: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2071: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 2098: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2117: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2125: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2235: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2258: Mr. LANTOS and Ms. HART.
H.R. 2269: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2308: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2362: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2466: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2521: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2578: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. OSE.
H.R. 2713: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2725: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2764: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2775: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 2794: Mr. SHAW and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2799: Mr. LEACH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2812: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2830: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FROST, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2874: Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2907: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 2940: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 2951: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2955: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3003: Ms. LEE and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 3008: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 3011: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 3015: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3021: Mr. PUTNAM.
H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. OSE.
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H. Con. Res. 184: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2960: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *107th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2001

No. 133

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEAN CARNAHAN, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEAN CARNAHAN, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. CARNAHAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
OCTOBER 9, 2001

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2001.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:00 and 29 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 9, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S10341

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING JACKIE
THOMAS ON HER 50TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jackie Thomas, of San Jose, California, on her 50th birthday, which was Saturday, September 29, 2001.

Mrs. Thomas was born in 1951 in Little Rock, Arkansas. When she was three, her family moved to California, where they settled in the Bay Area. A member of a single-parent family, Mrs. Thomas helped to take care of her working father and raise her two younger brothers. After marrying and having two children of her own, Mrs. Thomas continued to devote herself to her family. Her selfless dedication to family has been a hallmark of her life.

The achievements of Mrs. Thomas' life include more than her success as a mother and wife. She was the first in her family to achieve a college degree. She also maintained her own career as a customer service and inside sales representative in the electronics industry, while supporting her husband's career goals and caring for two small children.

I extend to Mrs. Thomas the happiest birthday wishes on her 50th birthday and wish her many more in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO FEDEX

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize FedEx for its work and sacrifice in honor of all the people who both survived and who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001, their families and their friends.

These terrorist attacks mark a solemn moment in America's history. American men and women, civilians and soldiers, firefighters and police, mothers and fathers, were slain for a cause so terrible, so heinous, and so despicable that we find it unimaginable and indescribable. United, Americans seek to find meaning and hope in a seemingly hopeless and meaningless act. In the days since these terrible terrorist attacks, America has been shoulder-to-shoulder in a struggle to meet the challenges of a world that is a little less safe, a little scarier, and far less predictable. The efforts of businesses like FedEx signify the commitment and concern of Americans everywhere. Our nation's strength does not lie in her military might but rather in the collective compassion of its people.

Since the September 11th terrorist attacks, FedEx has assisted UPCCO and their customers nationwide providing the costs of mail-

ing and distribution of dog supplies to the New York/New Jersey German Shephard Rescue. The patriotism and persistence of FedEx is a lasting memorial to the thousands of victims who perished in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania.

Through the days, weeks, and months ahead, all Americans must come together and do what they can to assist the nation's war effort. Whether it is giving blood, sending donations, praying for the thousands of grieving families, or simply saying thanks to the brave men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day so that we may be free, it is important that the American people are vigilant in their efforts to overcome this evil. Though our nation has witnessed unspeakable horror, America's virtues, determination, and faith continues to shine brightly on the world.

I am confident that the United States will seek out those that harbor hatred, terror, and depravity in their hearts; and we will defeat them. This is a war that we must, can, and will win. May God bless the families and children grieving across this great nation and may God bless America.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "RUSSIAN
RIVER LAND ACT"

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the proposed legislation titled "Russian River Land Act" on behalf of Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated. The purpose of this legislation is to ratify an agreement that settles a land ownership issue at Russian River on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska.

The agreement that this legislation ratifies was reached on July 26th of this year, after three years of negotiations between the Alaska Native regional corporation, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. and the United States Forest Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The agreement covers lands at the confluence of the Kenai and Russian Rivers.

The area surrounding the confluence of the Russian and Kenai is rich in archeological cultural features. It is also the site of perhaps the most heavily used public sports fishery in Alaska. Because of the archeological resources at Russian River, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. made selections at Russian River under the section of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act that allowed for selections of historical places and cemetery sites. The lands at the confluence are managed in part by the U.S. Forest Service and in part by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Seeking to protect the public's access to the sports fishery at Russian River, the two federal agencies and Cook Inlet Region, Inc. have reached agreement that requires federal

legislation in order to become effective. Because this agreement provides for the continuing ownership and management by the two federal agencies of the vast majority of lands at Russian River, the public's right to continue fishing remains unchanged from its current status.

Through negotiation and agreement, the two federal agencies and Cook Inlet Region, Inc. have found a way to fulfill the intent of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in a way that fully protects the interests of the public. I congratulate all three parties on reaching final accord on the long-standing unresolved issue of land ownership at Russian River. I urge passage of the Russian River Land Act.

ST. JOHN LUTHERAN CHURCH
CELEBRATES ITS 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate St. John Lutheran Church in Cudahy, Wisconsin on its 95th anniversary as a congregation.

St. John was founded by a small group of area Slovak immigrants, and received its charter on October 7, 1906 as a member of the Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church (SELC). Later, that synod merged with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and St. John became a member of the Missouri Synod's SELC district.

Over the years, St. John has grown and prospered, adding programs like its Day Care Ministry and a second ministry and workshop site called the Life Enrichment Center along the way. In 1999, the church's renovation project expanded the sanctuary and fellowship hall, and added new office space.

St. John's theme for its 95th anniversary year is "Heritage of Faith; Foundation for the Future." What a fitting statement for a church that has played such an integral part in the spiritual life of the community for so many years, and continues to be a very special place to worship and grow in service to God and to His people.

The congregation is blessed with two gifted and devoted pastors, Reverend Carl H. Krueger, Jr., who also serves as president of the SELC District, and Reverend Richard Schauer. Other dedicated members of the St. John ministry team are the church's current vicar, Rodger Williams, parish nurse Marcia Isherwood, and Karen Erickson, who serves as the day care director.

The members and staff of St. John Lutheran are actively involved in many community activities, such as Project Concern and Cudahy/St. Francis Interfaith for the Elderly, Pastor Kreuger is also the chaplain at Wisconsin Air National Guard's 128th Air Refueling Wing in Milwaukee, the unit where I once proudly

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

served as a medic. An attitude of service is certainly evident in every aspect of the life of the congregation.

Congratulations to St. John Lutheran Church on this very special day in the history of the congregation. May God continue to bless its ministry with His presence and His love.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO THE TIF-
FIN COUNCIL 608 OF THE
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS ON
THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 2001 the Tiffin Knights of Columbus Council 608 will celebrate their 100th anniversary. For the past 100 years, this fraternal organization has worked to promote charity for those who are less fortunate, to promote unity and brotherhood among Catholic men, and to promote patriotism in our country.

More than 120 years ago, a small group of men met in the basement of St. Mary's Church in New Haven, Connecticut. These men formed a fraternal society that would one day become one of the world's largest Catholic family fraternal service organizations. Their purpose was to bring men together under the banner of fraternity and philanthropy. These men bound themselves together by the ideals of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of the Americas, the one whose hand brought Catholicism to America.

For the last 100 years, the Tiffin Council has carried on the principles of their founding fathers. Their services to the Tiffin community are profound. The Tiffin Council provides religious education and activities for students and those with mental and physical disabilities. Their efforts at the Ecumenical Sharing Kitchen ensure that those who are less fortunate have a hot meal. Through their charitable efforts, the Tiffin Council raises funds for the Firefighters' Projects for Children, St. Rita School for the Deaf, and Catholic Guild for the Blind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all the members of the 107th Congress to join me in applauding the efforts of the Tiffin Knights of Columbus Council 608. Their selfless acts of volunteerism and brotherhood over the past century are truly an example for future generations.

COLONEL JAMES A. McMURRY
RETIREES AS COMMANDER

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 2001, Colonel James A. McMurry will retire as Commander of Volk Field Combat Readiness Training Center, Camp Douglas, Wisconsin. After a distinguished career in the U.S. Air Force as an instructor pilot, Colonel McMurry joined the Wisconsin Air National Guard where he served as an instructor pilot, flight examiner and squadron standardization officer with

the 128th Tactical Fighter Wing. During that time, he participated in three overseas deployments. In 1989 he was assigned to lead the installation of a \$31 million Air Combat Maneuvering Instrumentation system at Volk Field. He became Commander in November, 1993. In 1997, he was assigned the additional duty of Air National Guard liaison to the Air Force Command and Control Battle Lab.

Colonel McMurry is a command pilot with over 3800 hours in a variety of aircraft. His awards and commendations include the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Joint Service Achievement Medal, the Outstanding Unit Award and the Organizational Excellence Award.

Colonel McMurry represents the very best in leadership in the Wisconsin National Guard. He is considered one of the most accomplished and respected senior officers in the Air National Guard. He has led in the area of new technologies to train the men and women of the future Total Force.

In addition to his distinguished military career, Colonel McMurry has served in a number of community leadership roles including the American Legion, Lions Club, County Wisconsin Workers Steering Committee and the Greater Mauston Wisconsin Development Corporation.

Colonel McMurry resides in Mauston with his wife, Sue, and their three children, April, Sara and Mike.

I have considered it an honor and a privilege to have worked with Colonel McMurry since his arrival at Volk Field, which is located within the 6th Congressional District that I represent. It is fitting that he receives full recognition and praise for the service he has rendered to his community, his state and his nation along with the thanks and best wishes of his fellow citizens in Wisconsin.

ON INTRODUCTION OF FIRST RE-
SPONDERS HOMELAND DEFENSE
LAW

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce legislation that will help our local law enforcement agencies and public safety personnel prepare for and respond to terrorist attacks.

As the horrific attacks upon our Nation on September 11th have proven, our local police, fire, and rescue personnel are our first line of response to acts of terrorism. While our federal law enforcement officers have a very important role to play in our homeland defense, the role of their state and local counterparts is still more critical. They are the first on the scene, the first to assess the damages and circumstances, the first to attend to victims.

But, they are not now well equipped or prepared for dealing with these situations. They must deal on a day-to-day basis with the more mundane tasks of keeping the peace on the streets and bringing common criminals to justice. They need access to the knowledge and equipment that our federal law enforcement and military personnel freely have, but now lie outside their routine training.

As our Nation sought to prosecute the long, hard war on drugs, we came to similarly realize the value of fully integrating beat cops, state troopers, and other law enforcement officials into the fight. But those officers needed access to the equipment and the knowledge of our military personnel in order to fully realize their capabilities. As a result, there are two programs through which state and local agencies fighting drugs can acquire defense personnel property to conduct counter-drug operations.

One of those two programs, found at 10 U.S.C. 2576a, was already amended by Congress to allow these same resources to be used for counter-terrorism. Through that program, local law enforcement can get free access personnel property no longer needed by the Department of Defense. It is time to bring the second program into the Twenty-First Century as well, and that is what my bill does.

This second program, found at 10 U.S.C. 381, simply provides state and local enforcement officers access to the catalog of equipment and knowledge currently available to the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration.

No new funds are needed to expand this program. The local agencies pay for the items they purchase with their own dollars. But, by purchasing these items through this program, the communities may be able to leverage the buying power of the federal government and pay lower prices.

There is no cost to making this change in law, but there is a great cost to not providing our local public safety workers with the tools they need to respond to future potential terrorist attacks. As we begin to prepare our Nation to fight what could be a long, hard war against terrorism, we must arm our front-line soldiers—the police, fire, and rescue personnel of our local communities. The First Responders Homeland Defense Act is one right step in that direction.

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHSIDE
FALL FESTIVAL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the patrons and organizers of the Southside Fall Festival for their work and sacrifice in honor of all the people who both survived and who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001 their families and their friends.

These terrorist attacks mark a solemn moment in America's history. American men and women, civilians and soldiers, firefighters and police, mothers and fathers, were slain for a cause so terrible, so heinous, and so despicable that we find it unimaginable and indescribable. United, Americans seek to find meaning and hope in a seemingly hopeless and meaningless act. In the days since these terrible terrorist attacks, America has been shoulder-to-shoulder in a struggle to meet the challenges of a world that is a little less safe, a little scarier, and far less predictable. The efforts of the patrons and organizers of the Southside Fall Festival signify the commitment

and concern of Americans everywhere. Our Nation's strength does not lie in her military might but rather in the collective compassion of its people.

Since the September 11th terrorist attacks, the patrons and organizers of the Southside Fall Festival have raised and contributed more than \$1,500 to assist the grieving families and rescue workers. The patriotism and persistence of the patrons and organizers of the Southside Fall Festival is a lasting memorial to the thousands of victims who perished in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania.

Through the days, weeks, and months ahead, all Americans must come together and do what they can to assist the Nation's war effort. Whether it is giving blood, sending donations, praying for the thousands of grieving families, or simply saying thanks to the brave men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day so that we may be free, it is important that the American people are vigilant in their efforts to overcome this evil. Though our Nation has witnessed unspeakable horror, America's virtues, determination, and faith continues to shine brightly on the world.

I am confident that the United States will seek out those that harbor hatred, terror, and depravity in their hearts; and we will defeat them. This is a war that we must, can, and will win. May God bless the families and children grieving across this great Nation and may God bless America.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF ART COOK

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, when someone is stranded in the backcountry and a search and rescue team is called into action, dedicated and brave individuals respond to the call of those in need. Today I would like to rise and honor the service and contributions of Art Cook, a 14-year veteran with the Mesa County Search and Rescue, whose service has led him to be one of the most respected members of his squad and who was recently recognized by the Lions Club in Grand Junction, Colorado for his selfless acts.

In the vast terrain of Colorado, the vehicles needed for search and rescue differ from region to region. However, the need for four-wheel drive vehicles always seems to be a necessity and Art established the four-wheel-drive division of the Mesa County Search and Rescue. Not only did he implement this crucial component to the service, Art also created a unique and very effective mechanism for rescuing someone out of the backcountry. His innovation has been appreciated tremendously and has served to make the Mesa County Search and Rescue a better operation.

Art began his volunteer service in 1987 after retiring from Mountain Bell. Now 67 years of age, Art has helped to save numerous lives and has extended a warm and helping hand in numerous instances. At times, his dedication worries his family but that does not halt his volunteering. This award from the Lions Club was accompanied with a check to be given to the Search and Rescue team.

Mr. Speaker, Art Cook has offered himself and his expertise to others on many rescues. His honorable and commendable service is greatly appreciated. I would like to take this moment to congratulate Art on his recent recognition and extend my warmest regards and best wishes to him and his family in many years to come.

IN HONOR OF CHARLES G. OFIESH

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring this great chamber's attention to a distinguished decorated military veteran recently elected state commander of the Department of Pennsylvania Disabled American Veterans (PADAV). Mr. Charles G. Ofiesh, a resident of Altoona, Pennsylvania, located in the 9th Congressional District, served honorably during WWII and the Korean War. After his return from the Korean War, Mr. Ofiesh enlisted with the 341st Medical Company, Army Reserve, Altoona, and quickly rose to the rank of first sergeant—a position to held for years. Mr. Ofiesh was then transferred to the 99th Army Command where he was soon promoted to command sergeant major where he served until his retirement in November 1984.

During his distinguished military career, Mr. Ofiesh received over 24 awards and decorations, most notably the Legion of Merit and the Meritorious Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster. Mr. Ofiesh is a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has served as a member of the Altoona City Zoning Appeals Board for over 24 years and is very active in the Civil Air Patrol program.

The tragic incident of September 11th reminds all of us to honor our military, both past and present. Mr. Ofiesh is a person who believes in America and fought admirably to protect our country. Mr. Ofiesh deserves the recognition from Congress and we should take notice and acknowledge all of heroes like Mr. Ofiesh. I look forward to working with him in his new role as state commander of PADAV and joining the fight to ensure that all veterans and their families receive the respect and benefits that they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place a copy of the article from the Altoona Mirror into the RECORD.

[From the Altoona Mirror, Sept. 30, 2001]

LOCAL MAN ELECTED TO HEAD PA. DISABLED
AMERICAN VETERANS
(By Mark Leberfinger)

Charles G. Ofiesh has worn many hats over the years: government official, parade marshal, businessman and decorated military veteran.

Now he has a new hat to wear as state commander of the Department of Pennsylvania Disabled American Veterans.

"He's a guy whose feet never stop," department adjutant John W. Neeves said. "He's always on the go. "He has all the attributes a leader should possess."

Ofiesh was elected to his new role during the Disabled American Veterans' Pennsylvania convention in June. DAV was founded in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932. It is the official voice of America's service-connected disabled veterans.

Ofiesh said he joined the organization because he felt he could do more directly helping veterans than he could in other organizations.

"The DAV takes care of members of the Legion and VFW, everybody," he said. "You don't have to be a DAV member to be served."

"I couldn't do near what I could do in the other organizations what I can do in the DAV," Ofiesh said.

He has been working on several goals for the organization including improving the transportation system that takes veterans to area VA medical centers and doctor appointments and increasing membership in the nearly 53,000-member organization.

"The DAV is lobbying all the time for veterans," the new state commander said. "We're trying to tell them 'you made promises and you need to keep those promises'—to take care of the veterans for life after they came home."

In addition, the state Disabled American Veterans is seeking more grant money from the Commonwealth to purchase more vans for the James E. VanZandt VA Medical Center and the seven other VA centers in the state.

Before taking the reins of the state DAV, Ofiesh served as the organization's junior vice commander and senior vice commander.

He already has represented the state organization at various statewide veterans meetings.

"There are so many organizations and they're all working toward one goal: to support the veterans," he said.

Ofiesh served in the 24th Infantry Division during World War II and the Korean War. After his return from Korea, he enlisted with the 341st Medical Company, Army Reserve, Altoona. Ofiesh rose to the rank of first sergeant, a rank he held for 16 years.

He was transferred to the 99th Army Command in Oakdale, where he was promoted to command sergeant major. He retired at that rank in November 1984.

During his military career Ofiesh received many military awards including the Legion of Merit and the Meritorious Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Ofiesh and his wife, Helen, have three children and three grandchildren.

He is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Ofiesh has served as a member of the Altoona City Zoning Appeals Board for 42 years. He is also a member of the Altoona Blair County Development Corp. and Blair County Industrial Development Authority.

Ofiesh has been grand marshal for parades in Altoona during the past 20 years.

"I would call the commander's honor the crowning glory, my final salute," he said, "because all the other things I've done aren't of the magnitude of state commander of an organization like the DAV."

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD WADE FAULK

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Leonard (Wade) Faulk of Julesburg, Colorado. Wade was one of only 51 high school students nationwide selected for a \$20,000 Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation Scholarship. For this, Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress commends him.

Wade is a recent graduate of Julesburg High School in Julesburg, Colorado. He and

117,000 other high school seniors representing over 16,500 high schools competed at the annual Coca-Cola Scholars Weekend in Atlanta Georgia. As a result of the competition, Wade was chosen to be a 2001 Coca-Cola National Scholar. The Coca-Cola Scholarship is one of America's most prestigious scholarship awards.

In a recent edition of the *Julesburg Advocate*, Sandy Williams, Chairman of the Board of Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation said, "Wade Faulk has demonstrated a commitment to educational achievement, leadership and service to his school and community. The Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation is proud to name him as a 2001 Coca-Cola National Scholar." Wade's strong work ethic and leadership remind us about the strength of America's youth. It is reassuring to know we have people like Wade to lead us into the future.

As a constituent of Colorado's Fourth Congressional District, Leonard Wade Faulk is truly a positive role model for the youth of America. He not only makes his community proud, but also his state and country. I ask the House to join me in extending our warmest congratulations to Mr. Leonard Wade Faulk.

[From the *Julesburg Advocate*, Aug. 23, 2001]

FAULK SELECTED AS 2001 NATIONAL COCA-COLA SCHOLAR

NATION'S MOST PRESTIGIOUS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AWARDS JULESBURG STUDENT \$20,000 FOR COLLEGE

Leonard [Wade] Faulk, a 2001 graduate of Julesburg High School is recognized as one of the country's most outstanding high school seniors as Coca-Cola awards him with a \$20,000 National Coca-Cola Scholars college scholarship.

The Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation, a joint effort of Coca-Cola Bottlers across the United States and The Coca-Cola Company, is one of the largest corporate-sponsored, merit scholarship programs of its kind in the United States. The program recognizes a diverse group of exemplary high school seniors who have demonstrated academic and civic excellence in their schools and communities.

"Wade Faulk has demonstrated a commitment to educational achievement, leadership and service to his school and community. The Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation is proud to name him as a 2001 Coca-Cola National Scholar," said Sandy Williams, Chairman of the Board of the Coca-Cola Scholars Foundation and President of Corinth Coca-Cola Bottling Works in Corinth, Miss.

