health working side-by-side uniformed rescue workers all along.

These volunteers—construction workers, iron and steel workers, and many others—toiled alongside firefighters and police officers, digging tunnels and gaining access to victims by operating cranes, burning steel, driving trucks, and moving debris by hand as part of the ''Bucket Brigade.''

Many of these individuals gave their time and labor for a week or more, giving up their salaries, families and the comforts of daily life to search for survivors around the clock.

They did so at great risk to their health as fires raged and toxic fumes emanated from the burning rubble.

Three months later, those fires are still smoldering, and the fumes are still endangering everyone working at Ground Zero.

But even as their boots melt from the heat of the fires below, hundreds of workers are persevering at the site, removing what remains of seven office buildings that once symbolized the center of the global economy.

They embrace this unprecedented and perilous challenge out of enduring determination to get New York get back on its feet and one day restore Lower Manhattan's majesty and vibrance.

Throughout this heartbreaking process, these unsung heroes have shown profound respect for the victims and their families.

The hushed silence at the site, which lasted for many days after the bombing, reflected an appreciation for the magnitude of the horror—and the fact that they were working on the surface of a mass grave.

I want to extend my deepest gratitude to the New York City Department of Construction and Design, who, at my request, preserved a segment of the ruins to be transformed into a national monument at an appropriate time in the future.

We all remember images of steel fragments from the towers that plunged upright into the pavement like arrows in the hearts of all New Yorkers, and nearby fire trucks that were partially submerged in the rubble.

Thanks to the care and respect that workers have demonstrated in dismantling and removing the wreckage, these images will be preserved in honor of those who were lost, and in remembrance of a black Tuesday that this nation must never forget.

The scores of companies, organizations and union members who have cooperated in clearing the site with extraordinary speed, efficiency and safety include, but are not limited to: a special team of the New York City Office of Emergency Management and the New York City Department of Design and Construction; with main contractors Turner Construction Co./Plaza Construction, Bovis Construction, Amec Construction and Tully Construction; and dozens of subcontractors, including Thornton-Tomasette Engineering, LZA Engineering, New York Crane, Bay Crane, Cranes Inc., Slattery Association, Grace Industries, Big Apple Demolition, Regional Scaffolding & Hoisting, Atlantic-Heydt Scaffolding, York Scaffolding, Weeks Marine, and Bechtel Corp.

In addition, many other entities worked to resolve the daily problems confronted by the Fire Department of New York, the New York City Police Department and the Port Authority Police Department in rescuing and recovering their own.

Every New York City agency, especially the New York City Department of Sanitation and the Department of Environmental Protection, was involved, as were the New York State Police, The National Guard, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, the Army Corps of Engineers, Con Edison, Verizon, and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and the Senate have come to Ground Zero. They have seen devastation, but also resilience and redemption in the work that's being done there.

I know I speak for this entire body in expressing our country's deep appreciation for the risks taken and sacrifices made by the unsung heroes at Ground Zero, who have reminded us what the American spirit is all about.

PAKISTAN TIES TO TALIBAN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to talk about several matters of concern regarding Pakistan.

I appreciate Pakistan's willingness to assist us in the fight against Osama bin Laden and his terrorist networks, and I know that General Musharraf continues to make a concerted effort to cooperate with the United States in our global fight against terrorism. Under the current circumstances, due to the attacks of September 11, I do feel that it is appropriate to provide economic assistance to Pakistan for General Musharraf's willingness to support the U.S. in seizing Osama bin Laden and eliminating the al Qaeda terrorist network. In fact, I also felt that it was appropriate that the economic sanctions that were in place against Pakistan were rightfully lifted by President Bush earlier this year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I stand strong in my argument against military aid to Pakistan, even under the current circumstances. I oppose the lifting of military sanctions, and I still feel the U.S. should exercise its discretion not to provide military assistance.

The Pakistani dictatorial government has in the past been directly involved in the planning and logistical support of Taliban military operations. Not only has Pakistan provided institutional support to terrorist activities by the Taliban and other groups, it has also provided weapons as a result of its irresponsible weapons export policies. Withholding military assistance to Pakistan will help pressure Musharraf to withdraw its support to terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, there have been several recent reports that corroborate the difficulty Pakistan has in separating itself from the Taliban. According to an article from last Saturday's New York Times, Western and Pakistani officials report that one month after the Pakistani government agreed to end its support of the Taliban, its intelligence agency was still providing safe passage for weapons and ammunition to arm them.