Faulk is one of 51 National Scholars to receive a \$20,000 college scholarship and one of 252 students across the country benefiting from the Coca-Cola Scholars Program.

Faulk competed for 51 National scholarships of \$20,000 or 200 Regional scholarships of \$4,000 when he joined 201 of America's most impressive high school students in Atlanta for Coca-Cola Scholars Weekend, April 27-29, with the theme, "Transitions." The 2001 Class of Coca-Cola Scholars interviewed with several education, business, government and arts leaders from across the country. Scholars were evaluated on their academic achievements, school and community leadership and the desire to succeed. Scholars were chosen from an initial applicant pool of more than 117,000 high school seniors representing more than 16,500 high schools nationwide.

While in Atlanta, the students were also recognized at a banquet held in their honor. In addition, the Scholars received surprise recognition when Coca-Cola, in partnership with the Corporation for National Service, presented each of them with the President's

Student Service Award—an additional \$500 scholarship, certificate and gold pin. The President's Student Service Award honors high school juniors and seniors who have contributed at least 100 hours of service during the last year. The President's Student Service Challenge is designed to reward and encourage activities that have a significant impact in meeting the needs of local communities.

During Scholars Weekend the students also visited the World of Coca-Cola, the Atlanta History Center, CNN and the Martin Luther King Jr. Center. The Scholars also participated in a community service project, working to beautify a local elementary school and tutoring students.

The Coca-Cola Scholars Program is the most-recognized and respected corporate sponsorship in America. The program was created in 1986 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Coca-Cola establishing a lasting legacy for the education of tomorrow's leaders through college scholarships. There are more than 2000 Coca-Cola Scholars who have benefited from nearly \$17.7 million in scholarship awards. The Foundation is supported by the financial commitment of local Coca-Cola Bottlers including Denver Coca-Cola Bottling Company and the Coca-Cola Company.

HONORING MITCHELL WRIGHT

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the bravery of a remarkable young man. Until last May, Mitchell Wright was a joyful, healthy nine-year-old boy without the burdens of a serious illness. Today, he lives with a rare strain of cancer called rhabdomyosarcoma that most nine-year-old children could not even imagine, or yet, overcome.

Mitchell discovered the cancer himself and approached his mother about it. They went to see doctors and their worst-case scenario was soon realized. Experts say that this type of cancer is usually not found until it is too late, but luckily Mitchell discovered the tumor when treatment was possible. Mitchell has been traveling from Grand Junction to undergo chemotherapy and radiation therapy in Denver every three weeks and will continue to do so for another year. Mitchell has a tough road in front of him including numerous doctor check-ups for the next five years. It is a well-known fact that the treatments that Mitchell is receiving have extremely uncomfortable side effects, but Mitchell is courageously enduring these struggles and his friends and family are standing by him.

It is my honor to stand up with Mitchell's family and friends to support him during this time and recognize the bravery this young man has demonstrated. Mitchell is a courageous individual, but he is not alone in his struggle. He is surrounded by a community that provides strength and support in Mitchell's battle to overcome rhabdomyosarcoma. My thoughts and prayers along with those of this Congress are with Mitchell and his family during these difficult times.

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS TROOPS ON THEIR RETURN FROM BOSNIA

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize and express my sincere appreciation to the National Guard Troops from southern Arkansas, our men and women in uniform, who have just returned to the United States from staging operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

These selfless individuals and their families made great sacrifices, including spending time away from their homes and jobs, to serve our country and to help the people of Bosnia in this time of need. They did so with honor and dignity, and I am grateful for their service.

In May, several members of my staff traveled to Bosnia to visit our National Guard units from Magnolia and Sheridan, Arkansas, in my district, including my legislative assistant for military affairs, Toby Stephens, a former member of the Magnolia unit. I regret that I was unable to accompany them due to my congressional responsibilities in our Nation's capital, but I was pleased to hear that our troops were admirably representing Arkansas and the United States in a foreign land.

As they return to their loved ones, their homes, and their daily lives in this current time of uncertainty, I want to personally thank each of these men and women for their invaluable servitude at home and abroad.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF DONALD J. COHEN, M.D.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness, in a time of national sadness, to pay tribute to an extraordinary man. Dr. Donald Cohen was a friend of the New Haven community and friend of mine. He left an indelible mark on all he touched and a legacy that will touch many he never knew.

For almost thirty years, he brought an unparalleled dedication to the Yale School of Medicine. Most recently he served as the Chairman of Child Psychiatry at the Yale-New Haven Children's Hospital and was the Sterling Professor of Child Psychiatry, Pediatrics and Psychology in the Yale School of Medicine. Donald has been the Director of the Yale Child Study Center, internationally renowned for its multi-disciplinary programs and advocacy for children and families, for nearly two decades. Under his leadership, the Center has grown to be one of the most respected research and development institutions in the world. Within the Center, Donald also founded the very successful Yale-New Haven Child Development Community Policing Program which helped teach law enforcement officers how to respond to children and families. The program has since been duplicated in communities throughout the country.

In a letter I recently received from Donald, he wrote, "the Child Study Center has been at the core of my intellectual and personal development. All of my work has been nourished by

relationships that are based here . . . the coming together of so many wonderful people who gathered around the visions of the future directions and potentials of our field." Donald dedicated his career to helping children with very special needs. He has been recognized nationally and internationally for his work in urban child development and the impact of violence and trauma on children and families. However, it was his clinical and research activities which focused on the developmental psychopathology of serious childhood neuropsychiatric disorders including pervasive developmental and tic disorders and autism that were closest to his heart. It was here that he truly wanted to make a difference.

Over the last several years, I worked on so many projects with the Yale Child Study Center, and almost always worked closely with Donald. Since our first meeting, I was in awe of his tireless efforts and dedication—especially to his research on autism. It was only this past week that I received the news that he would be honored next month at the International Meeting for Autism Research with the Lifetime Award for Research in Autism. In his letter, he described this occasion as "particularly special . . . because they bring together what I have most cherished what I have most cherished about my life as a scholar and a clinician—the opportunity to be a part of family's lives and the lives of students and colleagues working together to improve our understanding of the most enduring questions of human development."

I stand today to pay tribute to a great man and to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife Phyllis, his four children and their families, and his mother Rose. A tireless advocate and a dear friend, Dr. Donald Cohen was an inspiring leader and his legacy will forever live in the hearts of the many lives he has touched.

STATEMENT ON THE TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION (TUC) ACT

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, as our economy enters a period of great uncertainty, Congress can take at least one step that will protect the families most imperiled by mounting job losses, while simultaneously stimulating consumer demand and economic growth. In short, we should improve our unemployment compensation (UC) system. Expanding, extending and supplementing UC coverage will put more money into the pockets of the families most affected by economic dislocations and most likely to spend quickly.

I am therefore introducing the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act to improve our Nation's response to rising unemployment levels. The bill would draw down funds from the federal unemployment accounts for one year to: (1) provide benefits to certain unemployed workers who are now not covered by the Unemployment Compensation system; (2) extend benefits by 13 weeks to workers whose regular UC has expired; and (3) supplement the amount of unemployment benefits. Over the next year, these provisions

would provide UC benefits to over one million jobless Americans who otherwise would go without any assistance, they would extend UC coverage to roughly 3 million individuals whose regular benefits have expired, and they would increase the amount of unemployment payments to 9 million displaced workers. With new claims for unemployment benefits recently reaching their highest level in nine years, it is imperative that Congress and the Administration consider these reforms in the quickest possible time frame.

Any effort to improve our unemployment system must start with the recognition that many dislocated workers, particularly low-wage workers, do not receive assistance from the current system when they are laid off. The General Accounting Office (GAO) reported last December that while low-wage workers were twice as likely to become unemployed, they were only half as likely to receive UC benefits compared to higher-wage workers, even when employed for similar periods of time. The GAO cited the fact that only 18% of unemployed low-wage workers were receiving UI benefits compared to 40% of higher-wage workers. This problem may track a general reduction in the percentage of unemployed Americans who actually receive UC benefits (which has declined over the last few decades from about one-half to about one-third).

Over the last few years, Congress has received repeated recommendations to correct this situation. Groups suggesting changes include: the Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation, which was jointly appointed by Congress and the President; the Committee for Economic Development, which is led by leaders in business and academia; and a group of state, federal, business and labor stakeholders in the UC system. All of these organizations highlighted two issues that must be addressed. First, too many unemployed workers are denied UC because their most recent wages are not counted. (Many States do not count the last completed quarter of work). And second, part-time workers are sometimes discriminated against in the UC system. To begin to address these inequities, the TUC Act would provide federally-funded UC coverage for one year to jobless workers who would be otherwise ineligible because their last completed quarter of employment was not included in their wage record, and to unemployed workers seeking part-time employment.

As unemployment creeps up, it becomes increasingly difficult for dislocated workers to quickly find new jobs. For this reason, Congress also should consider increasing the duration of unemployment benefits, particularly since the current law provision providing an extension of benefits has proven ineffective. In fact, since 1983, only 12 States have triggered on to the current Extended Benefits (EB) program. Because changes to the existing EB program would demand time-consuming changes to many State's laws, this legislation would establish a new, temporary program that would provide an additional 13 weeks of benefits to individuals whose regular UC expires. Like the coverage for certain newly eligible workers, these extended benefits would be federally-funded and would continue requirements that recipients seek work.

One final area that deserves attention is the adequacy of UC benefits. Unemployment benefits generally replace 50% or less of lost wages, leaving many workers hard-pressed to

meet their monthly bills. This is particularly true in many urban and suburban areas where housing costs have exceeded inflation over the last decade. Furthermore, many States have relatively low average and maximum UC payment rates (the average weekly UC payment in the US is about \$230). Finally, UC wage replacement rates were never adjusted to account for the fact that unemployment benefits were made fully taxable in 1986. This tax policy was enacted to ensure equity among families with the same amount income but from different sources. However, it has had the effect of reducing the value of UC benefits by about 15%. Therefore, to restore the value of unemployment benefits, while also maintaining equity in the tax code, this legislation would increase every UC recipient's weekly check by 15% for the next year.

Mr. Speaker, we have over \$38 billion in the Federal Unemployment Trust Funds. Those reserves are designed just for this purpose—responding to rising unemployment. We should spend a portion of those funds to help Americans face the uncertainties and hardships that come with increased joblessness. The Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act will put those monies to good use by expanding, extending and increasing unemployment coverage just when it is needed most. Thank you.

A TRIBUTE TO MARY R. WRIGHT

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the selfless public service of an individual who has committed herself to the betterment of our public parks. Ms. Mary R. Wright recently retired from her position as Chief Deputy Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and I wish to take this opportunity to recognize her work for the State of California.

Mary began her career with the Department of Parks and Recreation in 1978 as the Acting Assistant Director, in Los Angeles. In this capacity, she worked as a liaison between the Department and various agencies and organizations in the greater Los Angeles area. Her valuable combination of talent in management and passion for our natural resources were quickly recognized by all those with whom she worked, and she held a variety of positions within the Department before being named District Superintendent for the Monterey District. The Monterey Peninsula is famous for its beauty and pristine natural habitats, enjoyed and treasured by residents of and visitors to the area. The role of managing and directing the efforts of those who work to preserve and protect these natural resources fell on Mary. She excelled at the task and, in June 1999, earned promotion as Governor Gray Davis's appointee to the position of Chief Deputy Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

In addition to her official work on behalf of the State of California, Mary works alongside her husband as an enthusiastic community advocate. As a resident of Big Sur, she works on behalf of the residents and businesses there, serving as a member of the Big Sur Historical

Society and as the Vice President of the Big Sur Health Center Board of Directors. She has also been active on the Monterey Peninsula for many years, serving as an appointed commissioner on the Monterey Historic Preservation Commission from 1983 until 1992, and as an appointed commissioner on the Marina Dunes Task Force from 1985 until 1992. She truly is a precious resource for our elected officials and community members.

Mary Wright is a dedicated public servant, and a respected administrator. Her talent and vision will be sorely missed in the California Department of Parks and Recreation, but I am certain that the communities of the Central Coast will continue to benefit from them. I wish her well as she heads into a well-deserved retirement.

HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF VINCE THOMAS

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Vince Thomas, a committed and dedicated community activist from my Congressional District. He is retiring from his position as executive director of Project Now, a community action agency, after almost 30 years of service to the Quad Cities area.

I have had the honor to know Vince for over 20 years. Throughout my work as a Member of Congress, I have had the privilege to work closely with him on many projects and initiatives to aid our local area. Through these efforts, he has helped build a strong Quad City community that respects diversity and reaches out to the less fortunate in our area. I am proud of the work we have achieved together and the wise counsel that Vince has given to me over the years.

You need to look no farther than the numerous awards presented to him to know the high regard that the Quad Cities and people throughout Illinois hold for Vince. He has been awarded the Dr. Martin Luther King "I Have A Dream Award" and the Martin Luther King Steering Committee Peace Award as well as the Illinois State Council of Senior Citizens Award and an appreciation award from the Quad City League of Native Americans. He is clearly a man of conscience and duty.

While Vince has been a man of many causes, he is also known for his warm personality. He may be a tenacious advocate, but he is also known for his quick smile and considerate manner. I am fortunate to count Vince as a good friend.

For those who know Vince, his name is synonymous with working for social justice and serving the neediest in our society. While Vince will be retiring from Project Now, I know that he will continue to be an energetic advocate for the underprivileged in our area. I wish him the best as he embarks on his retirement. I know that he will continue to be an inspiration to those of us who seek to make the Quad Cities an even better place to live.

TRIBUTE TO OS2 NEHAMON LYONS IV OF PINE BLUFF, ARKANSAS

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, our nation lost thousands of brave and innocent men and women in the unconscionable terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Among those who admirably, but regretfully, gave their lives that day while serving our country at the Pentagon was a gentleman from my district, Operations Specialist 2nd Class Nehamon Lyons IV. I wish to recognize his life and achievements.

Officer Lyons was born and raised in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, where he graduated from Dollarway High School in 1989. After graduating, he moved to Mobile, Alabama, and in 1997 enlisted in the Navy. Although he was first assigned to the USS *Gettysburg*, Officer Lyons had been attracted to the Pentagon since high school. Through hard work, he eventually received a coveted and prestigious assignment to the center of our nation's military command. During his tenure at the Pentagon, he effectively managed multiple responsibilities, including his most recent position as Chief of Naval Operations.

The Navy awarded Officer Lyons multiple accolades throughout his career for his contributions to our country including the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the Joint Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, the Good Conduct Medal, and two Navy "E" Ribbons. In addition, for his bravery in the face of extreme peril on September 11, 2001, Officer Lyons will posthumously be awarded the Purple Heart of Courage and the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal.

Officer Lyons was not only a decorated and distinguished serviceman, but also an honorable member of his community. He served this nation and his fellow citizens with spirit and bravery. All those who knew him will miss his cheerful demeanor and hard-working attitude. His passing is a significant loss not only to his family and friends, but also to our state and our nation.

I am grateful for Officer Lyons's service to and love for his country, and I pay tribute to him for his lifetime of accomplishments. My thoughts and prayers are with his mother, Jewel Lyons, and all his family and friends.

HERMAN CASTELLANI HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the long record of service to the community by my very dear friend Herman D. Castellani, who will be honored as "Person of the Year" by the Italian-American Association of Luzerne County at the association's annual Columbus Day banquet on October 7.

Herman has served as president of the association for two years and has also served as secretary to, and a member of, its board of directors.

He has participated in numerous community activities throughout the years. He has served as president of the North Italian Citizens Club, Perugia Beneficial Italian Club and president of the Exeter Ghents Club. He has been a member of the Exeter Lions Club for 38 years, serving as president in 1971–1972. He was a volunteer office clerk for St. Anthony's Parish in Exeter, where he currently serves as vice president of the Holy Name Society and formerly served as president.

In addition, he served his fellow citizens as treasurer and occupational privilege tax collector for Exeter Borough for 11 years. He owned and operated delicatessens in Wilkes-Barre and Scranton for 21 years. He was a concrete foreman for Addy Asphalt in Wilkes-Barre for 19 years and presently works for Luzerne County.

He resides in Exeter with his wife of 47 years, the former Louise Fumanti. They have three daughters, Gloria Sekusky of Plains Township, Sharon Ellis of Shavertown and Lisa Dolhon of Exeter, and nine grandchildren. The son of the late Eugene and Palmina Catani Castellani of Nocera Umbria, Italy, he is a graduate of Plains Memorial High School.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the long record of service to the community by Herman Castellani, and I wish him all the best.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARCUS HATTER

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Marcus Anthony Hatter. Dr. Hatter will be honored at a tree planting ceremony at his alma mater, Clio High School, on October 4. He was a member of Clio High School Class of 1975. The ceremony will honor both the Class of 1975 and Dr. Hatter's memory.

During his attendance at Clio High School, Marcus Hatter was student body president for several years. He served as captain of the varsity basketball team, he was a charter member of the Genesee County Youth Leadership Council, a member of the National Honor Society, and active in the Varsity Club.

After graduating from Clio High School with honors, Dr. Hatter obtained his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and graduated from the Michigan State University School of Medicine in 1989. He completed his medical residency at William Beaumont Hospital in Royal Oak, Michigan. He went on to become the primary physician for the Visiting Physicians Association at Medi-Lodge in Howell, Michigan. In 1994 he married Janette Dennis. They had four children and adopted a fifth child.

Dr. Hatter suffered from an illness that cut his life short. During this time Marcus Hatter was an undaunted example of courage, compassion and heart. His brother, Henry II, gave Marcus a kidney that extended his life by several years, but Dr. Hatter passed away on January 7, 2001.

He is enshrined in the memory of the people closest to him, wife Janette; children Elizabeth, Rachel, Miranda, Marcus Jr. and Aaron; parents Henry and Barbara Hatter; sister

Kelly; brother Henry II; and many others who will treasure always the inspiration Dr. Hatter provided to others his entire life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join the Clio High School Class of 1975 in paying tribute to one of its own. Dr. Marcus Hatter worked to make the world a better place. He brought joy to each person he met and will be greatly missed by his family, friends and our community.

TAIWAN DESERVES A PLACE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year, the people of Taiwan went to the polls to select the individual who would serve as the Tenth President of the Republic of China. Mr. Chen Shui-bian, a member of an opposition party, won that hotly contested race, and for the first time in Chinese history, people in Taiwan had a peaceful transfer of power.

Many scholars and government officials in the PRC suggested that if President Chen were elected, Southeast Asia would be thrown into economic and political turmoil. It did not occur. Instead, President Chen has avoided provoking the mainland. He has honored his pledge to seek a genuine dialogue with the Chinese mainland and his approach towards the PRC has won praise from neighbors in Asia and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, In spite of all that President Chen and the people of Taiwan have done, Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations, and its twenty-three million people are not represented in that body and in many other international organizations. It is time for fair-minded leaders of the world to correct this injustice.

Unfortunately, the General Assembly again failed to provide Taiwan with the membership in this body it so richly deserves this year. I call on my colleagues and the Bush Administration to urge membership for Taiwan when the issue comes before the General Assembly next year.

The members of the United Nations should include all people and nations, especially those who stand as a true example of political freedom. Many of my colleagues may be concerned about Taiwan's status as officially a province of China. I would remind my colleagues that other divided nations—Germany and Vietnam, for instance—enjoyed full representation in the UN by both of their governments. We should afford the free-market democracy of Taiwan the same.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CELEBRATES THE REDEDICATION OF THE LAMINGTON BLACK CEMETERY AND HONORS THE EFFORTS OF ITS ORGANIZERS

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate the rededication of the

Lamington Black Cemetery located in Somerset County, New Jersey and to honor those responsible for undertaking this reclamation effort.

Until a year ago, this rich history of New Jersey's African-American heritage was a hidden treasure lost among snarled tree roots and overgrown vegetation. But thanks to the efforts of many concerned citizens, the "old slave cemetery", its nearly three centuries of history and more than 100 graves—both marked and unmarked—have been preserved and rededicated.

For more than a year, neighbors and friends, brothers and coworkers, pastors and congregants have come together to rebuild and reclaim this small one acre cemetery. They have donated their time, talents and treasures to restore the peace and dignity those resting in this hallowed ground deserve.

At this time in our Nation's history, when we struggle to find solace and meaning in the acts of terror against us, we can gain strength and perspective from those buried in the Lamington Black Cemetery and those working to preserve our heritage. Theirs is a story of slavery, of war, and of freedom. Most importantly though, they are a genuine example of the dignity of human life, the strength of community and the pride of America.

Mr. Speaker, again, I celebrate this rededication and honor those who are buried and those who have worked so diligently to bring their memories back to life. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this invaluable contribution to our community and New Jersey.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF POLICE OFFICER DAVID ROBERTS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to serve the public as an officer of the law is truly a noble deed worthy of the praise from this body. These brave souls are the forgotten heroes of the day despite their importance to our country and to the welfare of the public. David Roberts, an outstanding retired police officer who served the Denver Police Department, considered being a police officer one of the greatest and most rewarding aspects of his life. The Denver chapter of the International Footprint Association has offered their praise by honoring him at the second annual Forgotten Officer Recognition Dinner. I too, would like to raise the service of this officer before this House and recognize his efforts to the service of the people of Denver, Colorado.

Although David is no longer an active officer, his heart is still captivated with a selfless devotion to others. In 1985, he experienced a gunshot wound to his mouth that ended his career. David had been with the department for only six years when one incident ended his career. The man who shot Officer Roberts was subsequently sentenced to 80 years in prison and David has been paralyzed on his left side since. This potential setback, though, has not fazed David and he is still involved with training officers by teaching them at police academies. He attempts to offer a glimpse of what to do should something of such trau-

matic magnitude strike them in the line of duty. But his teachings pertain to life more than just police duty.

Mr. Speaker, David Roberts gave a portion of himself to protecting the citizens of Denver and his service will not be forgotten. While the recognition he has received by the International Footprint Association is a piece of our appreciation, his admiration extends much further than an award. He is not a forgotten hero and will be considered a guardian to our security forever. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the commendable and valiant service of David Roberts and extend to him my warmest regards and best wishes in the many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO J.C. JEFFRIES OF PINE BLUFF, ARKANSAS

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the life and achievements of a man who was not only a personal friend, but a friend to his entire community and a respected civic leader in Arkansas, First Ward Alderman J.C. Jeffries.

J.C. passed away on Sunday, September 30, at the age of 57. Originally from Grady, Arkansas, J. C. moved to Topeka, Kansas, in high school and joined the Air Force upon graduation. Four years later, he joined the police department at Topeka and became involved in civic and youth issues. He returned to Arkansas and settled in Pine Bluff in 1979. J.C. spent the majority of his life caring for and taking an active role in the Pine Bluff community.

J.C. always put service above self by trying to make Pine Bluff a better place in which to live. He was a quiet man who always moved and spoke deliberately and with consideration. Although J.C. had his own opinions concerning politics or policy, he would always listen to others ideas and concerns. Under his leadership and non-confrontational guidance, J.C. could bring together many different groups within the community. I was honored to have him serve on my congressional African American advisory council.

As a member of the Pine Bluff City Council for 14 years, J.C. truly understood and enjoyed participating in city government. He had been an alderman since 1987 and was one of Pine Bluff's first African American city council members. As chairman of the council's public works committee, J.C. was dedicated to helping "at risk" youths through city programs. He fought hard for funding for the city's summer jobs program and made sure the money was used responsibly. The Pine Bluff Commission on Children and Youth was established under J.C.'s leadership.

In addition to his work in City Hall, J.C. also advised members of the Pine Bluff's academic community. J.C. worked at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff most recently as a career counselor and held several posts over the past twenty years. He helped find money to pave UAPB's streets and get financing for the new state-of-the-art Golden Lions Stadium.

J.C. was a man of great stature, a distinguished leader who showed compassion for

everything he did and everyone he met. Even on his last day of life he was worrying more about his town's future than his own health. His passing is a significant loss not only to his family and friends, but also to the city of Pine Bluff and the people of Arkansas.

I pay tribute to him for his lifetime of accomplishments, and I am deeply grateful for J.C.'s friendship, his devotion to assisting others, and his commitment to the betterment of his community. My thoughts and prayers are with his daughters, Jacquelyn, Rhonda, and Felicia, and all his family, friends, and loved ones.

CONGRATULATING THE INSTITUTE
FOR CUBAN AND CUBAN-AMERICAN
STUDIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1868, the Cuban people expressed their desire to be free of oppression and their determination to convert this dream into a reality. This "Grito de Yara" was a battle cry heard throughout the world, yet it was the United States who joined forces with Cuban patriots in their struggle for independence.

This served as the catalyst which would forever intertwine the histories of our two countries and would develop into an enduring friendship between our people, stemming from a unity of purpose and shared respect and admiration for our cultures.

Later, the exodus of Cubans fleeing the tyrannical and brutal rule of the Castro dictatorship in search of liberty in the U.S., further reinforced these bonds and enriched the tapestry weaving our two nations together.

The Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami, inaugurating its permanent home on October 10th, the anniversary of "Grito de Yara", builds upon this relationship by offering courses on Cuban history and culture, producing publications, sponsoring conferences and seminars, and generating original research on specific topics.

Its objectives are to preserve, teach, and disseminate the history and culture of Cuba; provide research and information about U.S. Cuban relations, contemporary Cuba, and about Cuban-Americans; increase awareness and appreciation of Cuba nationally and internationally; and to prepare for change in the island.

In the two years since its creation, the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies has coordinated a myriad of concerts; film viewings; and museum exhibits. It has held such important seminars as: "Bay of Pigs' 40th Anniversary"; "U.S. Policy Toward Cuba: Continuity and Change"; "Cuba After Castro: Succession, Transition or Chaos"; and the "Czech Republic and Human Rights in Cuba" with His Excellency Alexandr Vondra, Ambassador of the Czech Republic to the United States.

The caliber of the work being conducted by the Institute prompted the Association for the

Study of the Cuban Economy to choose the Institute as its Secretariat, and compelled the U.S. Congress to recommend that one of its seminal endeavors, the Cuba Transition Project, be funded by the Agency for International Development.

The Cuba Transition Project exemplifies the forward-thinking approach and immense value of the Institute. The Project's mission is to help prepare for a transition to democracy in Cuba and for the reconstruction of the island once the post-Castro transition begins in earnest.

Under the leadership of its Founding Director, Dr. Jaime Suchlicki, and of Dr. Andy Gomez, Dean of the School of International Studies, the Institute has earned high praise from leaders in government, business, academia and the arts.

I would like to thank our University president, Dr. Donna Shalala, the Board of Trustees, and all the administrative leadership for their support of the Institute.

Today, as the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies embarks upon a new chapter in its history and another year of groundbreaking research and memorable activities, I join my voice to those of so many supporters in congratulating the Institute.

I look forward to the continued success of the Institute.

IN MEMORY OF LIEUTENANT
COLONEL KAREN J. WAGNER,
U.S. ARMY, KILLED AT THE PEN-
TAGON ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the events of September 11 shocked America. The horrible acts of terrorism, designed to kill the maximum numbers, woke all of us to the threat of international terrorism. Our borders have been violated, and we are not the same today as we were before that bright, but terrible, Tuesday morning. We have all felt the pangs of discomfort, and the national mood has gone from business as usual to mourning.

None, however, have faced the impact as much as the families of those who lost their lives that morning. One such family of so many lives in my hometown of San Antonio, and they must now lay to rest their precious daughter and sister, whose life and future were cut short at the Pentagon on September 11.

Our Nation will mourn the loss of Lieutenant Colonel Karen J. Wagner, a 17-year veteran of the U.S. Army. On October 5, 2001, she will be buried with full military honors at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery in San Antonio, Texas.

Lieutenant Colonel Wagner began her Army service on February 14, 1984 with a ROTC appointment after graduation from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. She previously received a masters degree in Health Services Administration from Webster University.

Lieutenant Colonel Wagner received her most recent promotion just this past August

and was last assigned to the Medical Personnel Officer, Office of the Army Surgeon General, with duty as the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel at the Pentagon.

Her previous assignments included duties as Adjutant for the 85th Medical Evacuation Hospital at Fort Lee, Virginia; Executive Officer and Company Commander of D Company, 187th Medical Battalion, Fort Sam Houston; Chief, Personnel for the 57th Evacuation Hospital at Wurzburg, Germany; Chief, Personnel Services Branch at Walter Reed Army Medical Center; Personnel Officer assigned to Office of the Army Surgeon General; Staff Officer with Inspector General Office, U.S. Army Medical Command, Fort Sam Houston, Texas; and Executive Officer and Secretary General Staff, Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Lieutenant Colonel Wagner was born on February 22, 1961, in Kansas, and listed Texas as her home of record. She is survived by her mother of San Antonio, Texas, and two brothers and a sister.

Lieutenant Colonel Wagner was killed because she wore the uniform of our Nation's Army, and, like those who perished at the World Trade Center, simply because she was an American. She stood up for her country and has now paid the ultimate price. We all stand in honor of her and the thousands of others who lost their lives on September 11.

HONORING HARVEY WILLOUGHBY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor an American who fought bravely for our country during World War II. Harvey Willoughby, a resident of Montrose, Colorado, was a soldier in the 268th Field Artillery Battalion that fought courageously for our country during the war.

Harvey's outfit was unique to the war effort. His battalion was armed with 8-inch guns that seemed more fitting for a battleship. They were capable of firing great distances and hitting targets beyond enemy lines. This gave the Allied forces an advantage that helped them forge forward through German forces. The 268th Field Artillery Battalion landed on the shores of Omaha Beach on August 27, 1944 following the historic D-Day invasion. After their arrival in St. Malo, it took less than three days for the 268th to overwhelm the German and Italian forces that were stationed there. Harvey and his battalion made their way east with their burly equipment and enormous guns fighting their way through Ubachsburg, Aachen and several other cities until finally forcing German troops back across the Rhine. Harvey proudly served his country and earned several citations including the Bronze Star for his service during the war.

Mr. Speaker, Harvey Willoughby fought bravely for our country. As a nation, we are indebted to him for the perseverance and heroism Harvey displayed during World War II. I would like to extend my warmest regards and thanks and the recognition of this Congress to Harvey Willoughby for the monumental sacrifices that he has made in service to our Flag.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEXAS
A&M UNIVERSITY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Texas A&M University, the oldest public university in Texas, which is celebrating its 125th anniversary today. By virtue of being the first public institution of higher learning opened in the state of Texas, today we commemorate a milestone for public higher education in Texas.

When Texas A&M opened on October 4, 1876 it attracted a mere six students. Today its student body has grown to nearly 45,000, a level that is expected to once again place it among the five largest universities in the nation. Since its opening, Texas A&M has awarded more than 265,000 degrees. Its graduates include Texas Governor Rick Perry, Bolivian President Jorge F. Quiroga, legislators and other public officials at both the Federal and state levels, chief executive officers of Fortune 500 companies and numerous other highly successful individuals in business, industry and education. Additionally, it has produced thousands of officers for all branches of the military, including more than 200 who have achieved the rank of general or admiral.

While teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels will always be central to Texas A&M's multiple missions, the University has emerged as a major research institution. In fact, this past May it was selected for membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU), the prestigious 101-year-old organization that restricts its ranks to the nation's premier public and private institutions of higher learning. Texas A&M's annual investment in research now totals more than \$400 million annually—the most for any institution in Texas or the Southwest. The myriad of studies and experiments are significantly enhancing the basic body of knowledge, and many of the projects have had major economic impact on the state and nation.

Texas A&M's success in teaching and research can be attributed to an outstanding faculty whose ranks now total approximately 2,400. Included are scores of individuals who are considered among the best in their fields—nationally and internationally. The faculty includes a winner of the Nobel Prize, the National Medal of Science, the World Food Prize and numerous members of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering.

Mr. Speaker, Texas A&M was founded as a Land-Grant College under provisions of the Morrill Act which was approved by Congress on July 2, 1862. The act stipulated that such institutions' "leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and mechanical arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the various pursuits and professions in life . . ."

By most assessments, Texas A&M is unsurpassed in staying true to its Land-Grant heritage while expanding into other areas that pro-

vide the foundations for a leading 21st Century university. For example Texas A&M's Colleges of Agriculture and Engineering are among the largest and most respected in the nation, and its Corps of Cadets is the largest uniformed student organization on any campus in the nation, except for the service academies.

Additionally, Texas A&M took the lead nationally in applying the Land-Grant concept to two other areas that are crucial to the nation, specifically sea and space. The concept that led to the Federal creation of Sea-Grant and Space-Grant Colleges was initiated at Texas A&M, and Texas A&M is one of a select few institutions to hold Federal mandates as a Land-, Sea- and Space-Grant College.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate to represent and work closely with Texas A&M University since I was elected to Congress in 1996. During this time I have seen first-hand from the students, the faculty, and the administration why Texas A&M University has become one of our nation's premier universities.

Again, I wish to congratulate Texas A&M University on its first 125 years and wish everyone there much success in the university's next 125 years.

REACHING UP AND OUT . . .
EMPOWERING OTHER WOMEN

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, an extraordinary fashion show will take place in Chicago. This fashion show, sponsored by the law firm of Arnstein & Lehr, is designed by women who are committed to improving opportunities for other women.

The theme of this fashion show is "Reaching Up and Out . . . Empowering Other Women." I want to commend Arnstein & Lehr for their tremendous work in putting this event together. They have demonstrated a commitment to improving the lives of women in the Chicagoland community that is extraordinary, and I believe that this is the first example of a law firm hosting such an event. I hope that other firms will follow their example.

The proceeds of the October 15 fashion show will benefit two wonderful charities. The Prentice Women's Hospital at Northwestern Memorial Hospital is one of the most pre-eminent women's hospitals in the country, providing clinical care, education and research into women's health care. For too long, medical research and delivery services have failed to address the needs of women. Prentice Women's Hospital is playing a tremendous part in changing that, by focusing on women's health and allowing women to be actively involved in improving their access to medical care. The Nathaniel B. and Joyce Miriam Hirschtick Memorial Matching Gift Program will be unveiled at the Chicago Fashion Show, and it will continue to raise funds for Prentice Women's Hospital.

The other charity that will benefit is the Bottomless Closet, an organization also dedicated to improving the lives of women. The Mission

Statement of the Bottomless Closet is "to provide professional clothing, job retention training, coaching and mentoring services to working-poor women, enabling them to add value to the organizations that hire them while empowering them to craft a new vision for their lives." Clothes can make a difference, not just in how others see us but in how we see ourselves. The Bottomless Closet makes sure that low-income and working-poor women have the tools necessary to achieve their goals. With that assistance, women will be empowered to improve the well-being of their families and to become productive members of their community.

In addition to commending Arnstein & Lehr, I want to recognize the contributions of Cynde Hirschtick Munzer, a key organizer and moderator of this event, as well as Terry Schwartz and Gwen Rich, who are coordinating the Chicago Fashion Show and outfitting the models. I am pleased to be one of the participants in the Chicago Fashion Show. I also want to recognize the other women who will model clothing: Joy Cunningham, senior vice president and general counsel of Northwestern Memorial Hospital; Carrie Hightman, President of Ameritech Illinois; Mary Pat Reilly, press secretary to Senator DICK DURBIN; Rhoda Belson Salins, senior vice president of Solomon Smith Barney; Sheryl Swibel, a family therapist; Martha Tuite, a Chicago realtor; Vicki Turoff, Northwestern Memorial Hospital Service League board member; Stacey Kruger Birndorf, corporate managing director of Cushman & Wakefield of Illinois; Kathy Brock, anchorwoman at WLS-TV; Renee Cipriano, director of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency; Sherren Leigh, editor of Today's Chicago Women; Roni Weiner Pressler, assistant vice president of Illinois State Medical Insurance Services, Inc.; and the Honorable Rita Mullins, mayor of the Village of Palatine. Their willingness to contribute their time to this important event is greatly appreciated.

Arnstein & Lehr is not just putting together a charity Fashion Show in Chicago. They will also host a similar event in Miami later this year, where the benefiting charities will be the Women's Fund of Miami-Dade County and Sited for Success.

Again, I want to congratulate and commend Arnstein & Lehr for demonstrating such a wonderful commitment to women in their communities and for acting now at a time when our nation is facing economic difficulties and security threats. Now, more than ever, it is important for all of us—individuals and businesses alike—to support each other. The Chicago Fashion Show is a wonderful example of how one law firm can make a difference in the lives of many.

MARC TENBUSCH: DEAN OF THE
POLKA DANCERS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marc Tenbusch for his induction into the Michigan State Polka Music Hall of Fame.

Michigan is a state whose citizens are proud of their multi-cultural ancestry and who delight in celebrating that diversity with others. The Polish community is one of the proudest in Michigan, bringing with it a love for good food, good spirits, fellowship, dancing and the lively, footstomping traditions of the polka.

When Marc first hit the dance floor in the early 1950s to step to the sounds of the polka, he both fulfilled a family tradition and became part of a rich musical heritage with origins in the European waltz and the folk dancing of many lands. Contemporary polka music and dance represents a melange of musical talents and dancing styles brought to America by the many immigrants that created our great melting pot culture. Marc quickly became a master practitioner of the polka and a much sought after dance partner at places such as the Arcadia Ballroom in Parisville, Ravenna Gardens near Saginaw and Edgewood Gardens in Owosso.

Many former students at Uby Community still fondly recall Marc teaching them the polka, the waltz and the oberek as they listened to records on an old juke box in the school gymnasium. Marc also later took his passion for the polka to Fort Bliss, Texas, during a stint in the Army, where he always insisted a few polka tunes be played at Sunday evening get-togethers at a singles club on post. When he returned to the Uby area, Marc continued promoting the polka and sponsoring dances. The citizens of Parisville will always be grateful for a polka dance fund-raiser he organized to help pay for rebuilding Saint Mary Catholic Church after a fire destroyed the original structure.

Marc's reputation as a premier polka dancer was well-known beyond mid-Michigan and he proudly recounts taking part in a contest at the Polkabration in New London, Connecticut, with a well-know dancer called "Tillie from Philly." He also was honored to serve as a groomsman in the wedding party of "Big Daddy" Marshall Lackowski and Mary Ann Finnelli at the Polish Home in Baywood, New Jersey, where he danced the Baltimore Polish Wedding March and the New Jersey Bounce.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Marc Tenbusch on achieving the Michigan Polka Music industry's highest honor. Marc's polished and seemingly effortless footwork was an inspiration to a generation of polka dancers and I am confident that his love of dance will continue to provide encouragement to many more polka dance enthusiasts in the future.

HONORING STEWART R. WALLACE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the contributions that Stewart R. Wallace has made to the mining industry in Colorado. He has made significant strides in the field of exploratory geology. Mr. Wallace's years of work have led to substantial advances in the field of geology.

Stewart Wallace, born in 1919, has spent the majority of his life developing the molybdenum mining industry through extensive geological studies. In 1955, Stewart began work-

ing for Climax Molybdenum in Climax, Colorado. His studies have contributed to a better understanding of the geology of molybdenum ore bodies and aided in developing models that help predict the location of the ore bodies. His most significant discoveries included the Henderson Mine and the Ceresco Ore body at Red Mountain and Climax, respectively. These discoveries provided a significant boost to the Colorado mining industry. Additionally, Stewart's work with molybdenum have also led to significant advances in producing stronger steel alloys.

Mr. Speaker, Stewart Wallace was recently recognized for his achievements at the 2001 National Mining Hall of Fame induction ceremony. I too would like to recognize Mr. Wallace and thank him for the contributions that he has made to the Colorado Mining industry.

HONORING THE CARING SERVICE OF CAROLYN JAFFE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, special care is needed both medically and emotionally as a person nears the end of their life. Today, I would like to honor a woman whose contributions will never be forgotten as she has provided this care for countless patients throughout her own life. Carolyn Jaffe, a nurse who helped to establish the Hospice of Metro Denver in 1978, passed away on September 27, 2001 at the age of 76 and we will miss her by the many whose lives she has touched.

Carolyn was born in Youngstown, Ohio and received her doctorate degree from the University of Denver in 1965. Always selflessly devoting her actions to the care of others in need, Carolyn worked at the Children's Hospital from 1971 until 1983 when she retired. Throughout this time, she directed the audiology and speech pathology department while serving in numerous other capacities in the community. Carolyn concentrated a great deal of her energy with Hospice in addition to her full time job at the Children's Hospital.

Since implementing her vision in 1978 with the Hospice, over 700 patients have experienced the tender thoughtfulness of the facility and its people. In fact, the Hospice of Metro Denver has developed into the largest hospice in the Rocky Mountain region. Carolyn and her co-founder realized how sensitive this time is and the critical conditions that people face in life. Thus, they created the Hospice to provide a setting that creates a sense of comfort and security to its patients. This transformational approach, outlined in her book *All Kinds of Love: Experiencing Hospice*, which she co-authored with Carol H. Ehrlich, viewed dying patients as people worthy of care and not just subjects that consume resources.