In September, the U.S. issued an ultimatum to Pakistan that if they wanted to join the United States in the fight against terrorism, Pakistan had to end its ties to the Taliban.

Pakistani intelligence claims that the last sanctioned delivery of weapons to the Taliban occurred about a month after the U.S. issued this ultimatum. However, it is clear that the Inter-Services Intelligence, ISI, has perpetuated military support of the Taliban. The ISI is a powerful group of military jihadi who are not representatives of the government. Nevertheless, they operate fiercely within Pakistan; and accordingly, Pakistan inevitably engages in logistical and military support of the Taliban.

My other concern at this time, Mr. Speaker, regarding Pakistan is that it is a nuclear power. A country with nuclear power that has links to the Taliban and al Qaeda is a recipe for disaster. An article reported that nuclear experts in Pakistan may, in fact, have links to al Qaeda. The fear is that nuclear experts have the knowledge and experience to provide nuclear weapons and related technology to transfer these goods to terrorists.

The article in the New York Times reports that American intelligence officials are increasingly convinced that Pakistan may become the site of a furtive struggle between those trying to keep nuclear technology secure and those looking to export it for terrorism or for profit.

Mr. Speaker, my last comment is that historically, U.S. arms exports to Pakistan have been used against India, primarily through crossborder military action in Kashmir. Since the terrifying example of terrorism in India on October 1 when a suicide car bomb exploded in front of the Kashmir State Assembly while it was in session, there have literally been murder incidents on a daily basis in Kashmir. The escalated terrorist violence in India has been horrific and left numerous civilians and military men victim to cold-blooded murder.

Last week I read that suspected terrorists shot and killed a judge in Kashmir, along with his friends and two guards. This is the first attack on the judiciary of Jammu and Kashmir state. Over the weekend I read that an Islamic militant group invaded an Indian army convoy in Kashmir and the attack left nearly 10 men dead and over 20 wounded.

These examples of murder by Pakistani-based militant groups should be evidence enough that weapons can and will fall into the hands of terrorist networks and potentially be used against India and other U.S. allies.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Bush administration is not proposing any major change in policy with regard to military assistance to Pakistan, but with removal of congressional sanctions, stepped up military assistance

remains a possibility. I continue to oppose that option, and I believe that the circumstances in Pakistan this weekend and over the last few weeks still do not warrant that kind of military assistance.

PUBLIC HEALTH SECURITY AND BIOTERRORISM RESPONSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is recognized for half of the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, at least here on the east coast, but we have just prepared for passage tomorrow morning a landmark piece of legislation to improve health security in this country, and I think it deserves some additional explanation as to what is in that bill and how it will help America to prepare for and to defend against any bioterrorist attack against American citizens here at home, and I would like to take a few minutes to explain how we came to this legislation and what it is intended to do and some of its provisions.

We expect to vote on this bill tomorrow here in the House although we debated it here on the floor about half an hour ago.

We need to be better prepared for terrorist attacks involving biological agents. There are about 36 different pathogens, or germs, that are designated by the Centers for Disease Control as extremely dangerous. They are in a list that is maintained by the Centers for Disease Control, and we have got to be better prepared against those kinds of biological toxins, because the fact is that the world has changed.

The idea of using disease as a weapon of warfare is not a new one. It has existed for a long time, and countries have developed biological warfare capabilities even in spite of the fact that there were treaties against that.

In 1979 there was an anthrax outbreak in the former Soviet Union near the town of Sverdlovsk, and it created some casualties near that site. At the time, America suspected that there was a biological warfare in Sverdlovsk, but we were able to confirm that after the end of the Cold War.

In the Gulf War and its aftermath, we knew that Iraq was developing biological warfare capability, including anthrax, and we also knew that they had used chemical warfare agents, including against their own people; and we have no illusions about the willingness of Saddam Hussein to destroy his own people or to use biological warfare against the United States or any other enemy of the Iraqi Government.