Mr. Speaker, Carolyn Jaffe was a highly respected member of the Denver community and never asked for anything in return for her helping hands. Just as she helped many others and their transition to a life without a loved one, it is our time to assist her family and friends at this time of remembrance and mourning. With a solemn heart, I would like to extend my deepest sympathies and the respect and sympathies of this body of Con-

gress to her family and wish them all of the best in years to come. Carolyn was a tremendous person and she will be missed greatly.

HONORING WILLIAM R. MARTINELLI

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor an individual, a friend, and pay tribute to the late William Martinelli, from Mystic, Connecticut, a veteran and a civic leader in our community.

Bill was a pillar of the Martinelli family. From his humble beginning in Norwich, Connecticut, Bill received great success in business and in life, but Bill's greatest satisfaction came from helping others.

Recently I received a letter from his wife, and she said that one of the most important things about Bill was that he hated to see people in need. He would always provide a helping hand during numerous community programs including the Tootsie Roll Drive, Special Olympics, the Mystic Art Festival, the Sunshine Committee and the Used Medical Equipment Committee, for which both he and his wife earned the Connecticut Treasures Award in 2000. Bill touched the lives of many individuals in the community by giving unselfishly.

Bill Martinelli's efforts throughout the years earned him the "Citizen of the Year Award" by the Mystic Chamber of Commerce and had Dec. 2, 1999 proclaimed "Bill Martinelli Day" by the Stonington Board of Selectmen in appreciation for his many volunteer efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Martinelli reached out and touched the lives of many individuals in eastern Connecticut, contributing to a variety of causes. He gave his service to our country in World War II and continued to serve our nation as a pipe fitter at Electric Boat in Groton. Best of all, Bill served my local community faithfully. We will miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in heartfelt appreciation for the service this great man provided my community. I would also like to ask the House to join me in extending our deepest condolences to Bill's wife, Liz and her four children, Robert, Gary, Gene, and Terry Ann.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND WILLIAM D. WATLEY, PH.D. ON HIS 17TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to Reverend William D. Watley and his family as he celebrates his 17th anniversary as Pastor of Saint James African Methodist Episcopal Church in Newark, New Jersey.

Reverend Watley has been an active and involved leader, implementing a number of innovative programs, including a successful effort to feed over one thousand people weekly.

He also established the Intergenerational After-School Program and sponsors Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and an HIV AIDS Ministry that educates the community about the disease.

A former president of Paul Quinn College in Waco, Texas, Dr. Watley initiated the Adult Basic Educational Program, the St. James Bible Institute, The Christian Learning Center, New Life Ministries, Community Bible Study, Men and Women's Bible Studies and the Pastor's Bible Study. His fourteen year quest to build St. James Preparatory School, a Christian Academy, came to fruition a few years ago.

St. James is world renowned for its Wednesday "Sweet Hour of Praise" Service, which I have had the privilege of attending many times. The service in its eleventh year has grown from one worshipper to hundreds.

Dr. Watley serves as chairman of the St. James Preparatory School: A Christian Academy, St. James Social Services, and St. James Credit Union. He serves on the boards of the New Jersey Housing Mortgage Finance Agency, Horizon Mercy, Boys and Girls Clubs of Newark, United Movie Corporation, the World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches, African Methodist Episcopal Church First District and Beth Israel Medical Center.

He has authored several books and articles and is currently writing a book. He has a long and distinguished record in the areas of education, pastoral practice and youth services. Dr. Watley holds both the Doctor of Philosophy and Masters of Philosophy degrees from Columbia University in Ethics and Theology respectively. His B.A. degree is from Saint Louis University. He has also completed the Institute for Educational Management Program at Harvard University.

Dr. Watley is married to Muriel Watley and they are the proud parents of two children and a granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in extending our very best wishes to Dr. Watley and his family as they continue their dedicated service to the church and the community.

GIVE TOM RIDGE THE AUTHORITY TO DO HIS JOB

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Tom Ridge's last day as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On Monday, former Governor Ridge takes on a huge assignment as Director of the Office of Homeland Security—a job critically important in fashioning our government's response to terrorism.

To be effective, he needs tools that Congress must provide. Today, my colleague from Nevada, Mr. GIBBONS, and I introduced legislation that does just that.

The bill, the Office of Homeland Security Act of 2001, creates a Cabinet-level position subject to Senate confirmation.

The Director of Homeland Security is given authority to review, certify, or reject the terrorism-related budgets of the more than 40

federal departments and agencies. This power is essential to assure coordination and integration of the many programs needed to prevent, prepare for, and respond to terrorist attacks.

The people working today to protect our nation are spread among federal, state and local agencies. They are involved in collecting and analyzing intelligence, patrolling our borders, protecting critical infrastructure, and identifying and treating health effects of various attacks on our population.

The Gibbon-Harman-LaHood-Roemer-Castle-Boehlert bill assigns the Director for Homeland Security the responsibility for:

Directing the creation of a national strategy for homeland security and developing a national budget to carry out this strategy;

Certifying or rejecting agencies' budget requests;

Coordinating all federal homeland security activities, and certifying or rejecting federal agencies' budgets for the activities;

Directing the development of a comprehensive national threat assessment;

Overseeing information sharing among Federal, State, and local agencies involved in intelligence collection and law enforcement; and

Conducting a review of the legal authorities still needed to prevent and respond to terrorist threats.

Every day that Governor Ridge does not have these powers, his ability to do his job will decrease.

I urge my colleagues to join us in securing passage of this bill as quickly as possible.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL TO VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACK ON THE PENTAGON

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by a group of bipartisan colleagues to introduce legislation to establish a memorial in honor of the victims of the September 11 attack on the Pentagon.

This legislation would reserve a portion of land at the Navy Annex, which is situated across from the Pentagon in Arlington, to erect a memorial for this purpose.

Anyone that has visited this site knows the many personal stories and tributes left in memory of the victims of this attack. It overlooks the site of the attack on the Pentagon and has already served as a informal memorial location, marked by countless flowers, handwritten notes and candlelight vigils.

This land, which is already subject to transfer to the Secretary of the Army (under section 2881 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for FY2000, P.L. 106-65), would provide an ideal location to locate a memorial to honor the victims of the Pentagon attack.

Words do not sufficiently describe the pain and utter sadness we all feel as a result of this tragic event. Locally, we all know someone who was affected by this attack.

The establishment of a memorial at the Navy Annex is just one small way we as a country can ensure that the spirit of these individuals lives on and that our American way of life is uplifted.

These 189 victims were not only friends and neighbors, but they represent the countless American lives that have been touched by September 11. Many of them were serving their country as either soldiers or public servants.

They were parents, friends and active members of our communities. They, like other victims of the tragic events of that day, represented a cross-section of America, coming from all walks of life.

Despite the profound pain that our country has experienced, we have also witnessed an uplifting of the American spirit in the aftermath of this event through the outpouring of generosity and volunteer assistance.

We must not forget how powerful our country is when we come together and work toward a common goal and purpose. I think this memorial should also serve as a reminder of what makes our country and its people persevere in the face of adversity.

Already we have seen an outpouring of generosity and interest from members of the public in establishing the Navy Annex as an official site for such a memorial.

The New York and Pennsylvania delegations are planning to establish memorials to the victims who died in those attack sites. It is only fitting that we establish a site here that will enable the general public to pay tribute to the 189 Americans who died in the September 11 attack at the Pentagon.

I would note that this legislation complies with the established standards for memorials and commemorative works. It leave the process of siting, design, and construction of the memorial to the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capitol Monuments Commission and the Fine Arts Commission.

I am confident that the collective expertise of these commissions will yield an appropriate design and message for such a memorial.

I look forward to working with Members of Congress and the administration to swiftly enact this legislation establishing a memorial to properly honor the victims of the September 11 attack on the Pentagon.

THE AGONY OF THE LEFT

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who might have missed it, I would commend to the attention of my colleagues a piece by Andrew Sullivan from today's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Sullivan skillfully delineates the egregious errors of many on the radical left who would dare to blame the recent terrorist attacks on our nation's policies—even as other liberal groups recognize and properly condemn the atrocities of Osama bin Laden and the Taliban regime that supports him.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 4, 2001]

THE AGONY OF THE LEFT

(By Andrew Sullivan)

One of the most telling things I have seen since the Sept. 11 massacre was an early "peace movement" e-mail. It listed three major demands: stop the war; stop racism; stop ethnic scapegoating. A liberal friend had appended a sardonic comment to the bottom. "Any chance we could come out against terrorism as well?"

One of the overlooked aspects of the war we are now fighting is the awakening it has spawned on the left. In one atrocity, Osama bin Laden may have accomplished what a generation of conservative writers have failed to do: convince mainstream liberals of the illogic and nihilism of the powerful postmodern left. For the first time in a very long while, many liberals are reassessing—quietly for the most part—their alliance with the anti-American, anti-capitalist forces they have long appeased, ignored or supported.

COLLECTIVE KNEE

Of course the initial response of left-wing intellectuals to Sept. 11 was one jerking of the collective knee. This was America's fault. From Susan Sontag to Michael Moore, from Noam Chomsky to Edward Said, there was no question that, however awful the attack on the World Trade Center, it was vital to keep attention fixed on the real culprit: the United States. Of the massacre, a Rutgers professor summed up the consensus by informing her students that "We should be aware that, whatever its proximate cause, its ultimate cause is the fascism of U.S. foreign policy over the past many decades." Or as a poster at the demonstration in Washington last weekend put it, "Amerika, Get A Clue."

Less noticed was the reasoned stance of liberal groups like the National Organization for Women. President Kim Candy stated that "The Taliban government of Afghanistan, believed to be harboring suspect Osama bin Laden, subjugates women and girls, and deprives them of the most basic human rights—including education, medicine and jobs. The smoldering remains of the World Trade Center are a stark reminder that when such extremism is allowed to flourish anywhere in the world, none of us is safe." The NAACP issued an equally forceful "message of resolve," declaring, "These tragedies and these acts of evil must not go unpunished. Justice must be served."

Left-wing dissident Christopher Hitchens, meanwhile, assailed his comrades as "soft on crime and soft on fascism." After an initial spasm of equivocation, the American Prospect magazine ran a column this week accusing the pre-emptive peace movement of "a truly vile form of moral equivalency" in equating President Bush with terrorists. Not a hard cell, but daring for a magazine that rarely has even a civil word for the right.

Most moving was Salman Rushdie's early call in the New York Times to "be clear about why this bien-pensant anti-American onslaught is such appalling rubbish. Terrorism is the murder of the innocent; this time, it was mass murder. To excuse such an atrocity by blaming U.S. government policies is to deny the basic idea of all morality: that individuals are responsible for their actions." Whatever else is going on, the liberal-left alliance has taken as big a hit as the conservative-fundamentalist alliance after the blame-America remarks of Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson.

It's not hard to see why. Unlike previous Cold War battles, this one is against an enemy with no pretense at any universal, secular ideology that could appeal to Western liberals. However, repulsive, the communist arguments of, say, Ho Chi Minh or Fidel Castro still appealed to a secular, Western ideology. American leftist could delude themselves that they shared the same struggle.

But with Osama bin Laden, and the Islamo-fascism of the Taliban, no such delusions are possible. The American liberal mind has long believed that their prime enemy in America is the religious right, what does that make the Taliban? They sub-

jugate women with a brutality rare even in the Muslim world; they despite Jews; they execute homosexuals by throwing them from very high buildings or crushing them underneath stone walls. There is literally nothing that the left can credibly cling to in rationalizing support for these hate-filled fanatics.

This is therefore an excruciating moment for the postmodern, post-colonial left. They may actually have come across an enemy that even they cannot argue is morally superior to the West. You see this discomfort in the silence of the protestors in Washington, who simply never raised the issue of bin Laden's ideology. You see it is Barbara Ehrenreich's sad plea in the *Village Voice*: "What is so heart-breaking to me as a feminist is that the strongest response to corporate globalization and U.S. military domination is based on such a violent and misogynist ideology."

You see it in the words of Fredric Jameson, a revered postmodernist at Duke University, arguing in the *London Review of Books* that the roots of the conflict are to be found "in the wholesale massacres of the Left systematically encouraged and directed by the Americans in an even earlier period It is, however, only now that the results are working their way out into actuality, for the resultant absence of any Left alternative means that popular revolt and resistance in the Third World have nowhere to go but into religious and 'fundamentalist' forms." The only adequate description of this argument is desperate. And, of course, it ducks the hard question. What does the left do now that these forces are indeed fundamentalist?

The other rhetorical trope that is fast disintegrating is the anti-racist argument. The doctrine of "post-colonialism" which now dominates many American humanities departments invariably sides with Third World regimes against the accumulated evil of the West. So the emergence of the Taliban is a body-blow. If dark-skinned peoples are inherently better than light-skinned peoples, then how does a dark-skinned culture come up with an ideology that is clearly a function of bigotry, misogyny and homophobia?

One immediate response is to argue that the U.S. itself created Osama bin Laden in its war against Soviet communism. This isn't true—but even if it were, doesn't this fact, as Mr. Hitchens has argued, actually increase the West's responsibility to retaliate against him?

WHAT SUPPRESSION?

It may be, in fact, that one of the silver linings of these awful times is that the far left's bluff has been finally called. War focuses issues in ways peace cannot.

Leftists would like to pretend that any criticism of their views raises the spectre of domestic repression. But in a country with a First Amendment, no suppression from government is likely, and in the citadels of the media and the academy, the far left is actually vastly over-represented. The real issue, as pointed out this week by Britain's Labour prime minister, is that some on the left have expressed "a hatred of America that shames those that feel it."

The left's howls of anguish are therefore essentially phony—and they stem from a growing realization that this crisis has largely destroyed the credibility of the far left. Forced to choose between the West and the Taliban, the hard left simply cannot decide. Far from concealing this ideological bankruptcy, we need to expose it and condemn it as widely and as irrevocably as we can. Many liberals are already listening and watching—and the tectonic plates of politics are shifting as they do.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COBRA COVERAGE ACT OF 2001

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of a piece of legislation that I believe is an essential component of our efforts to help those affected by the attacks of September 11th. My bill, the COBRA Coverage Act of 2001, will provide a 50 percent tax credit toward COBRA coverage for laid-off workers. I believe this is the best way for us to ensure that the thousands of Americans recently laid-off do not go without health insurance.

Under current law, commonly referred to as COBRA, workers who are laid off are allowed to remain in their employer-based health insurance plan for up to 18 months, provided they pay the full premium for the plan (their share plus the employer share) plus a small administrative fee. The problem is, the full premium for employment-based coverage averages almost \$2,500 per year for self-only coverage and about \$6,500 per year for family coverage.

Since COBRA coverage is very expensive, many laid-off workers let their insurance lapse, gambling that they won't get sick or injured before they find another job. We cannot continue to allow so many hard-working Americans and their families to go uninsured. We must find a way to make COBRA coverage more affordable for the thousands of laid-off workers trying to recover from the September 11th attacks.

And my bill does exactly that. The COBRA Coverage Act of 2001 provides continuing health care coverage for laid-off workers at half the price. Under this legislation, laid-off workers would be eligible for a tax credit for 50 percent toward the COBRA coverage premium. The credit would be limited to a maximum of \$110 for an individual and \$290 for a family per month, and would be administered by the employer. This way, workers can receive an immediate benefit and would not have to wait until the end of the year to claim tax credit.

Now, more than ever, we must ensure that American families can afford to remain insured in case of sickness or injury. We must take the lead in ensuring that the thousands of hard-working Americans who have fallen victim to the effects of the September 11th attacks are not set back even further by the lack of health insurance. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to make COBRA coverage more affordable for our laid-off workers.

THE FARM SECURITY ACT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, my office has been contacted by dozens of groups expressing concerns about the Farm Security Act (H.R. 2646). I submit the following letter on their behalf.

OCTOBER 2, 2001.

Dear Representative: The one hundred forty-eight (148) groups listed below, from

across the country representing family farmers and ranchers, sustainable agriculture, religious communities, environmental and wildlife concerns, consumers, and many other constituencies and issues have joined forces to urge you to vote against the Farm Security Act of 2001 (H.R. 2646). As agricultural and rural groups, we make this urgent plea to vote against a farm bill with great reluctance. However, this bill proposed by the House Agriculture Committee would continue and expand misguided policies that have driven commodity program spending to record high levels, while doing little to stem family farm decline and falling far short of providing solutions to the many conservation, rural development, credit, research and other needs of America's farmers, ranchers, and their communities. This nation needs a Farm Bill that works for family farms, ranchers, rural communities, consumers and the environment. Unfortunately, H.R. 2646 fails to do this.

Specifically, H.R. 2646 would:

Unfairly subsidize the nation's very largest farms, while encouraging overproduction, low prices, environmental distress, and large government payments in perpetuity.

Ignore the need for a competition title to address the impact of rapid consolidation in agriculture and to check anti-competitive behavior that harms farm and ranch families, consumers, rural communities and the environment.

Transform the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) into a subsidy program for huge, polluting, factory livestock operations.

Ignore the needs of beginning farmers and ranchers.

Cap and severely limit funds for conservation technical assistance for the Conservation Reserve and Wetlands Reserve Programs.

Weaken the highly successful Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP).

Phase out within the next five years nearly all direct lending programs within USDA.

Fail to increase the percentage of total farm bill funds dedicated to conservation, and ignore the calls for a comprehensive stewardship incentive program for working land.

Take only minimal steps to support marketing innovation and development and value-adding enterprises and to reverse the decline in public support for agricultural research.

Fail to address structural changes essential to assure fair and equitable delivery of USDA programs and services to all farmers, despite costly legal settlements brought on by USDA actions.

The results would do substantial harm to family farms, to our communities and the environment. For years, family farmers and ranchers and concerned citizens have been developing solutions to agricultural problems and putting them into practice on their farms and in their communities. In our view, the bill reported out by the House Agriculture Committee not only ignores these solutions, but in fact would make them more difficult to achieve.

H.R. 2646 was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee in July 2001 after just 15 hours of debate. Federal policy affecting our nation's agriculture system and food supply for the next ten years is much too important to be pushed through in a matter of days. This bill must go back to the House Agriculture Committee for the substantial debate and policy development process our nation needs and deserves.

At a minimum, a new round of deliberations on the Farm Bill by the House Agriculture Committee should include:

Removal of biases against small and moderate-scale agriculture, and assuring that all farmers receive equitable access and service.

Comprehensive assistance for all small-scale, socially disadvantaged and new farmers and ranchers not served by current programs.

Restoration of direct lending for all family-size farms.

Stewardship incentives for family farmers that provide real conservation and environmental benefits for our society.

Rural development, research and marketing programs that increase the farm and ranch share of food system profit and support development of new cooperative and small businesses.

Commodity programs that enable family farms to earn a fair price.

A competition title to increase competition and fairness in the domestic agricultural marketplace.

We respectfully request that you vote no on H.R. 2646.

Alabama Sustainable Agriculture Network.

Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO).

Agricultural Resources Center.

American Corn Growers Association.

Arkansas Natural Produce, Inc.

Ashland Community Food Store.

Berkeley Ecology Center (CA).

Berkeley Farmers' Market (CA).

Beyond Organic Communications.

Cabinet Mountain Market (MT).

California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF).

California Church IMPACT.

California Farmers Union.

California Institute for Rural Studies.

California Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.

California Wilderness Coalition.

C.A.S.A. de Llano (Communities Approaching Sustainable Agriculture) (TX).

C.A.T.A., Farmworker Support Committee (NJ).

Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform.

Carolina Farm Stewardship Association.

Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry, School Sisters of Notre Dame (MN).

Center for Food and Justice, Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, Occidental College.

Center for Rural Affairs (NE).

Center for Sustainable Systems (KY).

Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana.

Coalition for the Bight (NY).

Coastal Enterprises, Inc. (ME).

Colorado Organic Producers Association.

Columbia Area Food Circle (MO).

Community Farm Alliance (KY).

Community Food Security Coalition.

Community Market Gardens.

Consumer Federation of America.

Corporate Agribusiness Research Project.

Dakota Resource Council.

Dakota Rural Action (SD).

Delta Land and Community.

Demeter Association.

Earthfriends.

Eden Foods, Inc.

Erehwon Retreat (NY).

Family Farm Defenders.

Family Farms for the Future (MO).

Farming Alternatives Program at Cornell University.

Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund.

Florida Organic Growers.

Food Works (VT).

Friends of Rural Alabama, Inc.

Friends of the Earth.

GRACE Public Fund (Global Resource Action Center for the Environment).

Green Eggers Farm (MS).

Greenpeace USA.

Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy at Winrock International.

Hoosier Environmental Council.

Idaho Organic Alliance.

Illinois Stewardship Alliance.

Indiana National Farmers Organization.

Innovative Farmers of Ohio.

Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement.

Iowa Environmental Council.

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy.

Johnny's Selected Seeds (ME).

Just Food (NY).

Kansas City Food Circle.

Kansas Rural Center.

Maine Farms Project.

Maine Organic Farmers & Gardeners Association (MOFGA).

Maysie's Farm Conservation Center (PA).

McCone Agriculture Protection Organization.

Michael Fields Agricultural Institute.

Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Services (MOSES).

Minnesota Project.

Minnesota Food Association.

Mississippi 2020 Network, Inc.

Mississippi River Basin Alliance.

Missouri Farmers Union.

Missouri Rural Crisis Center.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture.

National Center for Appropriate Technology.

National Family Farm Coalition.

National Farmers Organization.

Nebraska Wildlife Federation.

New York City Soil and Water Conservation District.

New England Small Farm Institute.

New York Certified Organic, Inc.

New Jersey Environmental Lobby.

New York State Grange.

New York Sustainable Agriculture Working Group (NYSAWG).

Northeast Organic Farming Association-New York.

North Carolina Contract Poultry Growers Association.

Northeast Organic Farming Association of Connecticut (CT).

Northeast Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.

NorthEast Neighborhood Alliance (NY).

Northern Plains Resource Council.

Northern Plains Sustainable Agriculture Society.

Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides.

Nebraska Wildlife Federation.

Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association.

Ohio Environmental Council.

Ohio Family Farm Coalition.

Organic Agriculture Systems Consulting.

Organic Farming Research Foundation.

Organic Independents.

Organic Trade Association.

Organization for Competitive Markets.

PCC Farmland Fund.

Pennsylvania Association for Sustainable Agriculture.

Pennsylvania Certified Organic.

Pesticide Action Network-North America.

Philadelphia Fair Food Project (PA).

Poughkeepsie Farm Project (NY).

Peacework Organic Farm (NY).

Provender Alliance (Pacific Northwest).

Regional Food and Farm Project (Northeast).

Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust (NM).

Roby Van En Center (PA).

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union.

Rodale Institute.

Rural Advancement Foundation International-USA.

Rural Coalition/Coalición Rural.

Rural Vermont.

Rural Virginia Inc.

San Juan Citizens Alliance.
 Sierra Club Agricultural Committee.
 Social Concerns/Rural Life Office Diocese
 of Jefferson City (MO).
 Sophia Garden CSA (NY).
 South Central Farmers Market Association
 (PA).
 Southern Research and Development Corp.
 (LA).
 Southern Sustainable Agriculture Working
 Group.
 Students Interested in Sustainable Agri-
 cultural (Dickinson College, PA).
 Sustainable Agriculture Coalition.
 Sustainable Agriculture for Everyone.
 Sustainable Earth (IN).
 Sustainable Food Center (TX).
 Tennessee Land Stewardship Association.
 Tuscaloosa CSA (AL).
 Tuscarora Organic Growers Cooperative
 (PA).
 Union of Concerned Scientists.
 United Methodist Church, General Board of
 Church and Society.
 Washington Biotechnology Action Council
 (WA).
 Washington Sustainable Food & Farming
 Network.
 Western Organization of Resource Coun-
 cils.
 Western Sustainable Agriculture Working
 Group.
 Willimantic Food Co-op (CT).
 Wisconsin Public Interest Research Group
 Virginia Biological Farming Association.
 Veritable Vegetable (CA).

IN RECOGNITION OF CANADA'S
 STEADFAST SUPPORT FOR THE
 AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THE
 UNITED STATES FOLLOWING
 TERRORISTS ATTACKS ON SEP-
 TEMBER 11, 2001

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our northern neighbors, the people of Canada.

Next week, I will be addressing the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Ottawa, Canada. While there, I will have the high honor of meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien and my colleague in the Canadian House of Commons, Speaker Peter Milliken. With both great leaders, I will express our heartfelt thanks for their tremendous support during these challenging times.

At this time, I would like to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two documents sent to me from Speaker Milliken. The first is a letter he wrote to me detailing "the profound sorrow and sympathy" Canadians have for the families and friends of the victims in September 11th's harrowing attack.

The second is a Resolution passed in the House of Commons on Monday, September 17, 2001, that in part reads: the people's body of Canada reaffirms "its commitment to the humane values of free and democratic society and its determination to bring to justice the perpetrators of this attack on these values and to defend civilization from any future terrorist attack."

In closing, I look forward to my meetings with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly so I can personally deliver America's thanks to the leaders of the free world, especially our friends across our northern border, the people of Canada.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Ottawa, Canada, September 19, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Wash-
 ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, on behalf of all members of the House of Commons of Canada, I would like to convey to you, and to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, the profound sorrow and sympathy of the Canadian people for the families and friends of the victims of the September 11th attack on the United States of America.

At this most difficult time, Canadians and Americans have found solace in the strength and endurance of their friendship. On September 14th, a National Day of Mourning in Canada, I stood with my colleagues from the House, shoulder to shoulder with 100,000 Canadians on the lawn of Parliament Hill in Ottawa, grieving the incalculable loss the world has sustained. Throughout our country, in similar ceremonies, the citizens of Canada echoed, and shared, the sadness of the American people.

The United States and Canada have often taken their relationship for granted; somehow, today, that seems right. There is, after all, much comfort to be had in the unwavering support of our friends during dark times. In fact, former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau once said: "The friendship between our two countries is so basic, so non-negotiable, that it has long since been regarded by others as the standard for enlightened international relations." In the difficult days that lie ahead, I trust you will continue to count on that friendship, as we count on yours.

I have attached the resolution that was adopted by the House of Commons on September 17th, 2001, and signed by the Clerk, as well as the day's Hansard, the transcript of the Commons' proceedings. I hope they will serve to convey to you some of the sentiments expressed by your Canadian colleagues in the House of Commons, as well as their heartfelt hope that the United States will draw strength from its many friends and allies around the world.

Yours truly,

*Peter Milliken,
 The Speaker.*

RESOLUTION

Resolved,—That this House express its sorrow and horror at the senseless and vicious attack on the United States of America on September 11, 2001;

That it express its heartfelt condolences to the families of the victims and to the American people; and

That it reaffirm its commitment to the humane values of free and democratic society and its determination to bring to justice the perpetrators of this attack on these values and to defend civilization from any future terrorist attack.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2001.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, relating to animal fighting.

This amendment, which is identical in content to H.R. 1155, would close a loophole in

section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act and bar any interstate shipment of birds for fighting purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in 1976, I joined my colleagues on the floor of the U.S. House in overwhelmingly approving an amendment to the Animal Welfare Act barring any interstate shipment of birds for fighting. Unfortunately, in the conference with the Senate on this legislation, a provision was inserted to allow shipment of fighting birds to States where cockfighting is legal [at that time, there were six States that allowed legal cockfighting].

For the last quarter century, it has become apparent that this loophole has undermined the effectiveness of State bans against cockfighting. Now only three States allow cockfighting, and the loophole in the law allows illegal cockfighters to argue that they possess and train fighting birds and equipment in order to sell the animals and equipment to any one of the three legal cockfighting States. In reality, they are typically making an excuse to conceal their illegal cockfighting operations within their own State. For instance, a cockfighter in Florida or West Virginia, where cockfighting is illegal, can evade scrutiny, and confiscation of fighting animals, by claiming he is going to ship the birds to one of the three legal States. In short, the loophole provides a smokescreen behind which illegal cockfighters operate and undermine the effectiveness of state laws against animal fighting.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment mirrors the provisions of H.R. 1155, a bill introduced by Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota which has 205 bipartisan cosponsors. This measure has been endorsed by 98 law enforcement agencies.

We should note that the legislation has been endorsed by leading animal welfare groups including the Humane Society of the United States and the American Veterinary Medical Association.

While the Animal Welfare Act currently prohibits any interstate movement of dogs for fighting, the prohibition does not apply to birds shipped interstate to fight in the three States where cockfighting is still legal. This loophole should be closed.

Accordingly, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

TRIBUTE TO JACQUELYN C.C.
 MENDIOLA

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to an exceptional young woman named Jacquelyn C.C. Mendiola. Jacquelyn, a 16 year-old junior attending George Washington High School in Mangilao, Guam, enjoys music, reading, writing and playing basketball. I bring special attention to her today because of a passionate poem she wrote regarding the September 11 attacks on our nation. Jacquelyn happened to be home sick that day and watched the World Trade Center events in New York on the TV news headlines. Her inspiration came from repeatedly watching the families of victims through

CNN news. Her emotions and creativity is reflected in her heart-felt poem which I submit for the RECORD along with her story in her own words.

I stayed home sick from school. When I awoke, I found my mom tuned into CNN. At first, I couldn't believe what was happening. It was like a movie. The twin towers were on fire and came crashing down. The people running on the streets trying desperately to get away. I was then glued to the television and the news reports CNN gave were unbelievable. They did an interview on relatives of those victimized by the attacks. Looking at their faces and seeing the pain in their eyes was overwhelming for me. It broke my heart because I realized that something traumatic can happen to anyone so unexpectedly. They didn't know they were going to die that day. No one suspected they would lose their loved ones. Then I heard about the lost firemen, those who went into save lives and ended up losing their own. When my mom and dad left for work, and my brother and sister were at school, I had a lot of time to myself and I couldn't help but reflect on what was happening. I knew people would be asking, "Why?" or "Where is God when you need Him?" or they would be pointing fingers looking for someone to blame. I can't blame them for being angry because this is terribly disappointing. However, I was thinking that if we continue to seethe with anger instead of uniting to help one another, the situation will be worse than it already is. It's so sad. We need support more than ever, but most of all, I feel we need a God whose power is much more great than the amount of evil in our world. It's harder to trust now and it's hard to maintain hope. We need a strength that defeats our own. With all this on my mind, I wrote it down, and I choose to express myself by writing a poem about a day we shall never forget.

TAKE YOUR SEATS

Passengers take their seats
On a flight to a set destination,
Not knowing that on this day
They will cry out with desperation.
Employees take their seats
In offices stories high,
Not knowing that in this city
Many of them will die.
New York's usual rhythm stopped
When loud explosion came.
It took our nation by surprise
On this long tragic day.
Firefighters and police
Rush to save their lives.
Courageous heroes trapped within
Feared to have not survived.
Faces and dreams wiped away,
The very thought makes me cry.
To know these victims cried in anguish,
Tears falling from their eyes.
Father why did this happen?
Your children have been killed.
Friends and families mourn their deaths.
There is a great void to fill.
A freedom-loving nation torn
United we must stand.
Help us to be strong, I pray
Shelter us with Your hand.
Have mercy on these victims God,
Whose lives came to a sudden stop.
Grant comfort to their loved ones
And be their unshaken rock.
How can this world have so much hate?
Although I've been there too.
Teach us to love instead of hate
Help us to be like You.
Passengers take their seats
On a flight to a set destination.
Not knowing that on this day,
Their flight will lead to Heaven.

SOCCER HALL OF FAME HONOREES

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an exciting event that will be taking place next week in my Congressional District. On October 8, 2001 the U.S. Soccer Hall of Fame, on Oneonta, New York, will award the National Soccer Medal of Honor to a truly remarkable group of individuals, the Championship 1991 U.S. Women's National Soccer Team.

The National Soccer Medal of Honor is a special honor created by the members of the Society of American Soccer History (SASH), and Board of Directors of the National Soccer Hall of Fame to be awarded on special occasions when an individual has so influenced the sport of soccer in the United States as to effect the course of its history. The medal is rarely bestowed. In fact, the October 8th presentation will be only the third in the last twenty years!

The amazing accomplishment of the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team in China in 1991 opened the door for tremendous gains in the world of women's soccer for the United States. A few such achievements include; a first Women's world championship tournament and World Championship title, the addition of women's soccer as an official Olympic event played for the first time at the 1996 Olympic Games in Atlanta, a foundation for the most successful women's sporting event in history—the 1999 Women's World Cup hosted in the United States, and last but far from least, the creation of the first women's professional soccer league in the U.S.—the Women's United Soccer Association (WUSA) which is in its inaugural season.

On this tenth anniversary of the unprecedented accomplishment of a group of 18 American soccer players, their coaches and support staff at the first ever Women's World Championships in China, the National Soccer Medal of Honor will be presented once again to the 1991 U.S. Women's National Team:

Michele Akers, Amy Allman, Tracey Bates-Leone, Debbie Belkin, Brandi Chastain, Joy Fawcett, Julie Foudy, Wendy Gebauer, Linda Hamilton, Mia Hamm, Mary Harvey, April Heinrichs, Lori Henry, Shannon Higgins-Cirovski, Carin Jennings-Gabarra, Kristine Lilly, Megan McCarthy, Kim Maslin-Kammerdeiner, Carla Overbeck, Head Coach Anson Dorrance, Coach Tony DiCicco, Coach Lauren Gregg.

This honor is to be awarded at the Soccer Hall of Fame in Oneonta, New York. The new \$7 million museum opened in 1999 on the Hall's 61 acre soccer campus to rave reviews. The highly interactive, youth-oriented museum tells the story of soccer in the USA from the earliest games played on the Boston Common to the latest scores and standings. They have been host to international teams from the USA, Brazil, Russia, Mexico, New Zealand, Canada, Chile and Saudi Arabia as well as local collegiate and high school championships. The Hall of Fame also offers a summer long tournament series for premier and club teams in every age category. Mr. Speaker, I have visited the National Soccer Hall of Fame numerous times. With each return visit, I encounter something new and exciting.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to bid all those who will attend this ceremony and the honorees my best wishes for the success of their event and applaud their desire to honor such a phenomenal group of athletes—the 1991 U.S. Women's National Team.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. SILVESTRE REYES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. CONYERS. It is time that we hold the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) accountable for the gaps in service to disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. This amendment will set a system in place that will allow the public to routinely monitor any failures of the Department to provide equitable service. In addition, this amendment makes county level data on USDA program participation of disadvantaged producers available to the public. The amendment also requires the release of similar data on participation in Farm Services Agency (FSA) county committee elections, and requires that the process of opening and counting ballots in county committee elections be open to the public.

Mr. Chairman, because of my role as Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I have been approached by Hispanic farmers across the country who are alleging discriminatory practices by the USDA and the FSA. The USDA claims that no discrimination has taken place, but the stories that I have personally heard from these farmers lead me to a very different conclusion. In fact, I am so concerned by what I have heard, that I have requested a General Accounting Office (GAO) audit with my good friend and colleague, Congressman JOE BACA. This audit, which is currently underway, asks, among other things, how much time it has taken the USDA and FSA to process loans for Hispanic farmers as compared with the non-Hispanic population. According to my constituents, the slow turn around time of loans from the USDA makes it impossible for them to plant their crops until it is too late. The lateness in planting the crops leads to the failure of the yield, and ultimately to the default on their loans. In addition, I have heard stories of corruption in regard to county committees and the elections of committee officers that greatly exacerbate the problem. These issues need to be addressed now.

I know that the Small and Disadvantaged Farmer Access and Accountability Amendment is not going to address all of these issues, but it is a start. I am hopeful that passage of this amendment will lead to a more equitable situation for Hispanic and other minority farmers, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the amendment offered by Mr. CONYERS.

HONORING CAL RIPKEN, JR.

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H. Res. 247 sponsored by Representative EHRlich that recognizes the outstanding contributions Cal Ripken, Jr. has made both on and off the baseball field. He is an American icon symbolizing integrity, team spirit, and discipline, and has exemplified true leadership throughout his twenty-one season baseball career.

Since 1978, Mr. Ripken has been honored with several prestigious awards including Rookie of the Year, Most Valuable Player, Golden Glove, Lou Gehrig Award, and Most Valuable Oriole. Baseball's "Ironman" has broken several significant American and personal records such as ending a 2632 consecutive games-played winning streak in 1998, scoring his 400th home run in 1999, and hitting his 3000th career hit in 2000. These moments will never be forgotten.

His greatest contribution has been the ability to take this success off the diamond and outside the walls of Memorial Stadium and Camden Yards by contributing significant time and energy towards various charitable organizations within the greater Baltimore area. Along with his wife, Kelly, he established the Kelly and Cal Ripken, Jr. Foundation which supports adult and family literacy, youth recreational, and health-related programs. They have also been greatly involved in the Baltimore Reads Ripken Learning Center and other organizations within the area.

I was fortunate enough to be able to attend opening day in Baltimore this season, and saw firsthand the all star abilities of this great baseball player. Cal Ripken is a winner in every sense of the word and his contribution to our national pastime will live in the minds of fans forever. He deserves the nation's recognition today. He is truly a living legend.

IN HONOR OF MIKE BYRNE

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the selfless contributions of one of the Oregonians I am privileged to represent, Mike Byrne of Malin, Oregon. I am also pleased to observe his 50th birthday today and offer up my sincere hope that he is blessed with another half century among his friends and family.

Mike Byrne is a long-time rancher on the southern Oregon—northern California border. He is a devoted husband and father and a tireless servant of his fellow Oregonians. But Mr. Speaker, he is much, much more. He is a patient confidant, a visionary, and a man of uncompromising principle. Perhaps most importantly, to me and to the people of his community, he is simply a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, in April of this year the Bureau of Reclamation announced that, based on biological opinions rendered by the National Ma-

rine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the farmers and ranchers of the Klamath Basin would be denied irrigation water for agriculture from Upper Klamath Lake. This decision, coming on the heels of a severe drought, has subjected the local agriculture community to extreme financial hardship. The combination of drought and misguided decision-making by the federal government has literally put the future of their way of life in doubt, as farming as it has existed in the Basin for over 100 years has virtually ceased.

Before the ink on the government's decision was dry, Mike Byrne was hard at work raising awareness about the Klamath crisis and rallying the local community. He has been in the trenches everyday, Mr. Speaker—in town hall meetings, in negotiations with federal, state and local authorities, and around kitchen tables throughout the Basin—to lend what help he could in seeing the farmers and ranchers of the region through this difficult time. Mike was one of the principal organizers of the historic Bucket Brigade on May 7, 2001, which raised the visibility of the crisis and brought the plight of the Klamath Basin to living rooms across America.

Since the crisis first arose in the Klamath Basin, Mike has been at the forefront of the effort to bring diverse groups together to achieve a workable solution. Mike understood that the future of agriculture in the Klamath Basin—and throughout the United States—laid in finding a balanced, workable solution to the conflict between farming and species protection. When this problem is solved and a practical resolution is agreed to by the many parties involved, it will be because of the patience and dedication of people like Mike Byrne.

Mr. Speaker, I take enormous pride in Mike's ceaseless efforts on behalf of his fellow ranchers and farmers. The perseverance he and others like him have demonstrated during this crisis has literally made the difference between despair and hope for so many of the farmers in the Klamath Basin. Mike Byrne represents the best of what citizenship in America means. I offer him both my praise and my most sincere gratitude for working on behalf of the people of the Klamath Basin, who have faced such significant trials. Many hurdles remain in the path of Klamath farmers, and I am grateful that I'll have Mike Byrne by my side throughout the challenges that lie ahead. Happy 50th birthday, Mike.

Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to share with my colleagues the extraordinary service of this outstanding American.

INTRODUCING THE VISA INFORMATION SECURITY ACT OF 2001

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Visa Information Security Act of 2001 (VISA Act)—legislation that increase the security of the American people by closing some of the loopholes within our visa application system. This legislation requires that all non-immigrant visa applicants submit a biometric fingerprint as of the routine visa application process.

Specifically, it would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require that non-immigrant visa applicants provide a biometric identifier, such as a fingerprint, that is machine readable, to be contained the visa or other documentation required for admission at their port of entry into the United States.

The recent terrorist attacks have highlighted the need to review the visa application process and we call improve the screening process used by U.S. Consular offices abroad. Usually, visa applicant names are checked against the State Department database for admissibility. However, some individuals use false information from their country of origin when they apply for a visa or use stolen visas to enter the U.S. As the Washington Post reported today, in the last few years, one country lost approximately 60,000 visas.

While it is impossible to screen every single individual who enters our country, with advanced technology and better coordination with the intelligence community we can better secure our nations border. However, in order to effectively authenticate individuals, we need a method based on inherent characteristics of a person that cannot be lost, changed or duplicated. Through biometric fingerprints, we would have an accurate and clear idea of who is entering our country.

This process is quick and efficient and can be run through our national criminal database to see if the applicant should or should not be allowed into the country. Additionally, when the individual enters the country through the port of entry, his fingerprints will be scanned to verify authenticity. Adding this technology requirement would not add significant time to the visa application process. But it would certainly prevent known terrorists and criminals from entering the country, while at the same time decrease fraudulent visa requests.