□ 2330

The use of biological warfare or serious toxins by terrorists is something that people have contemplated, but in some ways it goes into the unthinkable.

In Japan, there was use by a terrorist network of a nerve agent in the subways which kind of alerted us to the potential for using very toxic substances as a terrorist tool, but there was nothing like what we saw here on the east coast of the United States with the anthrax attack that followed on the September 11 attacks on the United States.

The fact is that terrorism has changed. It changed in a very significant way. In the 1970s and 1980s, most terrorist networks were either fighting in wars of national liberation, trying to get attention for a cause, trying to shock governments for effect, but they actually avoided mass casualties, and did not want to have a response against their cause by public opinion writ large. They did not want mass death.

But the terrorists we are dealing with now, and unfortunately, there are cells throughout the world, want to cause massive death and high numbers of casualties. The threat has changed, and America has to change with it.

In the 1970s and 1980s and certainly through the 1990s, our response to the threat of bioterrorism was largely to deal with our military. We developed a vaccine for anthrax, and while it was highly controversial and there were some problems with it, we began inoculating American military personnel against some strains of anthrax. We focused on military protection and not on homeland defense.

We also developed what are called National Guard civil support teams in about 27 States now, where there are teams of people who are designed to deal with unusual threats within the United States; but still, those were relatively small efforts, and focused on the capabilities of our military.

It was really about force protection for the military: How do we keep the American military able to continue to fight for the United States in the face of a potential biological warfare attack. We really did not deal completely with the threat of bioterrorism here at home.

The fact is that a new effort is required in the wake of the anthrax attacks and the new kind of terrorism represented by Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network. What we saw in New York and in Washington, D.C. is frightening, but it is also something we have to cope with. We have seen a terrorist network that has the ability to organize and plan simultaneous attacks, rather sophisticated attacks, in the United States. They were able to maintain secrecy over a period of time within the United States. They did not come from outside, they were within us, within the United States. They had access to the money in order to carry out this very sophisticated operation, and their objective was not to shock or to win in the realm of world public opinion; their objective was mass casualties and the deaths of thousands of civilians.

In light of that, and in light of the anthrax attacks that followed on the attacks in New York and Washington, D.C., we know we have a new need that we have not faced in this country before. It is going to involve all levels of government, because it is the local fire department and the local emergency room of our hospitals that will see the first impact of any epidemic that is caused by a bioterrorist agent. We have to make sure that everybody is trained that needs to be trained.

Likewise, at the State level and at the Federal level, there are also different kinds of responsibilities. At the National Centers for Disease Control, they worked with States and other networks, but there are all levels of government involved, and it will involve also private entities.

If I am sick, I do not go to the government. If my children are sick, I do not go to the government, I go to our doctor. Our doctor has to be connected in to an early alert system, just as everyone's doctor needs to be. That will involve planning, it will involve training of people, it will involve the development of curricula and ways of communicating very quickly to medical professionals throughout this country what they should be looking for, what kinds of symptoms show up in the first hours, and how to distinguish those symptoms from other things that might not be so threatening: What is the difference between anthrax and the flu, and how as a doctor in rural New Mexico can I make that distinction so that I can care for my patients, but I do not have to frighten them unnecessarily?

The second thing we knew we needed to do was to expand the availability of vaccines and medical equipment to deal with a large crisis. That is something that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, brought to our attention in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that in the event of a mass outbreak, not a naturally-occurring outbreak of a disease but the intentional spreading of disease in different parts of the United States simultaneously, that we were not prepared for that kind of a man-made epidemic, and so we need to expand our stockpiles of vaccines. We need to increase the availability of smallpox vaccine. We need to make sure that we have the stockpiles of medical equipment and diagnostic equipment to be able to deal with any epidemic very quickly and effectively across the United States.

We knew that we needed to better control and know about what pathogens exist in the United States. One of the things that I think surprised a lot of people after the outbreak of anthrax here in Washington and New York and Florida was that one of the first questions the FBI asked was, well, what labs in the United States have anthrax?

The first answer was, we do not know, because there is no requirement to say what we have. The only requirement in Federal law is that one has to