In addition, this legislation authorizes the Attorney General to impose a new fee on all visa applicants to cover the costs of implementing this important program. I want to note that my legislation will not apply to NAFTA participating countries and actually allows the Attorney General maximum discretion to decide what methods to utilize for those types of border crossings.

Mr. Speaker, we need to collect more information about the individuals trying to enter this country, but we must do it in a way that does not overburden our consular offices and still allows for visitors to enter the United States. My legislation is an economical first step in increasing our national security and I intend to work tirelessly for its passage.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3049, AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM ACT OF 2001

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the "Afghanistan Freedom Act of 2001", H.R. 3049.

This legislation is intended to underscore to the American people and to the international community our unequivocal commitment to the war on terrorism that was thrust upon us by the barbaric September 11th terrorist attack on

our nation. This legislation further underscores that the enemy in this war includes not only the terrorists who attacked us, but also the regimes that harbor those terrorists.

One such regime is the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Since 1996, the Taliban has harbored Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda organization, who were the authors of the September 11th attack on our nation. The Taliban cannot claim that they were unaware that Osama bin Laden was plotting war against our nation from the refuge they afforded him in Afghanistan.

Osama bin Laden and a number of his associates were indicted for orchestrating the 1998 bombings of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, and the United Nations Security Council joined our nation in demanding that the Taliban surrender them to stand trial for their crimes. The Taliban refused. As a result, the United Nations Security Council imposed mandatory sanctions on the Taliban in 1999.

Following this action, the Taliban chose to continue harboring Osama bin Laden rather than take the steps necessary to end the United Nations sanctions. Because the Taliban chose to place the interests of Osama bin Laden over the interests of the Afghan people, he was able to orchestrate from his base in Afghanistan the September 11th terrorist attack on our nation that claimed approximately 6,000 lives.

In view of these facts, there can be no doubt that the Taliban shares responsibility for the September 11th terrorist attack on our nation. In waging this war that has been thrust upon us, our objectives must include not only the capture of Osama bin Laden and the destruction of his terrorist organization, but also the removal from power of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

This legislation gives the President important authorities that he can use to help our nation succeed in this effort. It authorizes him to provide up to \$300 million in military assistance to resistance organizations in Afghanistan that are today fighting to overthrow the Taliban. It affords the President wide latitude in selecting which organizations should receive this assistance. In addition, the legislation authorizes \$300 million in humanitarian assistance to refugees and other victims of the conflict in Afghanistan. And it mandates the establishment of a Radio Free Afghanistan to broadcast a message of hope to the people of Afghanistan.

Finally, the legislation seeks to put teeth in the existing United Nations sanctions on the Taliban. It requires regular reports to Congress regarding whether any governments are violating those sanctions, and it authorizes the President to impose severe penalties on any governments that he determines are endangering our U.S. military personnel or other U.S. citizens by aiding the Taliban in defiance of United Nations mandates.

By this legislation, we do not declare war on the Taliban. Rather, we recognize that the Taliban has declared war on us, and we seek to equip the President with some of the tools he will need to prevail in this conflict.

H.R. 3049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Afghanistan Freedom Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The rise to power of the Taliban in Afghanistan has caused a drastic decline in the human, political, and civil rights of the Afghan people, particularly among women, girls, and ethnic minorities.

(2) In the year 2001, millions of Afghans are on the verge of starvation, the largest such group in the world.

(3) The United States is the single largest donor of humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan, totaling more than \$185,000,000 in fiscal year 2001.

(4) There are approximately 2,000,000 Afghan refugees in Pakistan, 1,500,000 Afghan refugees in Iran, and 1,000,000 internally displaced persons in Afghanistan, most fleeing oppression, violence, and economic hardship.

(5) During the period of Taliban rule, Afghanistan has become the world's largest source of illegal opium, and proceeds from the sale of raw opium to drug traffickers are used by the Taliban to finance its war on the Afghan people.

(6) Under Taliban rule, Afghanistan has become a training ground, operational base, and safe haven for terrorists and international terrorist organizations, many of whom gain experience fighting alongside Taliban forces inside Afghanistan prior to conducting terrorist operations outside Afghanistan.

(7) The Taliban have, since 1996, harbored and protected terrorist leader Osama bin Laden and members of his terrorist al Qaeda network.

(8) Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda associates were indicted for the August 7, 1998, bombings of the United States embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, as a result of which the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1267 (1999), 1333 (2000), and 1363 (2001), demanding that the Taliban surrender Osama bin Laden for trial and determining that the Taliban's continued provision of sanctuary to international terrorist organizations constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

(9) In order to compel the Taliban to surrender Osama bin Laden and terminate support for international terrorist organizations, the United Nations Security Council has imposed progressively more comprehensive sanctions on the Taliban under Resolutions 1267 (1999), 1333 (2000), and 1363 (2001), which sanctions are binding on all members of the United Nations under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

(10) As a result of the Taliban's failure to comply with the demands of the United States and the United Nations Security Council, Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda network were able to orchestrate from Afghanistan the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the United States in which approximately 6,000 Americans and foreign nationals were murdered.

(11) The Taliban have, since the September 11th attack on the United States, rejected all entreaties by the United States and other governments to surrender Osama bin Laden, close down international terrorist operations in Afghanistan, and comply with the other demands that have been made by the United Nations Security Council.

(12) Afghanistan is an ethnically diverse nation that can prosper only under a representative government that affords all citizens of that nation their basic human rights, restores peace and security, eradicates the drug trade, and brings all terrorists and terrorist organizations in Afghanistan to justice.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD AFGHANISTAN.

It shall be the policy of the United States to promote the removal from power of the

Taliban regime in Afghanistan so as to diminish the risk of future terrorist attack on the United States and restore basic human freedoms to the people of Afghanistan.

SEC. 4. MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO AFGHAN RESISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to direct the drawdown of defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, defense services of the Department of Defense, and military education and training for eligible Afghan resistance organizations.

(2) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The aggregate value (as defined in section 644(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) of assistance provided under paragraph (1) may not exceed \$300,000,000.

(b) ELIGIBLE AFGHAN RESISTANCE ORGANIZATIONS.—An Afghan resistance organization shall be eligible to receive assistance under subsection (a) if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that such organization, or coalition of organizations, is committed to—

(1) the removal from power of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan;

(2) preservation of the territorial integrity and political independence of Afghanistan;

(3) respect for internationally recognized human rights; and

(4) the suppression of terrorism in all of its forms and the surrender to justice of all international terrorists in Afghanistan, including perpetrators of the September 11, 2001, attack on the United States.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT FOR ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Defense articles, defense services, and military education and training provided under subsection (a) shall be made available without reimbursement to the Department of Defense except to the extent that funds are appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under paragraph (2).

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for fiscal year 2002 such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the applicable appropriation, fund, or account for the value (as defined in section 644(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) of defense articles, defense services, or military education and training provided under subsection (a).

(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subparagraph (A) are authorized to remain available until expended, and are in addition to amounts otherwise available for the purposes described in this section.

(e) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Activities under this section may be undertaken notwithstanding any other provision of law.

SEC. 5. DISASTER AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) DISASTER AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—Chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following: "**SEC. 495L. AFGHAN RELIEF, REHABILITATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION.**

"(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Congress recognizes that prompt United States assistance is necessary to alleviate the human suffering of the people of Afghanistan from four years of extreme drought and 20 years of civil war and to restore the confidence of the people in that country.

"(b) ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as the President may determine for the relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction needs of the people of Afghanistan, including displaced persons and other needy

people. Assistance provided under this section shall be for humanitarian purposes with emphasis on providing food, medicine and medical care, clothing, temporary shelter, and transportation for emergency supplies and personnel.

“(c) **POLICIES AND AUTHORITIES TO BE APPLIED.**—(1) Assistance under this section shall be provided in accordance with the policies and general authorities of section 491.

“(2) Assistance under this section or any other provision of law to alleviate the human suffering caused by famine and disease in Afghanistan shall be provided, to the maximum extent practicable, through international agencies, private voluntary organizations, and any eligible Afghan resistance organization.

“(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under the preceding sentence are in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes and are authorized to remain available until expended.”

(b) **OTHER ASSISTANCE FOR AFGHANISTAN.**—

(1) **ASSISTANCE.**—The President is authorized to provide assistance from funds made available to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund) for the provision of food, medicine, or other assistance to the Afghan people, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(2) **AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.**—In each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, not less than \$50,000,000 of the aggregate amount of funds made available to carry out chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is authorized to be made available for assistance to the Afghan people pursuant to paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Broadcasting Board of Governors is authorized to make grants for surrogate radio broadcasting by RFE/RL, Incorporated (formerly known as Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty) to the people of Afghanistan in languages spoken in Afghanistan, such broadcasts to be designated “Radio Free Afghanistan”.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, RFE/RL, Incorporated, shall submit to the Broadcasting Board of Governors a detailed plan for the establishment of the surrogate radio broadcasting described in subsection (a).

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003.**—In addition to such sums as are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003 for “International Broadcasting Operations”, \$8,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 2002 and \$6,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 2003 for “International Broadcasting Operations” to be available only for the surrogate radio broadcasting described in subsection (a).

(2) **TRANSMITTER.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) for the fiscal year 2002, \$1,500,000 shall be available only for a new transmitter for the surrogate radio broadcasting described in subsection (a).

SEC. 7. COMPLIANCE WITH MEASURES DIRECTED AGAINST THE TALIBAN BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL.

(a) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than one month after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every three months thereafter

until the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Taliban no longer exercises power in any part of Afghanistan, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies the government of each foreign country with respect to which there is credible information that the government has, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, violated, or permitted persons subject to its jurisdiction to violate, measures directed against the Taliban pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1267 (1999), 1333 (2000), or 1363 (2001), or pursuant to any other United Nations Security Council resolution adopted under the authority of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

(b) **CONTENT OF REPORTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall detail with respect to each government of a foreign country identified in such report the nature of the violation (other than violations detailed in previous reports submitted pursuant to this section), and shall evaluate—

(1) the importance of the violation to the efforts of the Taliban to remain in power in Afghanistan;

(2) the importance of the violation to the efforts of terrorist groups to continue operating from Afghanistan; and

(3) the risk posed by such violation to the safety of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of other countries acting in coalition with the United States.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE UNITED STATES SANCTIONS.**—The President is authorized to impose one or more of the United States sanctions provided in subsection (d) if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) a government of a foreign country identified in a report submitted under subsection (a) has knowingly violated, or knowingly permitted persons subject to its jurisdiction to violate, measures directed against the Taliban pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1267 (1999), 1333 (2000), or 1363 (2001), or pursuant to any other United Nations Security Council resolution adopted under the authority of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations; and

(2) such violation has put at risk the lives of members of the United States Armed Forces, or other United States citizens.

(d) **UNITED STATES SANCTIONS AUTHORIZED TO BE IMPOSED.**—The United States sanctions referred to in subsection (c) are the following:

(1) No assistance may be provided to that government or nationals under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act.

(2) No license may be issued for any transfer to that government or nationals of any goods, services, or technology controlled under the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act of 1979, or the Export Administration Regulations.

(3) The restrictions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 3(a) and (b)) shall apply to relations between the United States and the government of a foreign country and all nationals of that country with respect to which the President makes a determination described in subsection (c).

SEC. 8. SUBMISSION OF DETERMINATIONS AND REPORTS IN CLASSIFIED FORM.

When the President considers it appropriate, determinations and reports to the appropriate congressional committees submitted under this Act, or appropriate parts thereof, may be submitted in classified form.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Inter-

national Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(2) **NATIONAL.**—The term “national” means, with respect to a foreign country, a national of the country, including a natural person, corporation, business association, partnership, or other entity operating as a business enterprise under the laws of the country.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RONALD FLORES RIVERA

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, each of us in our own way adds to the history of our community; some people make history conspicuously, with flamboyant deeds and actions; others do it subtly, with powerful words quietly spoken. If a history maker is one who contributes significantly to the social, political or economic evolution of a community, then we in Guam are laying to rest a history maker, my good friend and confidant, Ronald Flores Rivera.

On September 27, 2001, the people of Guam lost a dedicated advocate who was steadfast in his political beliefs, free with his thoughts, judicious with his words and gentle in his manner. Ron Rivera, the son of Fay Naputi Flores and Francisco Afaisen Rivera, earned the respect of many on our beloved island. Born in Tamuning, Guam, on October 9, 1953, he grew up and attended grade school in the southern village of Inarajan. Ron graduated with honors from John F. Kennedy High School at age 16.

While an employee of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Ron was selected for training and education by then federal consultant at the University of Guam, Wally Kearns, with whom he shared a lifelong friendship. Ron was sent to attend the University of Arizona in Tucson where he earned both a Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts degree in Rehabilitation. Ron was a very intelligent and motivated individual and was often sought by his peers for his counsel. He was admired by his colleagues not only for his in-depth knowledge within his realm of expertise, but also for his ability to understand and absorb vast amounts of information in many other areas.

While away for his studies, Ron never forgot his home island of Guam. His good natured character, determination and perseverance emanated with the love and commitment to return to the island and continue working for the benefit of the people of Guam. As with his early educational endeavors and the desire to return home, Ron managed to complete his educational program and earn both degrees in less than the average time expected for such specialties.

In addition to his rehabilitation work, Ron also got involved with Guam's tourist industry, selling handicrafts both in Guam and Saipan. He eventually went into business full-time for himself, operating Ronsan Beach House, a recreational rental business on Tumon Bay. Running his own business allowed him the freedom to devote time and energy to his political activities.

Passing away just a few days shy of his 48th birthday, Ron left behind a body of work that would have taken the average person several lifetimes to accomplish. With his trademark Panama hat, Ron gained prominence and respect as a Chamorro Rights' activist.

As the status of the former Trust Territories was being addressed in the last 1970s and early 1980s, Ron became involved with Guam's search for its own political status. He shared great concern for the Chamorro people—the indigenous inhabitants of Guam, who had never been offered the opportunity to decide their own political fate. Delving into the matter, Ron was introduced to a committee on non-self-governing territories within the United Nations that received regular reports from the United States on its administration of Guam. Always a man of action, Ron began to work towards voicing perspective and aligning himself with the Organization of People for Indigenous Rights (OPIR). Through OPIR, Ron requested and later gained approval to make presentations for Guam at the United Nations, together with similarly situated political jurisdictions that were working toward ending their colonial relationships with their administering countries. Ron believed that the United Nations' forum offered a reasonable and objective way to focus upon the Guam-United States relationship.

Whether it was in congressional hearings, presentations at the United Nations, village meetings in Guam, or simply talking with tourists on the beach, Ron's friendly manner and quiet dignity never faltered. He was sure and proud of his heritage and sincere in his advocacy of the Chamorro people. He never wavered in his sentiments and he always impressed friends and opponents alike. His name, his approach, his ideas will be written into the history books of Guam whenever there is a discussion about the political development of Guam's people.

Ron's commitment to his family was beyond reproach. He was a loving husband and father. He recognized the connection between his political advocacy, the well being of the people he came from, and the family which sustained him. His maturity, his dignity, his gentlemanly approach to dealing with difficult situations made him the anchor of his family and a highly regarded member of his extended family. His wife, Annie; his daughters Andrea, Faye, Cara, and Vanessa; his grandchildren, Erica, Aaron, Connor Reid, Taylor Raye, and Evan Reece have so much to be proud of and are very lucky to have shared his presence in the short time that he was with us. I know that his parents, his siblings, his aunts and uncles and cousins all share in this pride. I extend to all of them my most sincere condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I can't begin to describe my deep sense of personal loss. He was a very close friend, a mentor, a supporter, and a brother. I join his family and the people of Guam in mourning this great loss and, at the same time, celebrating the life and work of a devoted husband, dutiful son, loving father, great friend, and staunch advocate of the Chamorro people. He will be greatly missed. Adios, Ron.

WALTER G. MORRISON, AN
AMERICAN HERO

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the terrible tragedy that occurred on September 11, 2001, it is necessary that we honor and recognize the men and women who risk their lives on a daily basis to ensure the safety of others—our Nation's fire and emergency services personnel. It is also necessary to pause, reflect, and honor the over 300 fire service personnel who made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of public safety on the 11th. Remembering the events that transpired on the 11th conjure up horrific images, but also images that inspire—images of true dedication to others, devotion to duty and bonafide heroism. It also triggers memories of a fire-service veteran and true hero from my congressional district—Walter G. Morrison—an individual who would have, without equivocation, been nowhere other than at ground "0" assisting victims on that fateful day. Walter died on July 18, 1981, in the line of duty—selflessly attempting to help others. A fire and civil defense coordinator in Otsego County, Walter also served as Chief of the Fly Creek Fire Department, a board member of the Central New York Firemen's Association, and Secretary of the New York State Fire Service Council. Walter exemplified the fire service and all it stands for. He was 46. Today, it is fitting that he, along with four of his fellow firefighters from the great state of New York, and numerous others from around the nation, have their names permanently etched upon the National Fallen Firefighters monument in Emmitsburg, Maryland for all to see and remember. It is our duty—our responsibility to never forget that it is people much like Walter—a neighbor; a colleague; an friend; a father; a son; a brother; a mother; willingly placing themselves in danger for you—for all of us.

DISPLACED WORKERS' RELIEF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, Congress approved the Air Transportation Stabilization Act to provide \$15 billion to help stabilize our nation's airlines, save jobs and moderate the negative economic impact of the September 11 attack. Helping our ailing aviation industry was important; helping the workers affected by the economic impact of this national tragedy is equally as important.

Over 100,000 people who worked in the airline industry have become unemployed as a result of the terrorist attacks, and even more are expected to lose their jobs in the future. If Congress does not act quickly, these men and women will be unable to pay for the necessities of life, such as food and rent. These workers need help now.

I encourage the leadership to work with Democrats, who have a plan to provide re-training programs, health insurance, and un-

employment benefits to displaced workers and their families. This proposal will give critically needed assistance now, while providing workers with the tools necessary to find new employment and rebuild long term economic security for themselves and their families.

I supported the Air Transportation Stabilization Act not only because it was needed to help stabilize the airline industry and our economy, but also because congressional leaders committed to quickly bring forth legislation to address the needs of displaced workers, who deserve the same attention and quick action Congress gave to the aviation industry. The time has come to make good on that promise.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to provide \$25 million for child nutrition programs. These programs provide funding for our nation's schools to purchase commodities for their National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs.

The National School Lunch Program serves more than 27 million children every day, slightly over half to children who live at or near the poverty level in this country. More than 85% of the 7 million breakfast served in schools each day go to poor children. For these children, our federal school meal programs are their most secure link to good nutrition. These commodity food programs also allow school districts to offset the costs of lunches for children who do not participate in the program. In essence, these programs benefit the child receiving the free or reduced cost meal as well as the child who pays full price.

Research has confirmed a link between nutrition and children's cognitive development, cognitive performance, and ability to concentrate. Preschool and school age children need to receive proper and adequate nutrition. Studies also show that those nutritional programs have contributed positively to scores on test of basic skills, reduced tardiness and absenteeism.

Also clear is the link between our federal nutrition programs and our agricultural communities. The United States began providing agricultural commodities to our schools more than a decade before we started grants in aid to schools to provide meals, and three decades before we recognized the special needs of our poorest children through the free and reduced price meal subsidies. In 1994, Congress amended the National Lunch Act to require that at least 12% of all federal support for schools meals must be in the form in commodities. However, in 1998 the Congress again amended the National School Lunch Act to count bonus commodities, food products purchased under separate authorizations and for a very different purpose, to meet the 12% statutory requirement. While some thought this

was merely an accounting change, the effect was a real cut in support for our school lunch program. The commodities, which will not be purchased under the entitlement authorization, are the ones best suited to meet the menu and nutritional requirements of our school meal programs. The impact of the change was not felt last year or this because Congress yet again passed another statute that correct the error, but only for 2000 and 2001. But our schools will lose more than \$55 million dollars in entitlement commodities in 2002 unless we act to correct the problem. Over the next eight years, this cut will exceed \$440 million. That is a very real and significant cut to our school programs. Make no mistake, this is a school lunch budget cut—this is more than \$55 million per year that schools will not receive. It is also a \$440 million cut in the amount of agricultural commodities purchased by USDA.

I have spoken with several of my colleagues and they share my interest in this matter. After all, this money is used by USDA to purchase agricultural commodities, and these purchases have a significant impact on producer incomes. The magnitude of this cut is even more dramatic when you consider the amount of food that it represents. This cut means that USDA will reduce its overall purchases by 660 million pounds.

One of the best ways we can move forward as a society is to meet our obligations to our children. The Federal Government must follow through on its commitment to work in partnership with states, schools, and the agricultural community to administer a major program designed to improve children's diets and, in turn their overall health and well being. We can be proud that these school meal programs promote the well being of some of our Nation's most vulnerable children by providing them with the nourishment they need to develop healthy bodies and sound minds. Nutritious meals help students reach their full potential by keeping them alert and attentive in the classroom. As both common sense and extensive scientific research confirm, a hungry child cannot focus on schoolwork as well as one who has been fed a nutritious meal.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing the many needs being addressed in this bill, I will withdraw the amendment, but would like to draw attention to how we, the representatives of our pre-school and school age children across America, have neglected them. And in the spirit of National School Lunch Week, which begins the second week of October every year, I would also like to express my interest in working together with members of both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and the Workforce to explore this issue and seek ways to support our nation's pre-school and school age children by providing additional agricultural commodities. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with all of my colleagues who share my concern to amend this problem and provide for our pre-school and school age children at home first. Thank you.

IN MEMORY OF SAMANTHA EGAN,
LISA EGAN, MICHAEL CURTAIN
AND JOANNE AHLADIOTIS

HON. FELIX J. GRUCCI, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of four constituents from the community of Rocky Point in my district who lost their lives at the World Trade Center in the tragic events that occurred there on September 11, 2001.

The tragedy that struck our great nation on the morning of September 11 has been an immense source of sorrow and mourning for our country, touching the lives of nearly every citizen in our country. This is especially so in Rocky Point, where the lives of four alumni of Rocky Point High School High School were taken on that fateful morning. This community will gather together this Sunday, October 7, to celebrate their lives and show their unity as a community.

Samantha Egan, a graduate of Rocky Point High School in 1992, spent much of her time involved in student activities. She played on the soccer, basketball, and softball teams. She was a member of both the Singing Santa's and Leaders Clubs. Samantha was also an adept musician.

Lisa Egan, Samantha's younger sister, was a graduate of the class of 1988, also spent her time studying and playing music. An ambitious young woman, she remained heavily involved in the Peer Leadership Program at her school where she spent much of her time.

Michael Curtain, a graduate of the class of 1975, retrained both the attributes of a scholar and an athlete. Michael occupied his time in the Thespian Society while at the same time holding the office of Vice President of his class. Michael played for the soccer, basketball, and baseball teams. He also involved himself in the Varsity Club. His guidance counselor once reflected upon Michael's career goals, stating, "I hope Mike will be given a chance to attain his goal as a police officer".

Joanne Ahladiotis, a graduate of the class of 1992, was regarded as a well-rounded and dynamic person. Her interests were diverse, ranging from the study of Modern Greek and playing on the field hockey team, to performing in the High School musical and working on the school's yearbook.

Those who lost their lives and those that gave their lives in the line of duty at the World Trade Center have shown themselves to be heroes. Their lives, like the lives of many other Americans that day, are a shining example of what makes this country as great as it is.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest sympathies and condolences to the Egan, Curtain and Ahladiotis families, and join the Rocky Point community in honoring the memory of these four young people.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS AND WORKING FAMILIES

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the urgent need to provide imme-

diately economic stimulus to this country in the form of a payroll tax rebate for working families.

The United States is facing a crisis, and it is not merely a security crisis. There is a visible, pressing need for economic stimulus and worker relief.

We should move quickly to jumpstart the economy by putting money into the hands of the tax paying lower wage workers that are more likely to spend it immediately.

My bill, the Working Families Tax Rebate Act will do just that.

This bill will provide an immediate payroll tax rebate of up to \$300 to people who didn't benefit from the tax cut signed into law in June.

The dramatic decrease in travel and tourism not only affects those workers employed by the airline industry.

Working men and women in the hospitality industry and service sector are also facing massive layoffs.

These people need immediate help with buying their groceries, preparing for the holidays, and paying their heating bills. Our shop keepers need consumers back in the stores.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3015. Because this country needs economic stimulus now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber when the following rollcall votes were taken, rollcall vote 336, rollcall vote 337, rollcall vote 349 and rollcall vote 350. I want the record to show that had I been present in this Chamber I would have voted "yea" on each of these rollcall votes.

VERMONT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT CONGRESSIONAL TOWN MEETING

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the outstanding work done by participants in my Student Congressional Town Meeting held this summer. These participants were part of a group of high school students from around Vermont who testified about the concerns they have as teenagers, and about what they would like to see government do regarding these concerns.

I am asking that these statements be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

ON BEHALF OF BLAKE KINKAID, CRAIG STEVENS, AND BRITTANY CHANDLER

REGARDING TOBACCO PREVENTION—MAY 7, 2001

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Now we are going up to the Northeast Kingdom and the Northeast Kingdom Youth Services. Who is going to begin?

BLAKE KINKAID: Blake Kinkaid.

BRITTANY CHANDLER: Brittany Chandler.

CRAIG STEVENS: Craig Stevens.

BLAKE KINKAID: That's a pretty tough act to follow, you guys. I have been watching it. The whole Napster thing. That is awesome. The cannabis thing. It is kind of hard to follow up on, but Josh, the whole tobacco thing killed a lot more people. He said that cannabis hadn't. Tobacco kills one person every fourteen seconds, different related disease such as cancer, heart disease, or anything like that. My dad, he has been a smoker ever since he was 14. And it has been a big shock to me. Last night, he was put in the hospital because of his heart. He is 40 years old. He just turned 40, and he is having heart problems through all the smoking. It scared the crap out of me, because it is exactly what my grandfather did when he was on his deathbed. Well, emphysema. He had smoked all his life too. And I just realized: Oh, my god! I wonder how many other people have to go through this every day. And it is really hard, and our group, we belong to a group called OVE, Our Voices Exposed, that helps get the prevention world for tobacco. Brittany is a new member who just started, and Craig is with me from the beginning. And we help put out the word about prevention, such as we give kids an alternative activity to do to keep them out of trouble. And Craig will elaborate on it.

CRAIG STEVENS: We are going to be having a dance coming up this Friday.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Try to speak a little bit louder. We don't have a mike. Sorry.

CRAIG STEVENS: We have going to have a dance this Friday, and we have had—what?—three dances in the past.

BLAKE KINKAID: Five.

CRAIG STEVENS: Five. We had five dances. We have had sliding parties, bowling, pizza parties. We have had a whole lot of stuff I can't remember.

BLAKE KINKAID: We have had cookouts at Lake Willoughby and Harvey's Lake sometimes. We have had jamborees down there in the summer, having a battle of the bands, and we had a haunted house that brought over 300 people. Everything we do has a nonsubstance theme. We have these things to try to keep kids off tobacco, and we try to give them something to do. I found the biggest cause of smoking and all other substance use in boredom. That is why I started, just boredom, pretty much.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Brittany, do you want to add anything?

BRITTANY CHANDLER: Well, most of my friends smoke, and I have noticed that my friends that do smoke, most of them don't do activities and stuff. And so they have nothing to do with their time, and just sit around and smoke and everything. And most of the people are around people that smoke, like their parents and stuff.

ON BEHALF OF DANIELLE HARVEY, ANDREA SHAHAN, AND STEPHANIE GRAY

REGARDING OPPOSITION TO PARENTAL NOTIFICATION FOR ABORTION—MAY 7, 2001

DANIELLE HARVEY: This year, the Vermont House has discussed the question of making parental notification for abortion a requirement. We feel that this would be making a big mistake. Having to tell your parents you are sexually active is hard enough; having to tell them that you are pregnant as a result could be dangerous, maybe even life-threatening. For this reason, as well as others, some girls delay in telling their parents about the predicament, which could cause some major health risks, such as: When someone goes out of state to avoid parental involvement laws, they are putting themselves at risk during the trip home, be-

cause there may be long stretches where medical care is not readily available. Parents who are opposed to abortion might force their daughters to carry the babies to term, regardless of any possible or known health or life risks. Or a woman who is pregnant and a few months short of her 18th birthday may wait until she is 18 to have the abortion. A delay of even five days can cause major complication in a procedure. If the government and the state of Vermont, as well as the national government, wants what is best for the nation's youth, they should leave parents out of a girl's decision to have an abortion. The decision is hard enough to make on her own, and adding parents to the situation makes it almost impossible.

STEFANIE GRAY: If a child is forced to tell her parents that she is pregnant, then her parents would know that she is sexually active. Most of the time, parents don't approve. Finding out she is sexually active and pregnant could cause verbal or physical abuse by her parents. The girl's parents may force her to go through with the pregnancy, or they may even kick her out. Family breakdown is a major result from girls telling their parents that they're pregnant and want an abortion. Girls that don't have a good relationship with their parents to begin with will probably make it worse and risk abuse. Families with good relationships don't need the law, because they are supportive. Then again, you might lose the family trust. In unsupportive families, the law will be ineffective because the families would be more likely to be abusive and add to the family's problems.

ANDREA SHAHAN: Some supporters of parental notification concede that some parents can become abusive when they learn their daughter wants to receive an abortion, and they have offered an option of going before a judge, instead of their parents, to get permission to receive an abortion. This option is known as the judicial waiver. Women who live in sparsely populated areas usually have difficulty receiving a judicial waiver, since easy access to a judge is not possible. Women who live in large cities, however, have easy access to courthouses, therefore not making it fair to many women in the U.S. In receiving a judicial review, confidentiality is not guaranteed. Many teens lack the knowledge and experience of court procedures to obtain a waiver. Students who need to attend their hearings will not be able to do so during school hours. Many of the court judges are very strongly pro-life. Even though the Supreme Court requires judges to issue a waiver if the teen is mature or if an abortion is in her best interests, several judges still deny them a waiver. Judge Nixon, of the District Court in Tennessee estimated that, even under the best circumstances, the judicial waiver process would take 22 days to complete. This becomes a significant problem, given the time-sensitive nature of pregnancy, and the risk involved in later abortions. Representative Sanders, we oppose any efforts to put into effect parental notification under Vermont law, and we hope that you will oppose any efforts at the federal level as well. Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CELEBRATES THE BOROUGH OF ROCKY HILL AND THE TRI-CENTENNIAL HERITAGE DAY

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Borough of Rocky Hill, New Jersey and its Tri-Centennial Heritage Day celebration. For three centuries, the community of Rocky Hill has made tremendous contributions to our state and our nation through its legacy of committed residents and unique spirit of pride and unity.

Rocky Hill, less than one square mile in size, has a rich history that began in 1717 when John Harrison obtained land from Indian Chief Nowenock. Then, in 1783, as he awaited the news that the Treaty of Paris had been signed, General George Washington prepared his famed "Farewell to the Troops" at his home Rockingham, located in Rocky Hill.

As we know it, Rocky Hill enjoyed industrial success at the turn of the century due to its proximity to the Delaware and Raritan Canal as well as the opening of the New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company's spur line along the Millstone River. This water traffic carried not only passengers, but lumber, coal and vegetables.

Rocky Hill has been home to not only President and General George Washington, but John Hart, a New Jersey Signer of the Declaration of Independence as well as a more recent outstanding American, former Rocky Hill Council-Member, Bill Fallon, a victim of the tragic September 11th attack.

Rocky Hill is home to a tight-knit community of families and friends and the celebration of the Tri-Centennial presents an opportunity to pause and reflect on our history and to strengthen and renew our spirit for the centuries to come.

Mr. Speaker, again, I celebrate this Tri-Centennial Heritage Day and honor the Borough of Rocky Hill and its residents, both past and present, who have worked so diligently to make this day possible. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this community and its 300th anniversary.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ackerman-Houghton Amendment to prohibit the marketing of animals so sick they oftentimes cannot even walk. Animals too weak from sickness or injury are routinely pushed, kicked, dragged, and prodded with electric shocks in an effort to move them at auctions and intermediate markets, en route to slaughter. There is no excuse of this unnecessary torment.

This amendment will protect these animals by preventing bad actors from transporting downed animals to livestock markets and requiring these downed animals to be humanely euthanized.

Unfortunately, because livestock sold for human consumption will bring a higher dollar than livestock sold for other purposes, greed has proven to be more important to some than the suffering of the animals or the knowledge that meat from these animals is likely to be unfit for consumption.

These animals do not deserve this treatment and we do not deserve the threat of contaminated meat at our grocery stores. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Friends of Animals Caucus, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Ackerman-Houghton Downed Animal Amendment.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative Sherwood to permanently extend the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Furthermore, I am distressed that this amendment was unable to receive a waiver from the Judiciary Committee, and thus will not receive an up or down vote.

New York's dairy farmers, which make up 60 percent of our agricultural base in my home State, have been cut out of this legislation. Producers and their organizations have been concerned about the viability of the dairy industry in the northeastern States for several years.

Declining herd and cattle numbers, combined with drought and fluctuating market prices, have led to a loss of infrastructure and revenue for our New York dairy farmers. Our farmers continue to experience a reduction in farm income including the loss of at least \$200 million annually.

Our dairy farmers are relying on their inclusion in the Northeast Dairy Compact, to provide them with stability in pricing. However, that measure is not only missing from this legislation, it was not even permitted to be discussed. Time and time again, our Nation's dairy farmers have had to face the challenges of nature and an unstable market.

In response to these challenges, these distressed dairy farmers looked to the Congress to provide them with a crucial milk price safety net, by extending the Northeast Dairy Compact, and offering the preferred milk pricing structure.

Accordingly, along with my colleagues from New York and throughout the region, I anticipated the opportunity to respond to our farmers by negotiating for the inclusion of favorable dairy language in this legislation. However, this opportunity was not afforded to us.

Finally, I urge the full committee to work toward the inclusion of the Northeast Dairy Compact during negotiations in the conference.

TRIBUTE TO OPERATION BREAKTHROUGH

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Kansas City, Missouri's most successful childcare facilities. Serving more than 400 children daily, Operation Breakthrough is Missouri's largest single site childcare center and broad based social service agency. This year, Operation Breakthrough will celebrate 30 years of helping less fortunate children develop to their fullest potential.

After working together at St. Vincent's Elementary School in 1967, Sister Corita Bussanmas and Sister Berta Sailer were approached by several economically disadvantaged working mothers that wanted affordable and quality childcare. In 1971, at the mothers request the sisters opened a childcare center in their living room, at 31st and Paseo to care for 50 children. Later that year, the Catholic Diocese closed St. Vincent's Parish. Without funds from the Diocese, the parents worked together to obtain Model Cities funding in addition to a grant from the Hall Family Foundation. Thanks to the hard work, long hours and dedication from the sisters, families, volunteers and the community, Operation Breakthrough has gone through many transformations to become the non-religious, 501 © (3) not-for-profit corporation that we know today.

In 1976, the center grew to include before and after school programs allowing parents the ability to enter and remain in the workforce. Five years later, Operation Breakthrough moved to its current location at 31st and Troost continuing its commitment to the urban core where it has added an extensive assortment of social services to meet the needs of the families and their children.

Over the past 30 years, Operation Breakthrough has assisted numerous children living in poverty by providing them a caring and positive learning environment. This not-for-profit organization offers the families and children of Kansas City the services of day care, Early Start and Head Start programs, a 7,000-volume library, a children's computer lab, health and dental services through Children's Mercy Hospital and various dental clinics, speech therapy, play therapy, occupational therapy, housing assistance, GED tutoring, parenting classes, mentoring, a clothing closet, and nutritious meals.

As the largest childcare provider in the state of Missouri, Operation Breakthrough has excelled in every aspect of its service to our community. As a direct result from the success Operation Breakthrough has shown, last years appropriation committee recognized their efforts by funding the Second Step anti-violence program and Child Abuse prevention program in the sum of \$180,000.

Today, Operation Breakthrough is a place of laughter and joy for children in need. Five

days a week from six a.m. to six p.m., Operation Breakthrough is a place which strives to provide children and their families the security and stability missing in their lives. Since 1971, Operation Breakthrough has provided the very education that will not only assist in developing these children, but also positively impact their ways of thinking and behaviors for the rest of their lives. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Operation Breakthrough celebrate thirty years of outstanding service to the Kansas City community.

AMERICA'S FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased a week ago to see an oped in my hometown newspaper, The Oregonian, written by the president of the American Foreign Service Association, John Naland. It highlights the work of the Foreign Service that we now know is even more important in the wake of the September 11 attack on our country.

There is a serious problem facing the Foreign Service, and it can be rectified in the FY02 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, H.R. 2500, when it goes to the House/Senate Conference. Personnel shortages in the Foreign Service Corps seriously impede our ability to conduct our nation's foreign policy. Even before September 11, our Foreign Service personnel were stretched too thinly in the face of growing demands. Work that should have been done was not getting adequate attention because of competing demands of time and energy. Personnel shortages also leave us under-trained because in choosing between training or filling a position, the system fills the position.

The Department of State calculates that the shortfall is about 1,100 people. The 2000 report on 'State Department Reform' by the Task Force chaired by Frank Carlucci and co-sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations and the Center for Strategic and International Studies estimated the workforce shortfall to be some 700 Foreign Service Officers or nearly 15 percent of Foreign Service requirements.

As the Foreign Service continues to promote and protect our interests abroad in these difficult days, it is vital that we appropriate funding for the Diplomatic and Consular Account in the State Department portion of the FY02 C-J-S appropriations bill that is at or above the \$3,646 million level provided by the House of Representatives. I encourage conferees to adopt this funding level.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the views of the American Foreign Service Association as presented here.

[From the Oregonian, Sept. 28, 2001]

DON'T FORGET THE VITAL ROLE OF DIPLOMACY
(By John K. Naland)

President Bush has vowed to use every resource at his command to defeat terrorism. In his address to the nation last week, he included four that are familiar to most Americans: military might, intelligence collection, law enforcement and financial pressure. But

many citizens might be hard-pressed to explain the practical value of the anti-terrorism tool that Bush put at the very top of his list: Diplomacy.

Diplomacy is the art of influencing foreign governments and peoples to support our nation's vital interests. Never has skilled U.S. diplomacy been more needed than in the current crisis. The president has made it clear that destroying the network of international terrorists will require the combined efforts of many nations. Thus, the task of forming that international coalition against terrorism now rests on the shoulders of U.S. diplomacy.

While Bush and Secretary of State Colin Powell are clearly our chief diplomats in this effort, our career diplomats stationed around the globe are implementing the detailed work. As Powell said in a Sept. 13 "all hands" message sent to all U.S. diplomatic and consular posts, "the men and women of American diplomacy will be at the forefront of this unprecedented effort . . . to break the back of international terrorism."

U.S. diplomats are now rallying key governments to apply political pressure on those countries that harbor terrorists. They are seeking to enlist foreign police forces and intelligence services in the search for the attackers. U.S. diplomats are negotiating for the military overflight and basing rights that will be needed if we must, as the president put it, "bring justice to our enemies."

Unfortunately, even as Congress does its part to fight terrorism by augmenting the budgets of our military, law enforcement and intelligence agencies, some in Congress do not acknowledge the parallel need to strengthen our diplomatic efforts. This despite the fact that diplomatic readiness is no less important to our national security than is military readiness.

Lost in the flurry of congressional activity last week was the Senate passage of a State Department appropriations bill that fell far short of what Powell requested last spring. The deleted funding was to have addressed two of the State Department's most pressing deficiencies: inadequate staffing and dilapidated overseas infrastructure. Because the House version of the bill fully funded the administration's request, a House and Senate conference committee will soon meet to decide on the final funding level.

The events of Sept. 11 underscore the urgent need for adequate resources for diplomacy, which Powell has aptly termed "America's first line of offense." As our diplomats go about forging an international coalition against terrorism, it is vital for the Congress to give them the tools they need to succeed.

John K. Naland, a career Foreign Service Officer and former U.S. Army officer, is president of the American Foreign Service Association.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my absence today, which resulted in my being unable to vote my strong support for the Emergency Appropriations Supplemental bill. I have been in lower Manhattan, where I have observed what can only be described as wreckage from a war zone. More moving, and more powerful, than the images of shattered skyscrapers and exploding

airplanes, though, is what else I have seen. In New York, I have seen bravery and heroism that has transformed by deep sadness into a far more profound sense of pride. This may be America's darkest hour, but in many ways it is also her finest.

Much has been said regarding the cowardly nature of these attacks, which were perpetrated largely against unarmed civilians. And yet September 11 was a day of heroes too, because of the heroism of everyday Americans. The terrorists struck the innocent because they thought they would be helpless, but the opposite proved to be true.

Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, speaking of the Battle of Iwo Jima during another great American crusade, said famously, "Uncommon valor was a common virtue." Such was the case on September 11. On that day, a fourth plane, perhaps intended for the White House or the Capitol itself, was brought down in the fields of Pennsylvania through the courageous deeds of determined Americans, ordinary Americans, who knew they were near the end, and that their story would never be told. Uncommon valor was a virtue demonstrated in abundance by the passengers on United Airlines Flight 93.

In New York I also saw the rubble which entombs the bodies of perhaps three hundred firemen. Many of these souls perished attempting to rescue others from the doomed World Trade Center, charging up stairways filled with people fleeing downward. Their sacrifice is astounding when one considers the fact that we lose an average of 100 firefighters each year nationwide. 300 were lost in one day, in one city block. We also lost a staggering number of police officers on Tuesday, individuals who gave their lives while serving and protecting the people of their city. We will not forget them.

In New York, I brought word that the House of Representatives, the people's house, mourns with the rest of the nation. I brought word that help is on the way. Let it be heard by all of those who were touched by this tragedy that the United States Congress will give whatever aid is necessary to respond to this disaster. The Congress will also stand behind the President, united with one voice, as he pursues those responsible for this barbarity.

The terrorists underestimated the spirit of America on September 11. While they must have known of the devastating military retaliation that would follow inevitably from their actions, they clearly did not anticipate how the average American would react that day. Terrorism did not inspire terror but instead courage, selflessness, and sacrifice. Many thousands were unable to defend themselves. However, those who were able to act did so with magnificent valor. America drew strength from these people as we stared together into the abyss. During our darkest day, these Americans gave us hope.

MISSILE DEFENSE NEEDED NOW MORE THAN EVER

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, How ridiculous it would be to start leaving the front door

unlocked just because burglars had recently found it easier to enter through the back window. When it comes to national defense, America will regret leaving its front door wide open.

Our military's preparation and emphasis on modern warfare proved insufficient in preventing last month's terrorist attacks. Appropriately, congress reacted by devoting greater resources to preventing future acts of terrorism and compensating for certain weaknesses. But the needs for modern defenses have not diminished. In fact, they have only become more acute.

The United States needs to broaden its response to the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon. It is not enough to focus on stopping terrorist attacks using commercial airlines, or the buildup of air power in the Middle East and Southwest Asia, or covert operations in Afghanistan against Osama bin Laden. The United States must not neglect building a defense against ballistic missiles and the possibility of terrorists making an unauthorized launch of ballistic missiles. Instead of the loss of six thousand lives, the United States could lose six million.

Even the accidental launch of ballistic missiles is possible, for example, from Russian nuclear-missile-carrying submarines where the command and control of nuclear missiles is much less secure than for United States ballistic missile submarines. Russian land-based or road-mobile ICBMs are also less secure than American Weapon systems and could similarly be taken over by terrorists and launched. Nor are accidents unthinkable. As recently as January of 1995 a Norwegian sounding rocket activated Boris Yeltsin's portable nuclear command briefcase for initiating a retaliatory missile strike against the United States.

In the early 1990's the United States recognized the threat of an accidental or unauthorized (terrorist) launch of ballistic missiles in President Bush's plan for building a ballistic missile defense called Global Protection Against Limited strikes (GPALS). To protect the United States from accidental or terrorist launches or rogue nations like North Korea, President Bush proposed building a space-based defense including high-energy lasers and Brilliant Pebbles interceptors. Unfortunately, Congress underfunded the program, and President Clinton discontinued it.

The United States faces serious international implications affecting its security. On September 11, the same day of the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, China signed a memorandum of understanding to provide economic and technical aid to the Taliban. For two years, Chinese companies have assisted the Taliban in its efforts to improve its telephone system in Kabul.

Unfortunately, the Congress is considering using the war on terrorism as an excuse to cut its ballistic missile defense programs, especially space-based defenses, evidently unaware of how china has threatened it with long-range missiles and is engaged in an aggressive arms buildup. China's ambitious buildup includes its DF-31 ICBM and JL-2 SLBM. China's road-mobile DF-31, which has been flight-tested and forms part of its Long Wall Project aimed at the United States, its forces, and allies particularly in the Pacific.

The war on terrorism extends to Iraq, which has helped equip Osama bin Laden with

chemical weapons. It extends to the war on drugs as drugs are used to finance terrorism. Much of the world's supply of heroin comes from Afghanistan. The war on terrorism also extends to U.S. relations with other countries and alliances, and the alliances China is forming to increase its international influence and control.

Beneath the war on terrorism is a reluctance of the United States to end its vulnerability to ballistic missiles, unwilling to confront their use by terrorists or in acts of war by countries such as China, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and others. Most importantly, the Congress, in passing the \$343 billion House Defense Authorization Bill, cut its space-based ballistic missile defense programs by \$400 million, which will continue to leave millions of Americans vulnerable to destruction by ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons.

If the United States is to succeed in its war against terrorism, it must act decisively against Osama bin Laden, confiscate his nuclear devices and destroy his chemical weapons. At the same time America must guard itself against ballistic missiles, realizing that ballistic missiles can be hijacked by terrorists. It must rebuild its military strength and intelligence. It must build the best ballistic missile defense it can by accelerating its Navy Theater Wide program, and emphasizing space-based defenses, including high-energy lasers, Brilliant Pebbles interceptors, and particle beams.

Thriving democracy, abundant liberty and glorious freedom are the legacy of our republic. These profound American qualities continue to be the envy of the world and the hope for humanity; and they only exist today because of God's blessings and America's commitment to a robust, and proficient defensive capability. Flinging wide open America's front door is an invitation to an even greater, and more cataclysmic frontal attack upon our liberty.

**BOWDOIN COLLEGE INAUGURATES
ITS NEW PRESIDENT, BARRY
MILLS**

HON. THOMAS H. ALLEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 27th, Barry Mills will be inaugurated as the 14th president of Bowdoin College, my alma mater and one of the finest liberal arts colleges in the nation.

The selection of Barry Mills by the Bowdoin College Board of Trustees last January was an ideal choice. He brings to this position

qualities and experience that will serve Bowdoin's students, faculty and alumni exceptionally well. The community in which Bowdoin is located, Brunswick, Maine, as well as the entire nation, will also benefit enormously.

Barry knows Bowdoin well, both as a graduate (Class of 1972) and as a member of the College's Board of Trustees. I came to appreciate Barry's abilities when we served together on that Board. He combines a sharp intelligence, leadership skills and energy with a warm and empathetic personality. His business acumen, scholarship and experience will be a great value in his new position.

Barry holds a doctorate in biology and a law degree. He formerly served as the deputy presiding partner of Debevoise & Plimpton in New York City, one of the nation's preeminent international law firms. He joined the firm in 1979 and became a partner in 1986.

Born in Providence, Rhode Island, on September 8, 1950, Barry graduated in 1968 from Pilgrim High School in Warwick, Rhode Island.

A Dean's List student at Bowdoin, Barry graduated cum laude in 1972 with a double major in biochemistry and government. He earned his doctorate in biology in 1976 at Syracuse University, where he taught courses as a graduate student in introductory biology, cell physiology, and animal physiology. He earned his law degree at the Columbia University School of Law in 1979, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar.

Barry has published papers in the field of biology and, as a lawyer, has produced numerous publications and speeches in his field. He was also a leader with the firm's continuing legal education program at Debevoise & Plimpton.

He is married to Karen Gordon Mills, a founder and managing director of Solera Capital, LLC, a private equity firm located in New York City. As a student at Radcliffe College, Karen Mills was president of the Harvard Dramatic Club. She graduated magna cum laude from Radcliffe in 1975 with a degree in economics and earned her M.B.A. at the Harvard Business School in 1977. She is currently a member of the Harvard University Board of Overseers.

As President of Bowdoin, Barry has already begun to focus on priorities he has wisely identified as important for the College's future: increasing campus diversity, improving technology and expanding Bowdoin College's international presence.

Barry knows how to find out what's going on at the campus: by listening and by doing what students do. In an interview with the *Portland Press Herald* earlier this year, he said, "I love talking with students. I invited them to send me an e-mail telling me when they think my office hours should be, to be most accessible

to them. That could be 8 to 11 at night, when they hit their bio-rhythms. They are going to see me at concerts, lectures, art shows, on the football field, and in training rooms. I'm really going to be a part of this campus. And I'm going to be a part of their lives."

I am pleased that Barry Mills will play an even greater role in the life of Bowdoin College. I congratulate him on his inauguration and congratulate Bowdoin College on the wisdom of his selection.

**IN HONOR OF GRACE BAPTIST
CHURCH**

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the fifty-first anniversary of the founding of Grace Baptist Church of Westlake, OH. This congregation has been a wonderful part of the Greater Cleveland community for over half a century.

This church traces its history back to February 24, 1950, when forty-seven members signed the charter to organize the church officially. The congregation originally met in an upper hall on the corner of Orchard Grove and Detroit Avenue in Lakewood, but a small church building was later purchased in Rocky River. As the church continued to grow, a larger building was needed. The church purchased land from Mrs. Dorothy Rogers, a member of the congregation, and broke ground on April 17, 1966. The dedication services were held in the present building on October 26, 1967. The congregation of Grace Baptist Church worships at that location to this day.

The church is located on a seven acre site in the eastern part of Westlake. The members come from the western part of Cleveland, Lakewood, Rocky River, Fairview Park, North Olmstead, Westlake, Bay Village, Avon, Avon Lake, and North Ridgeville. All ages are represented in the congregation.

The church is very active. Among its activities are a Sunday school for all ages, Sunday morning and evening worship, youth groups, prayer meetings, adult social groups, and junior and senior high school youth groups.

From the beginning, the prayer of Grace Baptist's membership has been that the church family would always stay faithful to God. For fifty-one years, that prayer has been answered. My fellow colleagues, join me in honoring Grace Baptist Church.

Friday, October 5, 2001

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

The House passed H.R. 2883, Intelligence Authorization Act.

The House passed H.R. 2646, Farm Security Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, page S10341

Senate met at 10:00:01 a.m. in pro forma session, and adjourned at 10:00:29 a.m. until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, October 9, 2001.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 3049–3058, were introduced. **Page H6421**

Reports Filed: No Reports were filed today.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative LaTourette to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6383**

Treasury, Postal Appropriations—Go to Conference: The House disagreed with the Senate amendment to H.R. 2590, making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and agreed to a conference. Appointed as conferees: Chairman Young of Florida, Istook, Wolf, Northup, Sununu, Peterson of Pennsylvania, Tiahrt, Sweeney, Sherwood, Obey, Hoyer, Meek, Price, Rothman, and Visclosky. **Page H6383**

Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002: The House passed H.R. 2883, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management

Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. **Pages H6385–H6407**

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, and made in order by the rule. **Page H6395**

Agreed To:

Goss amendment No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 3 that revises Sec. 306 and establishes a “Commission on National Security Readiness” to identify structural readiness of the United States to identify structural impediments to the effective collection, analysis, and sharing of information on national security threats, particularly terrorism; **Pages H6397–98**

Traficant amendment No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 3 that requires an assessment of security at the borders of the United States concerning terrorist and narcotic interdiction efforts to be included in the Commission’s final report; **Pages H6403–04**

Wolf amendment No. 9 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 4 that requires a report from the Director of Central Intelligence concerning the implementation of recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorism established in section 591 of Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277); **Pages H6404–05**

Simmons amendment No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 3 that authorizes full reimbursement for professional liability insurance of counterterrorism employees; and **Pages H6405–06**

Goss amendment No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 4 that strikes sections 503 and 504 dealing with drug interdiction activities.

Page H6406

Rejected:

Pelosi substitute amendment to the Goss amendment No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 3 that sought to retain Sec. 306 provisions that create the “Commission on September 11 Government Preparedness and Performance” to assess the performance of government agencies charged with the responsibility to prevent, prepare for, or respond to acts of terrorism up to and including that date.

Pages H6398–H6403

Withdrawn:

Traficant amendment No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of Oct. 3 was offered but subsequently withdrawn that sought to require compliance with the Buy American Act.

Page H6403

The Clerk was authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes in the engrossment of the bill.

Page H6407

The House agreed to H. Res. 252, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill by voice vote.

Pages H6383–85

Farm Security Act: The House passed H.R. 2646, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011 by a yeas and nays vote of 291 yeas to 120 nays, Roll No. 371. The bill was also considered on Oct. 3 and Oct. 4.

Pages H6407–11

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, and made in order by the rule.

Page H6407

The House agreed to H. Res. 248, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill on Oct. 3.

Page H6410

The Clerk was authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes in the engrossment of the bill.

Page H6411

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the Legislative Program for the week of Oct. 8.

Pages H6411–13

Meeting Hour—Tuesday, Oct. 9: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9 for morning hour debate.

Page H6413

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, Oct. 10.

Page H6413

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H6383.

Referrals: S. 1417, S. 1418, S. 1419, and S.J. Res. 18 were held at the desk. S. 1465 was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

Pages H6419–20

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yeas and nays vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on pages H6410–11. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL ATTACKS— ARE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PREPARED

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations held a hearing on “A Silent War: Are Federal, State, and Local Governments Prepared for Biological and Chemical Attacks?” Testimony was heard from Bruce Baughman, Director, Planning and Readiness Division, FEMA; the following officials of the Department of Defense: Craig Duehring, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Reserve Affairs; and Lt. Gen. James Peake, M.D., Surgeon General, U.S. Army; Scott R. Lillibridge, M.D., Special Assistant to the Secretary, National Security and Emergency Management, Department of Health and Human Services; Janet Heinrich, Director, Health Care and Public Health Issues, GAO; Diana Bonta, Director, Department of Health Services, State of California; Woodbury Fogg, Director, Office of Emergency Management, State of New Hampshire; the following officials of the City of Baltimore, Maryland: Martin O'Malley, Mayor; and Edward T. Norris, Commissioner, Police Department; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS TRADE MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 3009, amended, Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act; H.R. 3010, to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the Generalized System of Preferences until December 31, 2002; and H.R. 3008, to reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance program under the Trade Act of 1974.

The Committee recessed until October 9.

Joint Meetings

SEPTEMBER EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for August, after receiving testimony from Katharine G. Abraham, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of October 8 through October 13, 2001

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, Senate will not be in session.

On *Tuesday*, Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1447, Aviation Security Act, with a vote on a motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill to occur at 10:30 a.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation bills when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: October 9, to hold hearings on the nomination of John H. Marburger III, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and the nomination of Phillip Bond, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

October 10, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine, to hold hearings to examine bus and truck security and hazardous materials licensing, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

October 11, Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, and Fisheries, to hold hearings to examine the role of the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in strengthening security against maritime threats, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

October 11, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings to examine the needs of fire services in responding to terrorism, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

October 12, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce, and Tourism, to hold hearings to examine the state of the tourism industry, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: October 9, to hold hearings on S. 1480, to amend the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992 in order to provide for the security of dams, facilities, and resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and other proposals relating to energy infrastructure security, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

October 10, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 1480, to amend the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992 in order to provide for the security of dams, facilities, and resources under the jurisdiction

of the Bureau of Reclamation; and the nomination of Harold Craig Manson, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: October 10, to hold hearings to review the Federal Emergency Management Agency's response to the September 11, 2001 attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: October 9, to hold hearings on the nomination of J. Edward Fox, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Legislative and Public Affairs, the nomination of Kent R. Hill, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Administrator for Europe and Eurasia, and the nomination of E. Anne Peterson, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for Global Health, all of the United States Agency for International Development; and the nomination of John F. Turner, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, 2:15 p.m., SD-419.

October 11, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine international Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1999, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on January 10, 2000 (Treaty Doc. 106-49); and international Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 15, 1997, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on January 12, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106-06), 10 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: October 10, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine the current structure of federal food safety oversight to determine whether it can adequately protect the American public from possible food hazards, 10 a.m., SH-342.

October 11, Full Committee, with the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, to hold hearings to examine federal efforts to coordinate and prepare the United States for bioterrorism, 9 a.m., SD-342.

October 11, Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, with the Committee on Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine federal efforts to coordinate and prepare the United States for bioterrorism, 9 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: October 9, to hold hearings to examine effective responses to the threat of bioterrorism, 10 a.m., SD-430.

October 10, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 1379, to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Rare Diseases at the National Institutes of Health; S. 727, to provide grants for cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training in public schools; proposed legislation with respect to mental health and terrorism, proposed legislation with respect to cancer screening; H.R. 717, to amend the Public Health

Service Act to provide for research and services with respect to Duchenne muscular dystrophy; and the nomination of Eugene Scalia, of Virginia, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD-430.

October 11, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine economic security, focusing on employment-unemployment issues, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on the Judiciary: October 10, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine new priorities and new challenges for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 10 a.m., SD-226.

October 10, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of John P. Walters, of Michigan, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, 11 a.m., SD-419.

October 11, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine homeland defense matters, 2 p.m., SD-226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: October 10, to hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas M. Sullivan, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration, 10:15 a.m., SR-428A.

House Chamber

To be announced.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, October 9, to mark up the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations for fiscal year 2002, p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, October 10, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled "Sports Venue Security," 1 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing entitled "Electricity Transmission Policy," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "A Review of Federal Bioterrorism Preparedness Programs from a Public Health Perspective," 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, October 11, to consider H.R. 3004, Financial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2001, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, October 10, Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, hearing on "The Debt Collection Improvement Act: How Well is it Working?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

October 11, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, to mark up pending business, 11:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

October 12, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs, and International Relations, hearing on "Combating Terrorism: Assessing the Threat of Biological Terrorism," 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, October 10, hearing on the Role of Public Diplomacy in Support of the Anti-Terrorism, 10:15 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Europe, hearing on The Caucasus and Caspian Region: Understanding U.S. Interests and Policy, 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

October 10, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing on the Western Hemisphere's Response to the September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attack on the United States, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, October 11, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 2952, to ensure the orderly development of coal, coalbed methane, natural gas, and oil within a designated Dispute Resolution Area in the Powder River Basin, Wyoming, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

October 11, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, oversight hearing on the reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, October 9, to consider the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations for fiscal year 2002, 6:30 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, October 10, hearing on Cyber Security-How Can We Protect American Computer Networks From Attack? 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

October 11, Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards, hearing on Weatherproofing the U.S.: Are We Prepared for Severe Storms? 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

October 11, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Space Planes and X-Vehicles, 2 p.m., Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, October 10, hearing on the Role Small Businesses Can Play in Jump-Starting the Economy, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

October 11, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight, hearing entitled "September 11, 2001 plus 30: Are America's Small Businesses Still Grounded?" 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, October 10, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on Terrorism: Are America's Water Resources and Environment at Risk? 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

October 11, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Deployment and Use of Security Technology, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, October 10, to consider pending business, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

October 11, hearing on VA's Ability to Respond to Department of Defense Contingencies and National Emergencies, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, October 9, to mark up H.R. 3005, Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2001, 5 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, October 11, Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, hearing on National Security Advisors Role in the Current Crisis with former National Security Advisors, 10 a.m., room to be announced.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 9

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Tuesday, October 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the recognition of one Senator for a speech and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10 a.m.), Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1447, Aviation Security Act, with a vote on a motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill to occur at 10:30 a.m.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Allen, Thomas H., Maine, E1828
 Barcia, James A., Mich., E1813
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1826
 Boehlert, Sherwood L., N.Y., E1819, E1823
 Brady, Kevin, Tex., E1813
 Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E1809
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1808
 Evans, Lane, Ill., E1810
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E1809
 Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E1806
 Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E1806
 Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E1818, E1820, E1826
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E1805, E1806
 Green, Gene, Tex., E1820
 Grucci, Felix J., Jr., N.Y., E1824
 Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E1824

Harman, Jane, Calif., E1815
 Hastert, J. Dennis, Ill., E1818
 Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1811, E1825
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1823
 Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E1810
 Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1810
 Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E1805
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1816, E1828
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1805
 McCarthy, Karen, Mo., E1826
 McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1807, E1808, E1811, E1812, E1814, E1814
 Moran, James P., Va., E1815
 Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E1815
 Payne, Donald M., N.J., E1814
 Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E1806
 Reyes, Silvestre, Tex., E1819
 Rodriguez, Ciro D., Tex., E1812

Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E1812
 Ross, Mike, Ark., E1808, E1810, E1811
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1823
 Sanders, Bernard, Vt., E1824
 Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E1807, E1827
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1813
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E1816
 Shays, Christopher, Conn., E1825
 Sherman, Brad, Calif., E1811
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1807
 Simmons, Rob, Conn., E1814
 Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E1824
 Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E1818, E1822
 Walden, Greg, Ore., E1820
 Walsh, James T., N.Y., E1820
 Weldon, Curt, Pa., E1827
 Young, Don, Alaska, E1805



Congressional Record

provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$197.00 for six months, \$393.00 per year, or purchased for \$4.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$141.00 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to (202) 512-1800, or fax to (202) 512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate