



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2002

No. 2

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 24, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN SHIMKUS 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, You created the world for all to share in a spirit of love, justice, and equality. We pray today for peace in our world. We unite our prayer with representatives of the world's religions who gathered today in the town of Francis of Assisi, desirous of becoming instruments of peace.

We pray for peace, O Lord, and to pray for peace is to open our hearts to inroads of Your own power to renew all things.

By the life-giving force of Your grace, O God, You can create openings for peace where we see only obstacles and closures. You alone can strengthen and enlarge the solidarity of the human family, in spite of recent tragic events, all human suffering and the endless history of division and conflict in our world.

As we pray for peace, we pray for justice. We pray for a right ordering of human relations within and among nations and peoples.

As we pray for peace, we pray for freedom, especially for religious freedom that is a basic human and civil right of every individual.

To pray for peace, O Lord, is to seek forgiveness and to implore from You the courage to forgive those who have trespassed against us.

At this time of world distress, give us new unfailing reasons for hope. Show forth in our day that genuine religious belief is an inexhaustible wellspring for mutual respect and harmony among peoples.

Let our prayer and our faith in You, Almighty God, be our chief antidote to violence and conflict.

Hope is truly instilled in our world today as each of us prays, "Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace." 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 New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY 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. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union.

### TRIBUTE TO DAVE THOMAS

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man we all know as Dave, a man blessed with an extraordinary knack for business and a heart of gold. Sadly, we lost him to cancer only a few weeks ago.

Dave Thomas personifies the American dream, that a young person of humble beginnings can and should dream big. And that he did, by creating the third largest fast-food chain in the world.

Dave's devotion to his business was surpassed by only one thing, his great love for children. As an adopted child, Dave felt so fortunate to have been given a loving family to care for him. He wanted to see other children experience this joy.

Dave took his passion and turned it into something extraordinary. In 1992, he founded the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption to serve as a voice for children who cannot speak for themselves. The foundation is based in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio.

I feel so fortunate to have had the opportunity to work closely with Dave in our joint effort to bring children and families together and make the process of adoption easier.

Dave once said, "If I can get just one child a home, it would be better than selling 1 million hamburgers."

Well, Dave, you did just that, and more. You are a true class act, one who will be sorely missed, but remembered by all for generations.

### NOBEL PEACE PRIZE NOMINATIONS

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 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.

H39

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad this morning that our Chaplain spoke about religion as a human and civil right.

When U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan recently accepted his Nobel Peace Prize, he urged all nations to focus more on human rights in a quest to end poverty, end conflicts and foster democracy.

It is for those reasons that I am circulating a Dear Colleague letter requesting the Nobel Peace Prize Selection Committee nominate the Most Venerable Thich Quang Do and Father Nguyen Van Ly of Vietnam for the Nobel Peace Prize.

The Most Venerable Thich Quang Do is the secretary-general of the banned Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam. He has been under house arrest since June of 2001, after announcing his intention to escort the ailing 83-year-old Buddhist patriarch Thich Huyen Quang to Ho Chi Minh City for urgently needed medical care.

Similarly, in May of last year, Father Ly was placed under house arrest and banned from running his church for providing testimony to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, which urged this Congress to delay ratification of the bilateral trade agreement until Vietnam eased its restrictions on religion.

In recognition of their courage, sacrifice and belief, I hope all Members will join me in signing that letter.

#### FAULTY LOGIC ON CAUSE OF RECESSION

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, one of the political leaders of the other body said President Bush's tax relief plan "probably made the recession worse."

Oh, really? Only \$41 billion of the President's \$1.35 trillion bipartisan tax relief plan went into effect last year. Of that amount, 93 percent, or \$38 billion, comprised the income tax rebates that were mailed to every tax-paying American last summer and early fall. So according to this illustrious political leader, the tax rebate proposal, widely hailed by Democrats at the time, caused "the most dramatic fiscal deterioration in our Nation's history."

Blaming the President's plan for the cause of the recession, when the bulk of tax relief will not occur until the year 2005, is faulty logic at best. To say that providing a \$300 tax rebate to working Americans during a recession probably made the recession worse does not make sense.

The real reason some political leaders want to repeal tax cuts is just so they have more money for government program spending.

#### SIMILARITIES BETWEEN ENRON CORPORATION AND REPUBLICAN TAX CUT

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there are some very disturbing similarities between the Enron Corporation's activities and the Republican tax cut.

Last year a young reporter told the Enron Corporation and the investment community that the Enron books had been cooked, it was not on the level, the revenues were not what they said they were. Ken Lay, the CEO, said not so, not so. In the meanwhile, he was selling his stock, leaving the shareholders holding the bag.

Last year we said that if you had the tax cut and you did what the President wanted to do, what the Republicans wanted to do, it was the end of surpluses. They said no, no, it is not so; it is not so.

Well, today we are told in the papers it is the end of surpluses. We have red ink, according to CBO, as far as the eye can see.

What did the Republicans do? The first thing they did was get a tax cut for the wealthy. The first thing they did was take care of their friends. And now the unemployed, those in need of prescription drugs, those on Social Security, are left holding the bag. Why? Because we are now into the Social Security Trust Fund \$700 billion. \$700 billion. The surpluses have disappeared; \$4 trillion this year.

There is a disturbing parallel of values here about taking care of the wealthy and letting everybody else hold the bag.

#### BASIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS ON STIMULATING THE ECONOMY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, listening to the previous speaker, my friend from California, I wonder, did he not take economics in school?

History has shown us over and over again, lowering taxes stimulates the economy; stimulating the economy gives more people jobs; more people working means more people paying taxes; more people paying taxes means more revenues coming into Washington. And that is the basic difference between the Republican Party and the Democrat Party and their allies in Big Government.

That is why TED KENNEDY, the leader of the Democrat Party, has called for a massive new tax increase. Hello.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

All Members must avoid improper references to the Senate or to Members thereof.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the Speaker. I will not say anything more about the Democrat leader, who we all know now to be a prominent Democrat in the other body, who wants to increase taxes. And one can only assume that he has allies in the House over here, judging from the 1-minutes we are hearing, it seems just sort of calling for more tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe the way to turn the economy around is to still let people spend their own money, rather than having government bureaucracies in Washington in their command-and-control fashion spend tax dollars.

Let us create jobs by giving people back their hard-earned money.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised that using the terminology "in the other body" does not absolve them of the responsibility not to talk about the other body.

#### EFFECTS OF BUDGET DEFICITS ON GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND PROMISES

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the lead story in today's Wall Street Journal really tells it all: "Seeing Red: As Budget Deficits Loom, Many Promises, Programs Could Suffer. Social Security Is Vulnerable as Huge 10-year Surplus Contracts by \$4 Trillion."

Yes, an unprecedented 70 percent of the estimated surplus has evaporated in less than a year. It is true that the two Republican budget offices, one here in the House and one at the White House, cannot agree on exactly how deep a hole Republicans have dug.

But I can tell you, even using Arthur Andersen accounting, this hole is a whopper. Our Republican colleagues have "stimulated" little more than red ink with their huge tax breaks designed for certain privileged corporations and the wealthy few.

What a difference those huge tax breaks have made. They have not stimulated anything except red ink. Now when they have dug such a deep budgetary hole, it is time to stop digging, instead of offering more and more corporate tax breaks, as our Republican friends persist in doing this year.

Let us at least stop that digging downward, embrace some fiscal restraint and begin climbing out of this budgetary hole before Social Security is wrecked and we reach the point of economic "no return".

#### SUPPORT NATIONAL MENTORING ACT

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the filing of the National Mentoring Act legislation by myself, along with a broad group of bipartisan cosponsors. The mentor act would give tax credits to businesses that allow their employees 1 hour a week of paid time off to mentor children at risk of dropping out of school and getting involved with drugs. The reason for this bill is simple, to make it easier for mentoring organizations to recruit mentors.

Why is this important? Well, there was a recent study completed of 1,000 young people on the waiting list at Big Brother-Big Sisters. The list was divided into two groups: one group got a mentor; the other group did not get a mentor. Eighteen months later, the children with mentors were 46 percent less likely to begin using illegal drugs, 27 percent less likely to begin using alcohol, 53 percent less likely to skip school, and 33 percent less likely to engage in violence.

That is why this bill has been endorsed by every major mentoring organization in the United States, including Big Brothers-Big Sisters, America's Promise, and the National Mentoring Partnership Act.

I urge my colleagues today to call my office and sign up as cosponsors to this important legislation.

#### TREATMENT OF AFGHAN PRISONERS IN CUBA

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read that some people in publications in Europe and some members of the European Union have been very critical of U.S. treatment of the Afghan prisoners in Cuba. I think they are scraping the bottom of the barrel in a vain attempt to make themselves feel superior to Americans.

I wonder how they would feel or how they would respond if they had been attacked the way we were on September 11. No country on the face of the Earth, Mr. Speaker, has done as much. No nation has even come close to doing as much for other countries, as has the United States of America.

These prisoners will live far better as prisoners of the U.S. military than they ever would have in the caves of Afghanistan. Even more importantly, Mr. Speaker, they will live far better as our prisoners than they deserve, after killing thousands of our citizens in one of the cruelest ways imaginable.

□ 1015

#### CONTINUED FAILURE OF THE SCIENTIFIC PROCESS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, imagine if you were participating in an Olympic event and you were winning the race and suddenly the Olympic Committee came along and changed the rules because they did not want you to win. You would be outraged.

Well, yesterday the Nuclear Regulatory Commission notified Nevada of their plans to once again change the ground rules for judging Yucca Mountain. The NRC is proposing to eliminate rules governing what it calls the "unlikely event" of a volcanic eruption.

The NRC staff believes that there is less than a 1-in-10 chance of an eruption occurring within 10,000 years. A less than 10 percent chance? What does that mean? Does the term "1-in-10" or "less than" equate to "sound science"? There is a better chance of Yucca Mountain exploding than there is of winning the lottery.

We should ask the people of Africa. We should ask the people of Hawaii. We should ask the people of Mount Saint Helens in Oregon what they thought about that 1-in-10 chance.

I continue my outrage at the entire Yucca Mountain project. But by telling Nevadans that they have a less than 1-in-10 chance that Yucca Mountain could explode is downright astonishing.

The NRC should be ashamed of itself. It is time to put the safety of Nevadans and all Americans ahead of their own desire to win at any cost.

#### SCOTT GERMOSEN, A TRUE AMERICAN HERO

(Mr. GRUCCI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, America lost a true American hero, Staff Sergeant Scott Germosen.

After graduating from Centerreach High School in 1982, Scott answered the call to duty and enlisted in the Marine Corps. After serving our country, Scott and his family moved to California where he was exploring a career as a sheriff's deputy.

Like all of us, Scott was horrified by the attacks on America on September 11. Unfortunately, the tragedy was very close to home for Scott. Scott's second cousin was aboard the first plane that hit the World Trade Center. Hearing this tragic news spurred Scott to re-enlist in the Marines and help defend our Nation from evil.

While serving our country and fighting for freedom, Scott perished in the KC-130 tanker that crashed in Pakistan on January 9, 2001 while he was performing his duties as a loadmaster during missions in support of the War on Terrorism.

Scott Germosen has made the ultimate sacrifice so that all of us can live under the blanket of freedom that America provides. On behalf of the

First District of New York and the entire Nation, I thank Scott Germosen, a true American hero.

Scott is survived by his mother Myrna Washington, his wife Jennifer, and his 22-month-old daughter Alyssa. I ask my colleagues to join me in praying for and in paying respect to Scott Germosen and his family.

#### ESTABLISHING FIXED INTEREST RATES FOR STUDENT AND PARENT BORROWERS

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 334 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 334

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1762) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers, to extend current law with respect to special allowances for lenders, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 334 makes in order the bill S. 1762 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to commit.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1762 amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers and extends current law with respect to allowances for lenders. To put it simply, this legislation will allow for the continued availability of affordable student loans for students and their families by addressing a long-standing problem in the Federal student loan program about how interest rates are calculated. It will simplify loan terms, reduce confusion, and lock in low rates for the borrower. At the same time, it will provide stability for lenders, helping to avoid disruption in loan availability.

Mr. Speaker, more than 9 million United States students today need student loans to help pay for college, and the education of our Nation's children is a major concern of most Americans,

and it is the top priority for our President. While we all know that more money is not the single answer to improving the education of our children, student loan affordability and access should never become the barrier to a college education. It is important to pass this bill today so we can lock in these historically low interest rates.

Students attending the Ohio State University, which is located in my district, will benefit just like the millions of others pursuing that dream of a higher education all across our country. S. 1762 recognizes that investing in our children and providing them the opportunity to invest in themselves would prepare them and our country for the challenges of tomorrow and stays true to the spirit that "no child be left behind."

I would like to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), my colleague and good friend and the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for his hard work and commitment to improving the educational opportunities for all American students. I would also like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the committee, for his work and support of this bipartisan legislation. Finally, let me congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, for his hard work and leadership on this very important legislation.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation has the support of all the parties involved, including the lenders and the student associations alike, and it has the support of a majority of this body as it garnered 257 votes the last time we considered it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule, and I encourage a "yes" vote on S. 1762.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, S. 1762 is a noncontroversial measure designed to ensure the continued availability of student loans for students and their families. The bill before us today passed the Senate by unanimous consent in December and enjoys strong support in the Chamber from both sides of the aisle.

Student loans are critical for a majority of American families working to ensure a quality education for their children. With the cost of a college education skyrocketing, the need for student loans applies to all segments of society. Congress has a duty to ensure that as this country weathers a recession, a quality education does not take a hit in the process.

The legislation addresses a long-standing problem in the Federal student loan program as to how student loan interest rates are to be calculated. The problem first came to light several years ago when it was clear that a provision within the Higher Education Act would dramatically alter how interest rates would be determined. The interest rate formula set to take effect back in 1998 would have forced many of the lenders now participating in the Federal Family Education Loan Program to reduce or eliminate their participation.

At the time, Congress worked diligently to craft a solution to a problem that virtually everyone agreed would be an unintended result of previous legislation. The compromise resulted in the lowest interest rates in the Stafford loan program's history. Service was uninterrupted to students and their families, and student loan borrowers are now paying the historically low interest rate of 5.99 percent in repayment.

Unfortunately, the compromise reached in 1998 was not made permanent when enacted and is scheduled to expire in 2003, and that is why today's bill is so important. S. 1762 will extend the current interest rate formula set to expire in July of 2003 and lock in the lower borrower rates.

The bill also continues the current formula for determining interest rates made by student and parent borrowers before July 1, 2006. Loans disbursed on or after July 1, 2006 would be 6.8 percent for student borrowers and 7.9 for parents' loans. An average student who borrows nearly \$17,000 will save over \$400. Moreover, student interest rates will remain constant for the life of the loan rather than changing each year based on a complicated formula.

I would also note for my colleagues that the measure has been endorsed by the United States Student Association, the American Council on Education, Sallie Mae, and the Consumer Bankers Association. I urge everyone to support this bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), a classmate of mine and the chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the rule for S. 1762, this very important legislation to ensure the availability of higher education financing to the students embarking on a very important time in their lives.

This closed rule is necessary to ensure that this bill is passed without amendment so as to allow the White House to sign the legislation into law without delay. I do not believe there is

a better way to serve the students of this Nation than to assure a stable source of higher education funding for those who need it most: low and middle-income students. This legislation provides for the uninterrupted continuation of the Federal Family Education Loan Program, known as FFELP, and provides certainty of interest rates for all borrowers in later years.

I urge my colleagues to support this closed rule in an effort to allow swift action on this bill. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been involved in each stage of development of this legislation, and while we believe we had a commitment to this legislation prior to the end of our last session, unfortunately, due to unrelated circumstances, the bill failed to pass on the suspension calendar.

The efforts of our colleagues to take down the bill previously now forces us to bring it up again and avoid additional politics in an effort to do what is right for students and parents, as well as student loan providers, who have been vital partners in the Federal Family Education Loan Program for more than 35 years.

It is my hope that we can pass this rule and move immediately to the legislation at hand and pass it overwhelmingly. Let us show the students of this country that we put their needs above all else and ensure the availability of low cost student loans for them to embark on the road to achieving their goals of higher education. Vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on S. 1762.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), my friend and colleague, for yielding me this time.

I would suggest to the House that today we have a rule before us that will provide for a fair and open debate on a bill that we did in fact consider last month. Unfortunately, it was brought up under suspension and, due to some circumstances that had nothing to do with this bill, did not receive the requisite number of votes.

But I do believe that fixing the student loan interest rate problem will provide continued availability of affordable student loans for our students. Today some 9 million students take advantage of our student loan program, the highest number ever, and they are paying the lowest interest rates they have ever paid in the history of the program.

□ 1030

What we want to do today is to pass the underlying bill that will, in fact, continue to have low, affordable rates available to ensure that more of our students can achieve their goals of the

American dream by pursuing a postsecondary education.

Mr. Speaker, I think the rule that we have before us is fair and reasonable. We ought to pass this rule and then pass this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial rule that will allow us to pass very important legislation to continue the availability of affordable student loans, lock in these low rates, avoid possible long-term disruptions in access to financing, and provide educational opportunities for all our young people.

Let us give our children the opportunity to invest in themselves, and more importantly, to invest in this country's future. I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and this bipartisan bill.

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.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 334, I call up the Senate bill (S. 1762) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers, to extend current law with respect to special allowances for lenders, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 1762 is as follows:

S. 1762

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

**SECTION 1. INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS.**

(a) FFEL FIXED INTEREST RATES.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 427A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (m) and (n), respectively; and  
(B) by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

“(l) INTEREST RATES FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this part (other than a loan made pursuant to section 428B or 428C) for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

“(2) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under section 428B for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 7.9 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

“(3) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—With respect to any consolidation loan under section 428C for which the application is received by an eligible lender on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the lesser of—

“(A) the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of 1 percent; or  
“(B) 8.25 percent.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 428C(c)(1)(A) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1078-3(c)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) INTEREST RATE.—(A) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C), with respect to any loan made under this section for which the application is received by an eligible lender—

“(i) on or after October 1, 1998, and before July 1, 2006, the applicable interest rate shall be determined under section 427A(k)(4); or

“(ii) on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable interest rate shall be determined under section 427A(l)(3).”.

(b) DIRECT LOANS FIXED INTEREST RATES.—

(1) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (6) of section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)), as redesignated by section 8301(c)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178; 112 Stat. 498) is redesignated as paragraph (9) and is transferred to follow paragraph (7) of section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(2) AMENDMENTS.—Section 455(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) INTEREST RATE PROVISION FOR NEW LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006.—

“(A) RATES FOR FDSL AND FDUSL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Stafford Loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

“(B) PLUS LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, with respect to any Federal Direct PLUS loan for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 7.9 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

“(C) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, any Federal Direct Consolidation loan for which the application is received on or after July 1, 2006, shall bear interest at an annual rate on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to the lesser of—

“(i) the weighted average of the interest rates on the loans consolidated, rounded to the nearest higher one-eighth of one percent; or

“(ii) 8.25 percent.”.

(c) EXTENSION OF CURRENT INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS FOR THREE YEARS.—Sections 427A(k) and 455(b)(6) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077a(k), 1087e(b)(6)) are each amended—

(1) by striking “2003” in the heading and inserting “2006”; and

(2) by striking “July 1, 2003,” each place it appears and inserting “July 1, 2006.”.

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL ALLOWANCE PROVISION.**

Section 438(b)(2)(I) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087-1(b)(2)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking “, AND BEFORE JULY 1, 2003” in the heading;

(2) by striking “and before July 1, 2003,” each place it appears, other than in clauses (ii) and (v);

(3) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) IN SCHOOL AND GRACE PERIOD.—In the case of any loan—

“(I) for which the first disbursement is made on or after January 1, 2000, and before July 1, 2006, and for which the applicable rate of interest is described in section 427A(k)(2); or

“(II) for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, and for which the applicable rate of interest is described in section 427A(l)(1), but only with respect to (aa) periods prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan; or (bb) during the periods in which principal need not be paid (whether or not such principal is in fact paid) by reason of a provision described in section 427(a)(2)(C) or 428(b)(1)(M); clause (i)(III) of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘1.74 percent’ for ‘2.34 percent.’”;

(4) in clause (iii), by inserting “or (l)(2)” after “427A(k)(3)”;

(5) in clause (iv), by inserting “or (l)(3)” after “427A(k)(4)”;

(6) in clause (v)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “BEFORE JULY 1, 2006” after “PLUS LOANS”; and

(B) by striking “July 1, 2003,” and inserting “July 1, 2006.”;

(7) in clause (vi)—

(A) by inserting “or (l)(3)” after “427A(k)(4)” the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting “or (l)(3), whichever is applicable” after “427A(k)(4)” the second place it appears; and

(8) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) LIMITATION ON SPECIAL ALLOWANCES FOR PLUS LOANS ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2006.—In the case of PLUS loans made under section 428B and first disbursed on or after July 1, 2006, for which the interest rate is determined under section 427A(l)(2), a special allowance shall not be paid for such loan during any 12-month period beginning on July 1 and ending on June 30 unless—

“(I) the average of the bond equivalent rates of the quotes of the 3-month commercial paper (financial), as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Publication H-15 (or its successor), for the last calendar week ending on or before such July 1; plus

“(II) 2.64 percent,

exceeds 9.0 percent.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolution 334, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. 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 matter on S. 1762.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1762. The legislation addresses a long-standing problem in the Federal student loan program as to how student loan interest rates are to be calculated. It provides for the continued availability of student loan funds to students and their families by correcting an unworkable interest rate

and special allowance rate formula scheduled to take effect in 2003.

The problem first came to light several years ago when it was clear that a provision within the Higher Education Act of 1965 would dramatically alter how interest rates would be determined. The formula set to take effect back in 1998 would have forced many of the lenders now participating in the Federal Family Education Loan Program to reduce or eliminate their participation.

In 1998, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) were able to craft a bipartisan, but temporary, solution to this program that virtually everyone agreed that if it was not corrected would create serious harm to students and their families by creating an access program in the student loan programs.

The compromise reached through the hard work of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) resulted in what are now the lowest interest rates in the Stafford loan program's history. Service continues to students and their families, and student loan borrowers are now paying the historically low interest rate of 5.99 percent in repayment.

Unfortunately, the compromise reached in 1998 was not made permanent when enacted, and is scheduled to expire in 2003; and the unworkable index from prior legislation is set to go back into effect. The problem must be corrected to ensure the availability of capital within the student loan program.

Lenders in the Federal Family Education Loan Program will not be able to finance student loans under the index set to take effect in 2003. By taking action and passing S. 1762 today, we can ensure the continued availability of student loan funds to students nationwide.

The legislation also extends the current special allowance formula for student loan providers, allowing them to continue uninterrupted service to the Nation's students and their families.

This legislation enjoys the support of both Republicans and Democrats in both Houses of Congress and the administration. It is the result of compromise and collaboration with all involved and is supported by student loan providers, financial aid officers, and student associations.

The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is fast approaching, and we will have a lot to focus upon. The student loan interest rate issue consumed virtually all of the reauthorization process in 1998 and took away time and resources that could have been used more productively. I think it is important that we fix the interest rate problem now so that when we do the reauthorization, we can concentrate on the many issues that will confront us that are of significant interest to the higher education community and our students.

The bottom line is this: we have reached an agreement across the board that this interest rate issue needs to be resolved. Our colleagues in the other body have done their part. It is now time for us to do our part. Let us ensure that the availability of student loans is there for students all across our great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support S. 1762, that reduces interest rates on student loans. I would like to begin by thanking four Members who worked particularly hard on this bill in a bipartisan spirit: the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

I appreciate the leadership of Senator JOHNSON in the other body. Members of our committee worked very hard to bring this legislation about and to put it in a manner in which all Members of Congress could support it.

As we know, this legislation came up late last year, on December 20; and I opposed the bill at that time. I did so because of the Republican leadership's refusal to schedule a bipartisan bill authored by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), despite the support of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the New York delegation.

That bill, H.R. 3163 would forgive the education loans to surviving spouses of police officers, firefighters, and other fire and rescue personnel of the September 11 terrorist attack. I remain disappointed in the Republicans' failure to schedule this bill. However, my concern is with the Republicans' use of the suspension calendar and not this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill today.

Today's legislation will ensure continued availability of student loans. The bank subsidies on student loans will sunset in 2003, jeopardizing the loans' profitability and therefore the availability. S. 1762 ensures the stability of this program by making the lender subsidies permanent. S. 1762 cuts the interest rates for students, and this was the major part of the debate last year.

Last year some proposed raising the interest rates on the students to ensure these bank profits. All the Members on the Democratic side of the Committee on Education and the Workforce signed a letter advocating a stable loan program without higher rates to the students. Through the hard work of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and others, that is what this legislation does.

In addition to extending lender subsidies, it cuts interest rates to stu-

dents, fixing the rates at 6.8 percent beginning in 2006, and will save the average student about \$400. Too often in the Congress, the needs of the average people come last in line. My colleagues should be commended for assuring that this legislation meets the needs of students and their families.

There is broad support in the student loan industry. It has been endorsed by the U.S. Students Association, the American Council on Education, and student loan industry groups, including Sallie Mae, the Consumer Bankers Association. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and also for the great leadership that he has provided in the education area during this Congress. I also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for working with us. They have provided strong leadership in passing H.R. 1, and that is very important to the youth of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1762. This legislation, which has been supported by both Democrats and Republicans and was passed expeditiously by our colleagues in the other body, will ensure the availability of higher education financing to the students embarking on a very important time in their lives. There is no better way to serve the students of this Nation than to ensure a stable source of higher education funding for those who need it.

This legislation quite simply provides for the uninterrupted continuation of the Federal Family Education Loan Program, known as FFELP, and will provide certainty of interest rates for all borrowers in later years.

Many of my colleagues will remember that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and I worked diligently in 1998 to correct the problem in the Higher Education Act of 1965 dealing with student loan interest rate calculations. The success of our bipartisan efforts is evidenced by the current student loan interest rates. Students in repayment now pay 5.99 percent, the lowest Stafford rates in the program's history. This low rate and other benefits provided by student loan providers allows students to partake in a low-cost means of financing their education while maintaining a strong and stable student loan program.

The agreement we reached in 1998 is now running up against the clock. The interest rate formula resulting in new low rates while maintaining the viability of the FFELP is set to expire in the year 2003. If that occurs, students and parents will be unable to obtain these low-cost loans from lenders across the country, and lenders that make these

low-cost loans will not be able to finance student loans under the formula set to take effect.

While we intended the fix to be permanent in 1998, we were unable to institute it for more than 5 years. By taking this action now, there will be no interruption in the availability of student loan funds, and Congress will be able to concentrate fully on many issues that will confront us during the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including grant aid eligibility, distance education, access, and the cost of higher education, to name a few.

This legislation also takes one additional step for students and their families: it provides assurances as to what interest rates will be in the future. While S. 1762 would extend the current viable interest rate formula until 2006, it would then provide for both student loans and parent loans to be at a fixed interest rate. Supporters of this provision feel this will allow families to plan future expenses knowing clearly what the interest rates on their education loans will be. We can make the continued availability of low-cost student loans one less thing students pursuing their dream of higher education need to worry about.

I would like to thank especially Kathleen Smith and George Conant from the committee staff, and Bob Cochran and James Bergeron from my staff; and as I mentioned earlier, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK); and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for all of the excellent help on this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this well-reasoned, well-thought-out legislation. I want to thank and commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for their leadership in bringing this to the floor today.

On December 20, I was among those who opposed this legislation. I did not do so on its merits. I did so because of the principle of defending the rights of the minority in this Chamber.

The legislation the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) made reference to previously that was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), would have provided student loan forgiveness for the surviving spouses of

heroes, police officers and firefighters and other heroes involved in the atrocities of September 11.

That legislation is supported by the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership of the committee, and I believe it is supported by every member of our committee; and it should have been brought to the floor under the suspension calendar of the House. It should have been brought immediately to the floor of the House. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership reconsiders its decision to deny that opportunity and brings it forward.

Having said that, we now turn our attention to the legislation before us. It is worthy in three very important respects.

First of all, it will mean lower interest rates for students and their families right now. It will make it more affordable to borrow money to go to school, and that is a good thing.

Second, it will provide stability in the student loan system. We have an excellent system today that provides for competition between the direct student loan program and the bank-based private sector student loan program. As a result of this, students and their families and institutions get to choose the best offer, the best price, the best quality for themselves.

Without this change, which assures the financial structure of the private side of the program, the private side of the program would be very much in jeopardy, and it is conceivable that private lenders would leave the system. That would be very disadvantageous to students around the country.

Finally, the legislation is worthy because, as the chairman of the subcommittee said just a few minutes ago, it provides some certainty for families planning for paying for higher education by locking in today's relatively low interest rates well into the future, and making them permanent.

For all of these reasons, I would urge both Republican and Democratic Members to follow suit, follow the example of the other body, and approve this legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the introduction and for yielding time to me, but in particular for his hard work on the Committee on Education and the Workforce on bringing this bill to the floor; and I particularly commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), with whom I have worked for some time now, in seeing this bill actually come to the floor and be passed.

I really appreciate the acknowledgment of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) that the inaction or lack of action in December really had nothing to do with the merits of this legislation.

□ 1045

What has to do with the merits of this legislation is ensuring predictable

student loans at competitive and favorable rates for American students that otherwise might not or would not get the student opportunity to receive a higher education.

Secondly, it is important, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) has pointed out, that we provide the ability to lock in rates and have a fixed rate repayment so those families that are struggling to meet the demands of paying back their cost and ensuring that their child gets a higher education have a predictable, consistent flow and rate.

Third, it is important to understand that any time you put indexes and formulas into the law to affect the rates or the guarantees on any program there are going to be periodic needs for adjustment, and now is the periodic need for that adjustment.

There are some, in fact, I was questioned on a radio talk show last night as I talked about this bill, who questioned whether or not we ought to be in this business. Well, let me address that for one second because the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) on their hard work on higher education, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I know the same thing, in America the most important thing we can have is to see to it that bright minds who can achieve have the opportunity to further their education, who can then contribute to its fullest to the United States of America.

Second, as is the case in most Federal guarantee programs, it actually produces revenue for the United States as long as we are sure we will do a good underwriting job and a good collection job is done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today and endorse this legislation. I thank both sides of the aisle for their hard work on it and say to the students of America who are looking forward to a college education that otherwise would not be within their reach because of finances that we are willing to provide the underpinning and the opportunity for a consistent flow of favorable rate loans for students to further their dreams and reach their goals.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the words that were spoken here.

There was never any contention about this bill. I certainly supported it in committee and I support it today and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I think in this time of need of this country that we have to do everything possible to make sure that our young people and also our parents know they have the ability to send their children to college for higher learning. If anything, it is national security to make

sure we have the brightest minds, especially in math and science, to continue the work that we need.

What happened on December 20, unfortunately, I think was a misunderstanding. I know my chairman has promised to work with me to again bring up hopefully the bill on the Surviving Spouse Loan Act, which is important certainly to many of the victims on September 11, and I am hoping that we will continue to work on that. I wish we were able to work on it that night to have a clarification on it.

So, again I stand here in great support of this bill. It had nothing to do with the merits, the confusion that happened that morning, at 5 o'clock in the morning, I believe it was. But unfortunately we probably should not do things like that at 5 o'clock. As a nurse I can state one's mind is not functioning very well.

With that, I do urge my colleagues. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and I have worked well together on our committee. We have a lot of work to do on IDEA coming this year and I am willing to work with the gentleman on that. Again, I hope his promises of helping me to get this bill to the floor will continue. I am more than willing to work together. I urge all of my colleagues to certainly support this amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1762, a bill that will ensure the long-term availability of higher education loans for students and their families.

Our Nation's higher education loan system under the Federal Family Education Loan Program is an example of government at its best. By working in partnership with students, parents, college universities and private sector loan providers, the Federal Government has made the dream of college a reality for more than 50 million Americans since 1965.

Right now there are families with children heading off to college next fall who are talking about not only where their children will attend school, but how they will pay for it. For high school students and their families currently facing these daunting questions, today's action will resolve half of that equation and leave them with the more pleasant task of determining which college or university is right for them, not whether they will have the means to afford it.

By continuing the current formula for setting student loan interest rates, we will avoid the volatility that certainly would have set in had the current system been allowed to lapse. This will ensure stability in the Federal Family Education Loan Program and guarantee the loan system that serves 80 percent of America's schools and millions of our students.

For the past 35 years education loans have been critical in enabling America's families to afford the rising cost of college tuition. By passing this legislation today we will maintain our national investment in well-educated, well-trained young people who can compete with workers anywhere in the world. In short, this legislation is good for students, families, schools, taxpayers and the economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to all of my colleagues that this bill is supported by both loan providers and student advocacy groups. In fact, the State PIRG's Higher Education Project predicts that the typical student borrower will realize a savings of \$680 over the life of the loan.

I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for their leadership in assuring continued availability of education loans for future generations of students. This is important legislation for our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), a strong supporter of this legislation.

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

More importantly, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for the leadership they have exhibited in bringing this bill before us.

Passage of this legislation provides a final resolution to a long needed fix within the Higher Education Act related to the way interest rates for student loans are set, making college more affordable for millions of students across the country.

S. 1762 has been developed and agreed upon by a bipartisan process and the other body has passed this legislation in December by unanimous consent. Every major higher education association, including groups representing students, schools and lenders, support this legislation. If we do not take this action now, we run the risk of having a system under which two-thirds of students loans are made revert back to a troublesome formula that threatened the viability of several lenders back in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, most students, especially those from low- and middle-income families, have enough of a financial challenge getting through school. They either have to work their way through school or family members have to take a second job to help defray the cost of higher education. The burden of high or fluctuating interest rates should not be another distraction. We have the means to resolve this issue once and for all, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join my colleagues today first of all to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a great compromise entered into several years ago, in 1998, that provided for a new formulation of how we would finance student loans.

Basically what we are doing is making it attractive for lenders to provide funds for students and parents to get guaranteed low rates and to make the funds sound for at least the next 6 years to bring about a better use of higher education funding in the United States. I commend both the ranking member and the chairman of the committee and, as I said, the respective chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee.

This is a technical problem that probably is not of the highest order of understanding of people, but it is the type of fix and in the tradition of trying to be bipartisan in an issue in education and in the country today where both sides of the aisle can come together and support this.

I urge all of my fellow Members on the Democratic side to join the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and myself and others and my Republican colleagues on the other side and show a resounding show of support to fix the student loan program to provide long-term funding into the future at reasonable rates that parents, students and lenders can rely upon.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say a comment as we close. This really is important legislation. The costs associated with this bill are covered in the budget resolution that was agreed to earlier last year, and by doing this we will continue to have a strong availability of affordable student loans for our students. With that, I ask my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1762, which ensures that continued viability of low-interest loans for college students.

When the Budget Committee drafted the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution last spring, we sought to avert a potential crisis in the Federal Student Loan Program. The train we saw coming down the track was a change in the interest rate structure set to take place in July 2003.

That change would repeal the current structure, which supports \$38 billion in new, federally subsidized, student loans each year for needy college students. It would replace it with a controversial new formula that education experts warned would be potentially disruptive to the loan program.

The scheduled change could jeopardize the availability of funds for student loans because it would tie interest rates to long-term treasuries. The loan program has thrived for years on interest rates that correspond to short-term Treasury rates.

The scheduled change was created under the assumption that, by 2003, all student loans would be issued by the Federal Government. But 70 percent of the loans are now issued by private lenders. We have to adjust for that reality.

Fixing the interest rate problem will be expensive. It will cost money because the baseline already assumes the scheduled change in interest rates.

It is for this reason the FY 2002 budget resolution included a reserve fund that allowed the committee to adjust the appropriate levels in the budget resolution to offset the "cost" of repealing the change in interest rates.

I would observe, however, that this bill does not fully comply with the terms of the budget resolution. First, the bill slightly exceeds the size of the reserve fund in the resolution. This is mostly because the Congressional Budget Office re-estimated the cost of repealing the scheduled interest rate change after Congress had adopted the budget resolution.

Secondly, the budget resolution stipulated that the reserve could only be tapped if the surplus exceeded specified levels. Unfortunately, the surplus has not materialized as a result of the events of September 11 and the on-going recession.

Nevertheless, I will support this bill because it was accommodated in the budget resolution. Further, neither the Budget nor Education Committees could have foreseen CBO's rescoring of the bill nor the loss of the surplus due to the recent terrorist attacks.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. MCKEON for their efforts to ensure the continued viability of the student loan programs, which will issue more than 9 million new loans this year.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1762 which seeks to ensure the availability of low-cost student loans to millions of students across the country. Passage of this legislation will ensure a strong and stable Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) and give students and their families piece of mind that this important, and largest, student aid program will be there to serve them and I commend my colleague from California, Mr. MCKEON for helping bring this measure to the floor today.

The current student loan interest rate formula has provided for the lowest Stafford Loan interest rates in history, currently 5.99 percent, but is unfortunately set to expire on July 1, 2003. When the current formula expires, an unworkable formula will take over. Lenders have warned us that they will be unable to finance student loans under the new formula, putting a 35-year history of serving students and parents in serious jeopardy. Without lenders providing student loans, students and their families will be left out in the cold, with few options left to pay for higher education. The temporary fix enacted in 1998 was intended to be permanent, but the funds were not available to make that happen. S. 1762 will make the fix permanent.

S. 1762 assures loan availability and stability in the public/private partnership by continuing the current structure for payments

made to banks and other student loan lenders ensuring the private sector's continued participation in the student loan program. Present and future college students need to know that the Federal Family Education Loan Program will be available to them as they pursue higher education opportunities. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be on the floor today for consideration of the bill S. 1762. This bipartisan legislation keeps the interest rates on college student loans at their current and unprecedented low levels.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this bill. This is solid legislation that provides for the continued availability of affordable student loans. The extension of current low interest rates is necessary to ensure that students can continue to obtain the financial assistance needed to meet postsecondary education goals. The current student loan interest rate formula, set to expire on July 1, 2003, provides students and their families with an affordable way to pay for an education that might otherwise not be possible. A variety of educational and financial institutions, including the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, strongly support S. 1762. Stabilizing interest rates now will secure educational opportunities for the future. I am pleased by the broad support this legislation received.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to amend the Higher Education Act. This bill will help millions of students and their families across the nation deal with the rising cost of higher education. Now more than ever, it is important that our citizens can afford the costs of a college education.

The bill we are about to vote on will help that cause by setting a low, fixed, interest rate of 6.8 percent on student loans. Right now, we are looking at the lowest loan interest rates in history. This low rate, 5.99 percent, is due to the current interest rate formula that will expire next year. We must act now to ensure a low interest rate for our students. Student loans have repayment periods that range anywhere from 10 years to 25 years. If we can do anything to protect our students from facing the possibility of sinking deeper in debt because of higher interest rates, we should do that now. Our students and their families deserve as much.

This bipartisan bicameral legislation is a great way to start off the year and help our students across the country. It passed the Senate unanimously, and now I urge my colleagues to support this measure and vote "yes."

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 334, the Senate bill is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOEHNER. 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 372, nays 3, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]  
YEAS—372

Abercrombie	Deal	Horn
Ackerman	DeFazio	Hostettler
Aderholt	DeGette	Houghton
Akin	Delahunt	Hoyer
Allen	DeLauro	Hulshof
Andrews	DeLay	Hunter
Armey	DeMint	Inslee
Baca	Deutsch	Isakson
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Baird	Dicks	Issa
Baker	Dingell	Istook
Baldacci	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	Dooley	Jackson-Lee
Ballenger	Doolittle	(TX)
Barcia	Dreier	Jefferson
Barr	Duncan	Jenkins
Barrett	Dunn	John
Bartlett	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Bass	Ehlers	Johnson (IL)
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Johnson, E. B.
Bereuter	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Berkley	Engel	Jones (OH)
Berry	English	Kanjorski
Biggert	Eshoo	Kaptur
Billirakis	Etheridge	Keller
Bishop	Evans	Kelly
Blunt	Farr	Kennedy (MN)
Boehler	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Boehner	Ferguson	Kerns
Boozman	Filner	Kildee
Borski	Foley	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Forbes	King (NY)
Boyd	Ford	Kingston
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Kirk
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Klecza
Brown (FL)	Frost	Knollenberg
Brown (OH)	Ganske	Kolbe
Brown (SC)	Gekas	Kucinich
Bryant	Gephardt	LaFalce
Burr	Gibbons	LaHood
Buyer	Gilchrest	Lampson
Callahan	Gillmor	Langevin
Calvert	Gilman	Lantos
Camp	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Cannon	Goode	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Goodlatte	Latham
Capito	Gordon	LaTourette
Capps	Goss	Leach
Capuano	Graham	Lee
Cardin	Granger	Levin
Carson (IN)	Graves	Lewis (CA)
Carson (OK)	Green (TX)	Linder
Castle	Green (WI)	Lipinski
Chabot	Greenwood	LoBiondo
Chambliss	Grucci	Lofgren
Clayton	Gutierrez	Lowe
Clement	Gutknecht	Lucas (KY)
Clyburn	Hall (OH)	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Hall (TX)	Lynch
Combust	Hansen	Maloney (CT)
Condit	Harman	Maloney (NY)
Conyers	Hart	Markey
Cooksey	Hastings (FL)	Mascara
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Cox	Hayes	Matsui
Coyne	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Cramer	Hefley	McCollum
Crane	Herger	McCrary
Crenshaw	Hill	McDermott
Crowley	Hilleary	McGovern
Culberson	Hilliard	McHugh
Cummings	Hobson	McInnis
Cunningham	Hoefel	McIntyre
Davis (CA)	Hoekstra	McKeon
Davis (FL)	Holden	McKinney
Davis, Jo Ann	Holt	McNulty
Davis, Tom	Honda	Meehan

Meek (FL)	Rehberg	Stark
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Stearns
Menendez	Reynolds	Stenholm
Mica	Rivers	Strickland
Millender-	Rodriguez	Stump
McDonald	Roemer	Stupak
Miller, Dan	Rogers (KY)	Sununu
Miller, George	Rogers (MI)	Sweeney
Miller, Jeff	Rohrabacher	Tancredo
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Moore	Ross	Tauscher
Morella	Rothman	Tauzin
Myrick	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Neal	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Northup	Sabo	Thompson (MS)
Norwood	Sanchez	Thornberry
Nussle	Sanders	Thune
Oberstar	Sandlin	Tiahrt
Olver	Sawyer	Tiberi
Osborne	Saxton	Tierney
Ose	Schaffer	Toomey
Otter	Schakowsky	Towns
Owens	Schiff	Turner
Pallone	Schrock	Udall (CO)
Pascrell	Scott	Udall (NM)
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Payne	Serrano	Velazquez
Pelosi	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pence	Shaw	Walden
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Wamp
Petri	Shimkus	Watson (CA)
Phelps	Shows	Watt (NC)
Pickering	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Pitts	Simmons	Waxman
Platts	Simpson	Weiner
Pombo	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Pomeroy	Skelton	Wexler
Portman	Slaughter	Whitfield
Price (NC)	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (NM)
Putnam	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rahall	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Ramstad	Snyder	Wynn
Rangel	Souder	Young (FL)
Regula	Spratt	

## NAYS—3

Flake	Moran (KS)	Paul
-------	------------	------

## NOT VOTING—60

Barton	Hinchey	Oxley
Becerra	Hinojosa	Quinn
Berman	Hoohey	Radanovich
Blagojevich	Hyde	Riley
Blumenauer	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Bonilla	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Largent	Sessions
Bono	Lewis (GA)	Sherwood
Boucher	Lewis (KY)	Solis
Burton	Luther	Thomas
Clay	Manzullo	Thurman
Collins	McCarthy (MO)	Traficant
Cubin	Miller, Gary	Vitter
Davis (IL)	Mink	Waters
Doyle	Moran (VA)	Watkins (OK)
Everett	Murtha	Weldon (FL)
Fletcher	Nadler	Weller
Frank	Napolitano	Woolsey
Galleghy	Obey	Wu
Hastert	Ortiz	Young (AK)

□ 1122

So the Senate 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. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 4 on S. 1762 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 4, S. 1762, to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today, January 24, due to family considerations, I unfortunately was not present for a rollcall vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 4, S. 1762, to establish

fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 4, S. 1762, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers, to extend current law with respect to special allowances for lenders, and for other purposes. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls 2, 3, and 4.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, Due to a family health emergency, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 1–4 on Wednesday, January 23 and Thursday, January 24. Had I been present, I would have voted "present" on rollcalls vote 1, and "yea" on rollcall votes 2–4.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be in both Bakersfield and Washington, DC on January 23, and January 24. I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2234, and S. 1762.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 23, 2002, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall votes Nos. 1, 2, and 3 during the consideration of H.R. 700, a bill to authorize the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, and H.R. 2234, the Tumacacori National Historical Park Boundary Revision Act. Please let the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted "aye" for rollcall Votes Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

On Thursday, January 24, 2002, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 4, on passage S. 1762, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish fixed interest rates for student and parent borrowers, to extend current law with respect to special allowances for lenders, and for other purposes. Please let the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted "aye" for rollcall Vote No. 4.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader to respond.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for the chance to respond, and if I might preface my response by saying how very pleased I am to see the gentlewoman from California at the podium today performing her official duties as whip for the Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, January 29, 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 tomorrow.

On Tuesday, recorded votes are expected promptly at 5 p.m. in order to provide time for a security sweep of the House Chamber. The House will meet in joint session with the Senate at 9 p.m. to receive a State of the Union Address from President George W. Bush.

On Wednesday, and the balance of the week, no votes are expected in the House.

I want to thank the distinguished minority whip for yielding to me.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his presentation of the schedule and for his kind welcoming remarks. I want to in turn say that I congratulate him on his decision and wish him well. We still have a year to go and look forward to working with him during that time.

And "work" is the word. Do I understand that the only legislative business next week will be on Tuesday, with votes at 5 p.m.?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, she is correct, and this is a very important point. We will have the votes at 5 p.m. on Tuesday next in order for the security sweep in preparation of the President's address. This is a departure from our normal proceedings, as many Members know.

So as the gentlewoman from California correctly points out, we need Members to be aware that it is a 5 p.m. vote time on Tuesday next.

Ms. PELOSI. Well, we all are awaiting with great optimism the address of the President of the United States in the State of the Union on Tuesday. And I understand the votes are at 5 p.m., but there will be no legislative business on Wednesday or for the rest of the week next week?

Mr. ARMEY. No. Thanks again for the inquiry, but that is correct.

Ms. PELOSI. Do we not have any work to do?

Mr. ARMEY. There is no work to do.

Ms. PELOSI. We seem to have some challenges in our country, and I would hope we would use all the time available to us to do that.

I thank the gentleman for advising us of the schedule.

## THANKING COLLEAGUES FOR THEIR GENEROUS ACKNOWLEDGMENT REGARDING RETIREMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a moment to thank the

gentlewoman from California for her kind words. I have had so many people from the other side of the aisle speak so kindly to me on my decision to retire from Congress that I could not resist taking a moment to say that at last I finally have made a decision that is a source of great pleasure to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I want to thank them for their generous acknowledgment of that.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY,  
JANUARY 25, 2002, TO TUESDAY,  
JANUARY 29, 2002

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 25, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 29, 2002 for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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 of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REQUESTING IT BE THE WILL OF  
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTA-  
TIVES THAT THE ST. LOUIS  
RAMS BE VICTORIOUS ON SUN-  
DAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be the will of this body that the St. Louis Rams have a glorious victory on Sunday 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 (Mr. PENCE). 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.

WELCOME TO WASHINGTON, DC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the only Member who never has to leave Washington, I want to welcome my colleagues back to Washington, my hometown and your second home.

I was very gratified to note that the White House reopened White House tours to children just a few days ago. This follows a meeting I arranged between White House officials and D.C. leaders where I suggested that D.C. schoolchildren be allowed to view the White House Christmas tree decorations. Now the White House has seen to it that all children will be able to go into the White House.

I suggested at that time that the public could come in if they only left their Social Security numbers the way people have to anyway before they go into the White House. Now the children will leave their Social Security numbers. Let us hope the White House follows with the general public. I am very gratified for what they have already done for children.

These may seem small matters, but, my colleagues, what it does is to signal to the country that if the Capitol is open the country is open as well. The President has made an important ad to visit America, that Americans should do their business. It is important for people to travel, particularly now during a recession, and the more the District of Columbia seems open, the most visible city in the country, the more people will follow the President's advice and go out to their own places and help us get out of this recession by getting on planes.

Members and staff will soon receive a "Dear Colleague" from me about an event I am hosting on Tuesday, February 12, called "Ask Me About Washington," to acquaint them with tourist attractions and amenities in D.C. so they can advise their own constituents who come here.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, this is an election year. It is time to welcome our constituents back to Washington. Members need to transmit that the District is the safest city in the United States, precisely because it is the Nation's Capital.

The war is winding down. The President has said, absolutely correctly, terrorist threats will be with us for many years to come. It is time to get constituents used to traveling, particularly now, and coming back to Washington. Members and staff will learn how to advise constituents of where to go at my Ask Me About Washington event on Tuesday, February 12.

The economy is down. The way to get it up is for people to do what President Bush has indicated, go out and see the sites, but above all come and see Members of Congress. Look at the gallery. The galleries have been empty because Americans are not traveling. They are not traveling to Members' home States or the Capital.

That is bad news for people running for office, and it is bad news for our country when people are not flooding into the Capital to find out what to do about the issues that concern them most, especially during an election year. When constituents come, they

need to know what to see in Washington. When they come, they need to know that everything is still open to the public, notwithstanding the barricades. This is an open city because this is an open country.

CONGRESS BIDS FAREWELL TO  
SIX OUTSTANDING PAGES

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as the delegate from the District of Columbia welcomes us back, she is also going to say good-bye to six residents. I would like to have Lindsey Beck, Matthew Dinusson, Ashley Gallo, Jennifer Hsieh, Gregory Hyde, and Zachary Stanton come on down here. Grab some seats in the front row.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Page Board, it is my distinct pleasure to recognize these six outstanding pages that are departing today. This year's page class is a remarkable group of students. They came to Washington full of ambition and promise. Little did they know, nor did their friends and colleagues in the back, that they would be witness to such tragic events in history. Far from their families and friends, and so new to Washington that homesickness barely had a chance to ease, this page class refused to let fear chase them away from their dreams of working with Congress. They relied on each other, and on the day-to-day tasks before them; and they knew in their hearts they were working toward a common goal shared by all of us, to prove to our enemies that the American spirit cannot be extinguished. The courage, determination, and sense of purpose shown by this class and their colleagues in the back set an example for us all. They have proven that adversity does build strength and that the human spirit is resolute when it is tested.

Mr. Speaker, not only did this group carry on their work as pages, but they did so with enthusiasm, excitement, and as I found out, in good humor, which at such moments in history is kind of hard to do. There is no question that this class has made us very proud. This class is a credit to their families, their communities, and to the page program.

The six who are leaving today will be returning home on Saturday. They leave here with our thanks and congratulations. We share in their joy of being reunited with their families and share in their sadness of saying good-bye; but this group probably will not miss those 6:15 breakfasts we have all endured.

Mr. Speaker, these pages have left their own indelible mark on the page program, and I want them to know that their shoes will be hard to fill. As they return home with suitcases and boxes, memories and experiences, I

want them to take our sincere thanks. I thank Lindsey Beck, Matthew Dinusson, Ashley Gallo, Jennifer Hsieh, Gregory Hyde and Zachary Stanton. I thank them for having the courage and the strength to persevere when others would have given up. I thank them for approaching every day with curiosity and hope, and for encouraging others to do the same.

There is no doubt that these six pages will go on to do great things, and we hope they come back and share their accomplishments with us.

Mr. Speaker, I wish them a lifetime of success and happiness. And now my colleague on the House Page Board, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), would like to speak.

---

#### CONGRESS BIDS FAREWELL TO SIX OUTSTANDING PAGES

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as the ranking Democrat on the House Page Board, having been appointed to that position by Speaker Tip O'Neill 20-some years ago. I have seen many pages come here. There has been no class better than this class. This class has been outstanding pages, and I am very, very proud of them.

There is a very good program in the country called Close Up, and I always meet with my Close Up students; but no one, no one has seen this Congress as close up as this group of pages has. They have seen us at our best and at our worst, but this year they probably have seen us at our best. They witnessed history that no other generation will hopefully ever witness again, when this country was attacked by terrorists and thousands of people were killed.

I can recall walking with my staff away from the Capitol after the plane hit the Pentagon. I saw a group of pages coming towards the Capitol building. They were supposed to be here they thought, and I said get back to the dorm. Their sense of duty was enormous, although this building could very well have been the target.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the pages, but particularly Lindsey Beck from Arizona; Matthew Dinusson from Minnesota; Ashley Gallo from Michigan, my home State; Jennifer Hsieh from Texas; Gregory Hyde, New York City; and Zachary Stanton from Michigan. They can be proud of themselves. They will leave here knowing more about government, being able to tell others government is an instrument of good; and hopefully they will always be involved in government, whether they run for office or are a voter. Make government work. They have seen government at work. I thank this group of pages very much, and God bless them.

#### RECOGNIZING THE BRAVE SAILORS OF THE USS "CARL VINSON"

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) to fly out on a helicopter and go aboard the *Carl Vinson* as it came through the Straits of Juan de Fuca into Puget Sound into the Bremerton shipyard in my hometown. It was a great honor for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and I to have an opportunity to address the crew of the *Carl Vinson*. They had let the air wing off in San Diego, but still over 3,000 sailors, 12 percent of which were women, were coming home to Bremerton, were coming home to meet their families. I believe that the *Carl Vinson*, which was the first aircraft carrier into the North Arabian Sea, performed heroically on behalf of our country in Operation Enduring Freedom.

In looking over their record over this last 111 days when they were fully operational, they conducted 4,200 sorties flying F-14s and F-18s into Afghanistan using the smart weapons like JDAMs and the satellite weapons to destroy Taliban and al Qaeda targets in the area, and helped to contribute to the quick demise of the Taliban government.

I was pleased to be aboard and talk to the crew. They were extremely excited about coming home; but they were very, very proud of the service that they had rendered on behalf of our country. I want Members to know that we assured them that this Congress, this administration, strongly supports what they have done. There was bipartisan support in the Congress for the President's operations in Afghanistan.

I think we should reiterate the importance of these large big-deck carriers, 4.5 acres of American sovereignty. As we all know, we do not always get the bases that we need in any area of the world where we have to have American actions. In this case, we were not able to use airfields, as we were in Desert Storm and Desert Shield, in the region so these aircraft carriers became paramount.

Mr. Speaker, there were 48 attack aircraft coming off these carriers, and those attack aircraft flew these missions, having to have several airline refuelings, which also points out the importance of why we have to have tankers in order to provide the fuel for these planes on their missions, also for the bombers, the B-1s, the B-52s and the B-2s that were all used successfully in this endeavor.

It was also exciting to see the crew of the ship reunite with their families. Seventy-six of the men on board were fathers during the time they were gone, 6 months of deployment. In fact, I saw one woman who had delivered her baby on the day of the deployment, the

first day, so the child was 6 months old. And to see all of them reunited on the pier in Bremerton, Washington, my hometown, is truly something I will never forget.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all should recognize the important contribution of the men and women who serve us daily in the military. This Congress has a responsibility to make certain that we give them the benefits, that we give them the support, that we give them the equipment so that they can conduct these operations in the future.

But those large aircraft carriers were crucial in giving us the ability to make these attacks early on and to win this war decisively with very minimal loss of American life. I also would say that while they were operational, they conducted 37 replenishments while they were underway. This is when another ship comes up and provides supplies to the aircraft carrier when it is operational and moving. I think that is rather remarkable. Over 16,000 airplanes landed and took off on the *Carl Vinson* during this deployment; and they went 51,000 miles, which is almost two times around the Earth.

I was proud to be there, proud as a member of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and to see the men and women serving on the *Carl Vinson*.

We also learned in this war, 90 percent of the weapons that were used were smart bombs like JDAMs, and we almost ran out of those weapons. So we have got a lot of work to do here in the Congress to support the President to make sure that we have the equipment for the future. But it was a great day in Bremerton, Washington, and I am proud of the work of these great sailors and of our United States Navy.

---

#### THERE IS NO CHOICE IN CHINA

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, a woman 4 months pregnant flees to her mother's village to avoid a forced abortion in China. Her brother, two sisters and three other relatives are arrested as bargaining chips to enforce China's brutal one-child-per-family policy.

□ 1145

Three of her families' homes are destroyed. A second woman, 19 years of age, is told that she is too young to have a baby. She does not meet the government's age requirements for pregnancy. Her friends who accompanied her to the local clinic for her mandatory abortion all nod vigorously when asked by an undercover investigator if the young lady would like to keep the baby. "But the law forbids it," they add. Sound barbaric?

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, on this week where millions of Americans on either side of the debate over abortion gathered in our Nation's capital,

those of us who endorse what we call the right to life and many thousands that endorse a woman's right to choose debated the question of choice. But let us all understand on this week when we foment this debate in Washington, Mr. Speaker, that there is no choice in China.

China's indefensible population control programs, though, do not just have their detractors in the world. They actually have their promoters, some of whom are sponsored by the United States Government. The United Nations Population Fund, also known as the UNFPA, Mr. Speaker, has described China's forced abortion policy as a, quote, remarkable achievement. Proving their moral bankruptcy, Sven Burmester, the representative for the U.N. Population Fund in Beijing, said, "China has the most successful family planning policy in the history of mankind in terms of quantity, and with that," he added, "China has done mankind a favor."

Also proving the moral bankruptcy of the UNFPA, Mr. Burmester of the Fund said, in effect, my own view is that there is a generation of Chinese who have sacrificed themselves to benefit society, and that generation, presumably the generation expensed in China's policy of forced abortion, is to be recognized.

But the U.N. Population Fund, Mr. Speaker, recently received a significant increase in its funding from the U.S. Government. There will be those who will say at the UNFPA that they only work in regions where the Chinese government has suspended its oppressive one-child policy. However, testimony in a recent House International Relations Committee hearing revealed photographs of a UNFPA office located within the China Office of Family Planning. The testimony also uncovered evidence that the UNFPA is active in Sihui County in China in which family planning is decidedly not voluntary. Officials have imposed age requirements there for pregnancy and require birth permits, mandatory sterilization and forced abortion. Those who refuse to comply with these standards face fines, imprisonment and often the destruction of their homes and property. There is no choice in China, Mr. Speaker.

But, sadly, in the waning days of the first session of the 107th Congress, the UNFPA in the foreign operations bill recently received a 58 percent increase in its funding, \$34 million, U.S. taxpayer paid. The Mexico City Policy prohibits Federal funding of groups that perform or even promote abortion services overseas.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to urge the administration, as I did before over 100,000 pro-life citizens on the National Mall on Tuesday, I rise today to urge the administration to enforce the Mexico City Policy, to seize the Kemp Kas-ten language in the foreign operations bill and do what President Ronald Reagan did and do what President

George Herbert Walker Bush did, and that is render the amount the foreign operations bill has provided to the UNFPA to zero. The people of the United States of America deserve better than to have their taxpayer dollars used to foment and to promote an organization that praises China's forced abortion policy.

---

#### ON INTRODUCTION OF EMPLOYEE SAVINGS PROTECTION ACT (ESPA)

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create new legal rights for employees who are induced to make investment decisions about their 401(k) or other individual pension accounts that are contrary to their own best interests. As one who has endeavored to expand opportunities for greater participation in employer-sponsored pension plans, I strongly believe that our pension laws must be amended to ensure that employers, who have superior information as to the financial condition of their business and communicate information that they know to be false to influence their employees in the administration of their 401(k) accounts, face serious legal consequences.

My bill, the Employee Savings Protection Act of 2002, would ensure that employees that were unduly influenced by such information to the detriment of their retirement savings can have a legal claim that survives bankruptcy.

I am introducing ESPA in the hopes that employees who participate in employer-sponsored plans, such as many of my constituents who were employed by Enron, do not meet the same fate as the employees of Morrison Knudsen, whose claims against the Idaho firm did not survive Chapter 11 reorganization. The claims of Morrison Knudsen employees were extinguished by the company's bankruptcy reorganization plan, according to a 1999 ruling by the Federal District Court in Boise, Idaho. There is a gaping hole in our bankruptcy laws if directors and officers or other fiduciaries under the Employment Retirement Security Act of 1974 can torpedo the retirement savings of their employees and walk away without owing a penny.

In the case of Enron, we now know that senior management grossly mismanaged the company while telling employees that their stock would rise. As a result, thousands lost their life savings on the basis of faulty information and through no fault of their own. Under ESPA, plan fiduciaries that engage in such acts, including officers and directors, would be held personally liable for the losses incurred as a result of this deception. Further, should the plan fiduciary file for bankruptcy protection, this employee claim would be treated as a "priority" to be fully reimbursed in bankruptcy proceedings,

ahead of other unsecured creditors. Eligible employee claims could arise from violations occurring as early as January 1, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, our pension laws are very clear as to the duties that fiduciaries owe to plan participants. The consequences for breaches are substantial. Directors and officers can be held personally liable for such breaches. Claims by employees who were damaged because they trusted the misinformation imparted by a fiduciary must be protected. Our bankruptcy laws must not be used as a cloak behind which employers such as Enron who dupe their employees are protected. Mr. Speaker, my bill will ensure not only that such claims are protected but that these claimants stand ahead of other unsecured creditors in a bankruptcy proceeding.

The time has come for the House to take action. I hope that we move on this bill quickly.

---

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

(Mr. THUNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

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

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO JACK SHEA, OLYMPIC GOLD MEDALIST

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the 22nd Congressional District of New York, New York State and indeed our Nation and the world suffered a great loss when we experienced the untimely death of Mr. Jack Shea. Mr. Shea was a double Olympic speed skating gold medalist who died suddenly and tragically in an automobile accident less than one mile from his home. Mr. Shea was 91 years young and served this Nation in so many important and great ways that this loss will be felt for quite some time.

In addition to the two Olympic Gold Medals that he earned at the Lake Placid Winter Olympic games in 1932, he was both the father and grandfather of Olympians. His son Jim competed in the 1964 Winter Olympics, and today, ironically enough and I think adding to the sense of tragedy to this unfortunate incident, his grandson Jim is set to compete in the Olympics at Salt Lake City, Utah.

Also ironically, this weekend we will convene in Lake Placid for our annual

Congressional Olympic Challenge. Mr. Shea was to serve as our keynote speaker on Saturday night, welcoming Members of Congress and citizens from throughout this Nation to the great Lake Placid and indeed showing them the important history that Mr. Shea was so much a part of and so important to, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that many in Lake Placid referred to Jack as Mr. Lake Placid. His untimely death is made particularly tragic by the loss that we will experience and the loss of his advocacy on behalf of Lake Placid and the Olympic movement. Without Jack there, I can say that there will be just a little bit missing from this weekend. But as Jack would tell us if he were here, the games must go on. The efforts to ensure that the Olympic movement in the United States and indeed throughout the world needs to be made strong. That is why we will embark.

For those reasons, I intend to and will introduce a resolution into this House today to recognize and pay proper tribute to Jack Shea, a great man, a great Olympian and a friend who truly epitomized, Mr. Speaker, the greatness of America, the greatness of the Olympic movement, the greatness of competition in the Olympic movement. We will all dearly miss him. We are all deeply touched and have been deeply touched by his life.

---

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### AFGHANISTAN FACING LONG AND DIFFICULT ROAD TO RECOVERY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), both good friends who have really done a lot to help on human rights and hunger and religious freedom issues, and I traveled to Afghanistan and Pakistan from January 2 through 10. After spending 2 days of that trip in Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, clearly the situation there is desperate. At a later time on the House floor perhaps the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I can share in greater detail our observations, but there are some comments I would like to make today.

The issue of security in Afghanistan has to be dealt with immediately. The country is still not safe. We were told there are no low risk areas in the country. Crime in Kabul—banditry and murder—is on the rise. Interim Chair-

man Harmid Karzai told us that he may ask that outside forces be brought in to provide security not only for the Afghan people but to ensure that humanitarian aid is delivered. The Afghan government will need help with rebuilding an army that is loyal to the central government and an effective police force to maintain order.

The Bush administration is working diligently to help ease tensions between Pakistan and India, and I support that effort. The threat of nuclear war and the potential negative impact a war in the region would have on the United States' war on terrorism demands immediate attention. President Bush and the Secretary of State have done a great job with regard to bringing both India and Pakistan together. If a special envoy would be helpful in the region, I would suggest that be done.

We ought to immediately restore the AID, Agency for International Development, mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan. AID is doing a tremendous job. The Agency for International Development is critical to countries such as Pakistan and Afghanistan to prevent future extremism.

We must do whatever is necessary to defeat terrorism, which means the United States has a responsibility to stay active and involved because the war on terrorism is not a conventional war. It is not only a military fight but an economic, cultural and educational struggle.

Afghanistan and Pakistan are like bookends. Whatever happens to one country happens to the other. Many believe that the West abandoned Afghanistan after it defeated the Soviet Union, and it became a fertile ground for the rise of the Taliban. We cannot walk away again. If we do, we could be back to where we are today.

I would encourage individuals to go and visit Afghanistan to witness this firsthand. The Afghan people are optimistic, they are hopeful, they are looking to see progress. While substantial resources are required immediately, long-term, multiyear funding for development must be secured in addition to what is already available, but not detract from the development and humanitarian assistance given to other parts of the world.

We should continue to encourage and promote cooperation among the states in the region which share an interest in the stability of Afghanistan and be concerned with regard to the fact that the Iranians appear to be moving into Afghanistan in a big way.

Efforts should be made to prevent the drug trade from being increased and to ultimately wipe it out. Ironically, the cultivation of opium was banned under the Taliban but not strictly enforced. I am concerned that drugs may begin to come back in a big way, because, regrettably, for many Afghan farmers, growing opium is a way of making a living. We do not want to see the drug trade reestablished in Afghanistan

which then ends up on the streets of the United States and Western countries.

People-to-people diplomacy, without using taxpayer money, hospital to hospital, school to school, civic association, Rotary clubs, Kiwanis clubs, Lions clubs should be encouraged to take on projects.

While there we went into a girls' school. The young girls have not been to school for 5 years. They need supplies. Our schools could adopt those schools, and send pens, pencils, books. Hospitals here could donate medicines, equipment and other supplies. We ought not just be looking for Federal dollars but also for volunteer groups in the West, not only in the United States but in Britain and in other countries, to be involved.

The U.S. business community can also help. Hopefully the Afghan community in the United States will participate and go back and help their colleagues and fellow family members in Afghanistan.

There are a number of other comments that I will make that I will just submit for the RECORD.

I want to close by acknowledging the great job our military have done in Afghanistan and continue to do, the dedicated forces of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines.

□ 1200

I want to acknowledge and salute the thousands of men and women serving in the Nation's Armed Forces in Afghanistan and around the world. I want to salute the State Department personnel in Afghanistan and Pakistan and here in the United States who are working very hard on this issue. They deserve our special thanks.

I also want to thank all of the NGOs, the World Food Programme in particular, working in this region to keep famine from taking place; this is the beginning of the fourth year of a drought. Also Save the Children, Catholic Relief, Church World Services and many other groups are doing an outstanding job.

I also want to thank the American Ambassador, Wendy Chamberlin, and her staff in Pakistan and the staff in the American embassy in Afghanistan.

We will prevail and make sure that Afghanistan never returns to terrorism.

---

#### A FRESH LOOK AT THE DISAPPEARING BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. It is a new year, we are all back from our districts, from time with our families; and it is time to take a fresh look at where we are as we begin a new legislative Congress.

You know, to many of us things might look very much the same as they did in December when we left; the same people representing the American citizens across the country, largely the same dynamics in place. In fact, with much of the debate that I have heard this week, it is almost like we picked up mid-conversation, even though there has been a period of several weeks where we have been gone.

In one facet, however, there is very sharp difference of reality compared with where we were as we got to town one year ago, and it is trying to explain this significant different development that I will address in the course of my remarks.

What is different? What is different is the Federal budget. One year ago, we looked at tremendous budget surpluses of a historic nature. We were on the cusp of a plan to march toward reducing and then eliminating the debt held by the people of the United States to their Federal Government, eliminating that debt for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President.

We were debating how we might use these surpluses to advance Social Security reform before the baby boomers move into Social Security in the next decade. We were discussing how we might use these surpluses to bring on to the Medicare program a prescriptive drug benefit so desperately needed by so many then and continuing today.

All of these discussions were made possible because of a steady disciplined march toward establishing sound fiscal policy, generating elimination of the annual budget deficit, and then producing these record surpluses. This march began in 1993 with the budget bill passed by one vote in the House, without any participation by the Republican side, I might add, and passed by one vote in the Senate; and it set the course for tackling the deficit.

The course was certainly assisted by the fact that the economy went from a significant recession into a wonderful boom run through the decade; and as the economy grew faster than expectations, the revenues coming into the Federal Government grew faster than expectations.

Now, in the face of good times on a bipartisan level, this Congress held pretty steady with spending. I think Republicans and Democrats alike can take some pride in showing some discipline on the spending side and the contributory role that it had in producing the much brighter budget situation. So as we convened one year ago, we could look at the product of years of hard work, gut-wrenching choices, but take some satisfaction in a job well done. We tackled the deficits and eliminated them. We built surpluses and had actually the prospect before us of eliminating the national debt. What a wonderful legacy for members of my generation, the baby boom generation, to leave for their children.

Well, that was then. Unfortunately, the situation now could not be more

different. The 10-year projection from a surplus standpoint was \$5.6 trillion a year ago. This year, it has been revised and revised in one of the most significant dramatic reductions ever.

This chart shows the vanishing budget surplus over 10 years, and it truly is staggering: \$5.6 trillion projected 1 year ago. Based on the economic forecasting, the slowing economy reduced this \$5.6 trillion to \$3.3 trillion. The biggest development between those forecasts were the slowing economy and the enactment of a tax cut last May that absolutely committed all of these surplus revenues.

Yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office further reduced the 10-year unified budget surplus to \$1.6 trillion. Now, you may say that sounds like a surplus; I thought you were talking about deficits. That counts the Social Security surplus, the Medicare Trust Fund, and the general fund; so on a unified budget basis we are at \$1.6 trillion. If you just count the general fund alone, it is deficits for each of the next 10 years.

We have gone back to debt as the way we fund our operations, which means we do not pay for what we spend. We run it up on the tab, and we are going to pass that tab on to our children.

You might wonder how in the world did this happen. I think it is worth understanding where the error occurred so that we might learn from it as we face the difficult policy decisions that we now confront.

This chart shows what I believe was a mistake, a legislative mistake of historic proportion. When we passed the budget bill, which included the President's tax cut, last May, we committed every dollar of budget projection. We left no rainy day fund. We left no room for error. We left no possibility that things would not turn out in anything but the rosy projection that we looked at. We made no room to deal with the slowing economy, and we certainly had no contingency for something as devastating as what hit us with the terrorist attack of September 11. The result was we built a plan that required everything to work perfectly in order to not slide into deficits.

I used to be an insurance commissioner, and there was no way I would let insurance companies price their product in a way that just predicted the rosy upside scenario. The way my constituents work is they deal with reality. Their family budgets are based on the fact that things may not work out perfectly.

Well, we made a bad mistake betting the ranch that the country was going to have a perfect run. It has not had a perfect run, and now you can see the consequences from the reversal of fortune.

This chart shows what has happened as we have gone from the prospect of eliminating the debt and actually developing on a unified basis a budget surplus, to just more deficit spending,

continuing the debt at the extraordinarily high levels, driving up interest rates, and leaving a legacy of red ink for our children.

The non-Social Security budget has fallen from \$3.1 trillion surplus to \$760 billion worth of deficit. Again, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal budget, excluding Social Security, will be in deficit every year between now and 2010.

Again, take a look at this chart. This was our opportunity. We passed a tax cut that is irresponsible in its dimensions. We face a slowing economy. We have a God-awful terrorist attack. Now, as we reconvene 1 year later, we are looking at a sea of red ink from the ongoing deficits that we face.

What are the implications then going forward of these budget deficits? Well, instead of saving the Social Security surplus and taking every dollar coming in on Social Security and paying down the national debt so you have a better fiscal position of the country to meet the Social Security obligations when baby boomers retire, instead of that, we are going to spend more than \$700 billion of revenue coming in from Social Security money. We are going to spend that on running the Federal Government, money coming in for Social Security spent on general government spending.

We have seen this before. It is that era of deficits we worked so hard to climb out of, and, dang it all, we are back in the very same mess. Instead of saving the Medicare surplus, leaving us the opportunity to enhance the program, leaving us the opportunity to at least make sure we could meet the existing obligations of the program, all of the \$400 billion of Medicare surplus, all of it, is committed right out the door in government spending. It could have been used to pay down the debt, to position the Federal Treasury for when baby boomers retire. Now every nickel is spent on the general spending of government.

Instead of strengthening and adding to Social Security and baby boomers' retirement, we drain the trust funds of hundreds of billions of dollars. Instead of eliminating the publicly held debt, we will pass on to our children under existing projections \$2.8 trillion in debt. Instead of paying \$600 billion in interest costs, even if we had continued to reduce borrowing at this rate, there was a very large interest cost associated, given the trillions of dollars of national debt that we have. We were projected to spend \$600 billion this decade on interest costs alone. That figure now is now \$1.6 trillion, a \$1 trillion increase in government spending just to pay the interest.

Interest costs do not pave roads, interest costs do not help schools, interest costs do not put forth prescription drug coverage to help our seniors. Interest costs do not do anything. And we have put ourselves in a fiscal position where we are now going to have to spend \$1 trillion more in these interest

costs over the next 10 years because of the fiscal foolishness of that tax cut, compounded with the difficult circumstances of the recession and terrorist attack.

All of this means that instead of reducing long-term interest rates, allowing you to get a better deal on your home mortgage, allowing businesses structuring long-term debt to operate at significantly lower expense levels, the Federal budget is going to put upward pressure on rates. The markets will know the Federal Government, the big interest hog at the trough, is once more gulping up credit; and it is going to cost more for everybody else relative to long-term lending.

As bad as the situation I have told you is, it is worse, because the Congressional Budget Office did not account for some things that we all know are going to happen; and I will tell you what some of them are.

The President has asked for \$18.5 billion to increase homeland security. He announced that just this morning. I will tell you what, I cannot speak for my colleagues, but I am inclined to look very favorably toward the President's request. We have to do what we need to do to get security for the people of this country.

The President also announced yesterday morning a \$48 billion increase for defense.

□ 1215

So on top of these figures, \$18 billion yesterday, \$48 billion today, and that is just in additional expenses announced by the President on homeland security and defense.

The President continues to support, in the face of this red ink, a very expensive economic stimulus bill; whether one will pass or not remains to be seen. The cost to fully fund the recently enacted education bill, not a nickel of it is anticipated under the debt situation I have outlined. We are going to fund that education bill, at least in large part, and it is going to drive this debt situation higher.

We will extend expiring tax breaks, and that is going to drive the debt situation higher. Those of us representing rural America are bound and determined to pass a farm bill so badly needed by our farmers, and that is not included in the CBO budget projections. That means the budget projection is going to be worse on that one as well.

Mr. Speaker, when all of these actions are taken into account, and probably some more as well, the tax bill with many expiring provisions, those are likely to be extended, the alternative minimum tax, which will impact millions of Americans, an additional 35 million Americans will be hit with a tax increase under alternative minimum tax if we do not address that, and that has additional expense as well.

The long and the short of it, then, is that we have gone from surplus and wonderful opportunity to deficits in a single year.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, we have to come to grips with this new fiscal reality as we start looking at what is to be accomplished with this Congress this year. We have to understand that any stimulus bill is going to be funded 100 percent from revenue coming in for Social Security. We have to understand that we are going to drive the deficit situation worse. As we look at these new spending areas, including those outlined by the President or those championed by many Members of the House, we have to understand that they are funded on debt and that we are basically sticking our children with the tab. We have to have a whole new dimension of fiscal responsibility, because the sunny days of surplus are behind us and the damnably dark days of deficits are once again with us.

I see a couple of colleagues that have joined me on the House floor, and each of them I have had the pleasure of working with on budget matters. I recognize at this time the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), my friend and colleague.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to compliment the gentleman for organizing this Special Order and for his leadership on budget matters. The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) has led the charge for fiscal responsibility and restraint in Congress for many years before I got here. I am proud to stand with him today to add my voice to those who are extremely alarmed by the budget problem, the budget crisis that we find ourselves in.

The charts that the gentleman has been describing, the points that he has made in his presentation, point out in crystal clear fashion the huge budget problem we are now faced with. We have burned through \$4 trillion of an estimated surplus that was projected a year ago at a total of \$5.7 trillion. Now the Congressional Budget Office says the surplus for the next 10 years is just \$1.7 trillion; \$4 trillion is gone from the projections due to war, due to recession, and due to tax cuts, those three reasons.

The President, the White House and the Congressional Members of the Republican Party are very sensitive to the notion that the tax cut may be responsible for this loss of surplus and the return of budgetary deficits. They are correct that it is not the only reason, and it is wrong for anybody to suggest that the big tax cut of last summer that will cost \$1.7 trillion over 10 years, that is not the reason that deficits have returned. But we cut it too close to the bone. We did not allow for the unforeseen. We said at the time a tax cut that large, if the economy leveled off, could push us close to deficit spending again, but we did not anticipate that the economy would actually go into the recession that we are still in. Certainly nobody could anticipate the war that we are in after September 11 and the huge amounts of spending that we all agree need to be spent to

improve our homeland security and to prosecute the war on terror.

So because of war and recession and a tax cut that was too big and too gimmicky and too much favoring the wealthy, we have burned through \$4 trillion of a surplus projection that was after all just a projection. It is not going to come true. We now have a very real government deficit, a budget deficit. This current fiscal year, and for at least the next 2 years, we are back into deficit spending.

Now, what is wrong with that? Is there anything wrong with deficit spending? Does it matter to people that we are no longer continuing with balanced national budgets that we enjoyed for 3 years? Does it matter that we are now once again borrowing money to pay for ongoing government operating expenses? I think it matters very, very much.

It is bad for the government to borrow. I mean it is just a bad policy. We should pay our own way. We should balance revenue and expenditures. We should not borrow money because it means we are going into debt and we have to repay that money. It is bad to allow the government debt to increase. We have been accumulating debt for 200 and some years. We quadrupled our level of debt during the Reagan and Bush years. During the Clinton years that debt was actually reducing as we balanced the budget and ran surpluses for 3 years. But now we will go back to increasing the government debt, a debt that our children and grandchildren will have to pay. It increases our annual interest payments on that debt.

The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) just pointed out correctly that we now have \$1 trillion of increased interest payments over the next 10 years on our new borrowing. Paying interest on a debt is legally necessary. It is also the most unproductive thing we can do with Federal money. It does not buy a tank, it does not pave a road, it does not educate a child or provide prescription drugs for anybody; it is paying off legally-obligated interest payments to the people that lend us money. It is a bad position to be caught in and we do not want to be increasing our interest payments, but we will if we continue down the road toward government deficits.

We will also be increasing the interest rates that consumers have to pay. When consumers borrow for a house or for a college education or to buy a car, when we are borrowing money, when the Federal Government is in the private markets borrowing money, we are pushing up long-term interest rates and increasing the interest that consumers have to pay on their personal debt. It is a very bad practice.

But perhaps the worst is we are breaking our promise to stop borrowing from the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, because that is the first place we will go. When we start running deficits and borrowing money, the first place we will go is to

borrow even more, a practice that we stopped, from the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund.

Now, that money will be paid back. We are not stealing the money, and seniors should not be alarmed about that. But it is a bad practice. We should not continue to borrow from those trust funds. That is not why they are there. All of this is going to result from the deficit spending that we are facing.

We have a war, we have a recession, and we have big tax cuts. We need fiscal responsibility. We do not need fiscal denial. We need both political parties, both Houses of Congress, and the White House to face reality and to make some tough decisions and to be honest with ourselves, honest with our colleagues, and honest with our constituents about what we need to do.

Some people, for example, have called for a tax freeze. It is a proposal I favor. There is certainly not consensus on this at this point. One of the most distressing things about this notion is the response we hear from the White House and Republican colleagues that that is a tax increase, that Democrats are dying to increase taxes. Nobody is for that. Nobody is talking about raising taxes. I am not sure, I say to the gentleman, what it is about the word "freeze" that our colleagues do not understand. A tax freeze is not a tax increase. A tax freeze is a tax freeze. It means holding things in place. Why is that something we should consider? Because we do not know yet what it is going to cost to win the war on terror.

The President is going to ask for a 15 percent increase in the defense budget next year. We are all going to vote for that, or something close to what the President is recommending, because we have to win that war on terror. But we do not know over the next 10 years what the cost is going to be. We do not know what it is going to cost to improve homeland security. Hundreds of billions of dollars need to be spent in the next couple of years alone on improving homeland security. We do not know what that cost will be.

Should we not take a time-out? Should we not determine what our future costs are? Should we not factor in what it is going to take to address health care needs and public education needs? What about our desire to add prescription drugs to Medicare? Everybody wants to do that and we need to do it to keep faith with seniors, but it is going to cost a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we consider a wartime tax freeze, because that is what we are in. In the Second World War, the United States increased taxes 500 percent, a factor of 5. Nobody is talking about a tax increase now. But that is what had to be done in the Second World War, and we still fell into debt as a result of that war.

We must be fiscally responsible. We must do the right thing by the tax-

payers. We must avoid government debt. We must avoid increasing our interest payments. We must avoid crowding out private sector dollars which then increases interest rates that consumers must pay. We must avoid borrowing more from the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund. We need to be fiscally responsible. That is why we are sent here. That is what we have to do.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I join with him in this enterprise. I am glad to be standing shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I very much appreciate his ongoing leadership on budget issues. They are at the core.

I have a chart which illustrates the point the gentleman was making about how did we get in this hole? We have to be candid about assessing what happened because that is how we are going to learn how to go forward. This part, looking out 10 years, is lost revenue due to the tax cut. So as we can see, the tax cut played a very major role in this sharp change in the fiscal fortune of our country. It certainly was not the only factor. The green shows the effect of the slowing economy. We slipped into a recession, and that has certainly made a bad situation worse. The blue and the purple underscore additional adjustments, including expenditures that will be made, not anticipated, in the budget forecast.

Combine all of these and we see that the Republican tax cut was perhaps the largest driver in putting us back into deficits, but it has been joined by a number of other considerations as well. It just goes to prove the point, we do not bet the ranch on everything working out perfectly. The budget bill did, and things have not worked perfectly, and now we have deficits to work with as a result.

I see that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my cochair of the Democratic Budget Group, has joined me on the floor. I do not think the body has a more astute student of the budget than the gentleman from North Carolina, and I yield to him for his comments at this time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), one of our colleagues who is most attentive to the budget process, for his statement. And I certainly want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), an outstanding member of the Committee on Ways and Means, with whom I cochair the Democratic Budget Group. We meet every Wednesday morning and go over the sometimes arcane budget figures that we are dealing with. Those figures now are coming to life as we understand how much things have changed in this past year and as we stop and see what these figures portend for our country's fiscal

solvency and the kinds of things we need to do over the next 10 years.

□ 1230

These are figures we must attend to, and I commend my colleague for taking out this Special Order today to focus on our fiscal situation.

A year ago we were looking at a unified budget surplus over the next 10 years of \$5.6 trillion. Today that figure has been reduced to \$1.6 trillion.

I would just like to ask my colleague to elaborate on the fact that this is actually an optimistic figure, this \$1.6 trillion. Is it not true that it does not include the likely extension of certain popular tax credits like the research and development tax credit, as well as the repair of the alternative minimum tax that we all know is going to have to take place unless many, many middle-income people are going to run up against that tax?

It does not include the farm bill that is likely to pass in this Congress. It does not include the defense and homeland security requests that are going to be coming from the President and that we are going to want to support. None of that is included in this estimate.

So when we say that the surplus is now only \$1.6 trillion, that is actually an optimistic estimate. If we do all these things, then we are looking at a figure that is considerably lower. The figure that is now \$1.6 trillion could go well under \$1 trillion, something like \$700 billion dollars or \$800 billion. And natural disasters are not, I believe, in the mix either, the normal expenditures we make for recovery and relief after natural disasters.

So the figure we are looking at is really a best-case scenario. Yet, how much worse it is than what we thought we were facing just a year ago!

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments. The Congressional Budget Office I think did a good piece of work in their analysis which was published yesterday forecasting the loss of the surplus, the 10-year run into deficit that we will now have.

They, however, in their forecasting, are bound to very formalized models, and these models cannot capture some of the extraordinarily likely and, in fact, inevitable actions that this Congress will take.

Let us just review them again. First, \$18.5 billion announced by the President this morning in homeland defense is likely to be added to the tab; next, \$48 billion announced yesterday for defense, certainly likely to be added to the tab; \$73 billion presently in the farm bill budget commitment likely to be added to the tab. That is on the spending side.

Are we going to do anything to fund the education bill we have just passed with such fanfare? You bet we are going to spend some money there. That is an addition on the spending side.

Then there is the tax side, because there are tax issues that simply have

to be addressed, tax cuts that have to be advanced. These include extending the tax cuts that were time-limited and expired at the end of the last year. They include fixing the alternative minimum tax so that 35 million Americans do not find that they are seeing their taxes on the one hand go down under their existing tax form, but the alternative minimum tax raising significantly their tax liability on the other hand. We are going to fix that. It is going to be expensive to fix that. That is in addition to all of this.

I actually believe that on a unified budget basis, which means all the revenues of the general fund, all the revenues coming in from Medicare and all the revenues of Social Security will be committed and spent and exceeded if we do not sober up to this new fiscal reality and collectively work together to address it.

I have been disappointed in my time in this body at the very small common ground we can find between the partisan aisle. One area where I would have thought we might have found common ground is that red ink is bad, balancing the budget is good. We have seen this attacked, frankly, on both sides of the aisle, but attacked most vigorously by the Republican tax cut that passed last May.

Last year is last year; what is done is done. But let us understand what happened as a result of that action and move together to fix it. We have got to reject that we are going to languish for the next 10 years in deficits, because our children will pay a terrible price if we act so irresponsibly as to run government on the red ink.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will continue to yield, here, too, we are talking about a best-case projection. The figures that we have from the Congressional Budget Office suggest that the Republican tax act, including interest, is going to cost \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years. That is 41 percent of the reduction in the surplus that we are talking about.

As the gentleman has stressed, there are other factors that reduce the surplus. There is the war on terrorism; there is the declining economy. But the most important factor is the Republican tax act; and as the gentleman knows, there are some very unrealistic sunset provisions in that Republican tax act; assuming, for example, that the estate tax comes back online full force in 2011. We know that is not going to happen.

So the figures that we have been given show that if that tax act does not sunset, if it in fact stays in effect, then we should add another \$400 billion to the tab. What it costs over this period will go to something like \$2.1 trillion. So this is, again, a conservative estimate of the kind of burden that we are going to bear.

Let me now refer to the gentleman's chart dealing with the national debt. It was only a year ago that the Congressional Budget Office was estimating

that the debt held by the public would essentially be bought down, or that all of it that could be redeemed would be redeemed, by about 2006. CBO was also estimating that the publicly held debt would essentially be wiped out by 2008.

Again, what a difference a year makes. That debate we were having a year ago, about how much of the debt we could realistically hope to buy down on favorable terms, seems like a very quaint debate right now, because we are in a different world, fiscally.

Dr. Crippen, the director of the Congressional Budget Office, in our hearing before the Committee on the Budget yesterday, confirmed that what we are now looking at by 2006 is not buying down the redeemable debt but buying down a very small fraction of the redeemable debt and leaving something like \$3 trillion in publicly held debt in place. By 2008, the debt will still be in the neighborhood of \$3 trillion.

What, I asked him, are we foregoing by failing to buy down this debt? Of course, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, focused on one aspect of the answer, and that is that we are going to be paying an additional \$1 trillion in debt service. If there ever was money down the rathole, it is that money we pay in debt service, \$1 trillion more than was estimated a year ago. Think of the more productive public and private investments that those funds could be going into. Yet it is going into debt service.

In addition, we are not going to be paying down nearly the amount of publicly held debt we need to pay down in order to be in a position in the next decade to meet our obligations to Social Security and Medicare. We are building up assets in the Social Security Trust Fund at present, but we are going to need to redeem those bonds as the cash flow in Social Security reverses and the baby boomers retire.

The best way we can today be preparing to meet those obligations is to be getting rid of that publicly held debt and that annual burden of debt service. That is exactly what we are going to be unable to do unless we get hold of our fiscal situation and maintain a disciplined and systematic schedule of debt reduction, to remove this burden and get in a position to meet those obligations to Social Security when the bill comes due.

So I thank the gentleman for focusing on this. The opportunity costs for Social Security are obvious, because this is an obligation we are going to have to meet. There are also other costs. We need to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. That is a very expensive proposition; yet there is nothing more important to modernizing Medicare and meeting the health needs of our senior citizens than making that prescription drug benefit a central part of Medicare, available to any beneficiary who wants it. Yet I do not need to tell my colleagues that the fiscal situation we are describing here today is going to make it ever so much more difficult to meet that obligation.

Again, I thank my colleague for focusing on this fiscal situation. We have a job to do in, first of all, telling the truth about this budget and making certain that we have a common understanding here of the situation we face.

After all, both parties have counted on this surplus. Both parties have pledged their fealty to the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds and have said that we are going to reserve those Social Security revenues for paying down debt and for ensuring the future of Social Security. We have counted on these revenues, and now they are going to be borrowed to pay for the President's tax cut.

We have a job to do in being truthful about the situation that we face, and together, one would hope in a bipartisan way, figuring out how to maintain fiscal responsibility and maintain our commitment to Social Security. We must begin now to formulate a responsible budget that will preserve our solvency and our fiscal options for years to come.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for the very sobering information he has presented here today.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank my colleague, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, for his very thoughtful comments.

The newspapers today carried a discussion about how the stimulus package will be put together. We also have to acknowledge this stimulus package is all funded from the debt. We have shown the Members where the surplus has gone, so any stimulus passed is debt-funded. That means it has to be put together in a way that really makes it worthwhile in terms of addressing the economic slowdown, because otherwise we are just running up the tab some more.

When we are in a hole, the best way to try and reverse it is to first stop digging, and passing a stimulus package on the debt reflects more digging. The majority proposal embraced by the President, pursuing an agenda of permanent tax breaks which go mostly to the affluent, and addressing the corporate AMT repeal, would have the least bang for the buck and do the least to stimulate the economy, even though it would cost the budget and continue to be funded, again, from the debt.

This budget business can get pretty arcane. We are challenged sometimes to get Members to focus on the long-term debt, even while they think about something as exciting as passing a new stimulus bill, spending more money, passing another tax cut. I think Members as a collective body here in Congress need to really evaluate how American families conduct themselves. We ought to try and follow the example of American families.

The people I represent are concerned about putting together something that they might pass on to the children. They do not, in their elderly years, try and run up their credit cards, double-mortgage the home, roar a bunch of

debt up that will ultimately be a burden on their children when they are gone. Far from it. They do not want anything about how they have conducted themselves to fall as a burden on their children. That is how families conduct themselves.

How have we conducted ourselves in management of the Federal Government? Let us look again at this chart.

We were on a path to pay off the national debt. We were even on a path to leave something in a positive balance, leaving something for our children. Last year came and last year went, and now the situation is totally different: red ink as far as the eye can see. We are going to leave our children debt. We are running up the debt before we pass on this country to our children.

If we do not come squarely to terms that that is not the thing to do, that we owe our children more than that, we are going to have a hellacious debt that they will have that will limit the dimensions this great country of ours will be during their lifetimes when we are gone.

I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), for his comments on this issue.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I really want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota. I sense some animation in his voice right now as he is getting into this. There should be outrage throughout the country because of what is happening here.

A year ago, as the gentleman pointed out so well, we were arguing about how rapidly we could pay down the debt. Now, as the gentleman points out so well, we will be, and our descendants will be, saddled with the debt and the interest that goes with that.

The other side will say that this is because of the economic downturn and cyclic factors; and, indeed, there are some things that happened that perhaps were not fully foreseeable. The economic downturn was worse than people imagined, the war on terrorism has descended on us now, and we have obligations.

But when we had the budget before us last year, some of us said: build a cushion into the budget for this kind of unforeseen thing. So some of what happened was beyond our control, but some of it was very much the work of the leadership and the leadership of the Committee on the Budget for putting in place a tax cut that put us on this path so that we cannot at the current rate pay down the debt.

□ 1245

Mr. HOLT. And the reason we should be outraged about this is that this is not some financial technicality. This is money out of the pocket of any American, any American who has student loans, any American who borrows to buy a combine, any American who has a mortgage, any American who does anything involving interest. And so this is not just a financial technicality.

This is bread and butter for Americans. And the sooner we can shape up and get back on a path to pay down the national debt, the better will be the financial situation of all Americans. And we start by telling the truth.

I commend my colleague from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for telling the truth. His numbers hold up. They are clear and accurate. We have heard our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on the Budget go through these. And one thing I have learned through my years here in Congress, do not pretend to know more about numbers, budget numbers, than the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). He knows them well.

He has shown how we have gotten onto this path. And in order to get off of this path so that we can begin to pay down the debt, the first thing we have got to do is be honest with the numbers. I commend the gentleman for doing it. He has laid it out so very clearly.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and as a member of the Committee on the Budget, he has a very important role because we have got to get this debt under control. I appreciate his very intelligent, committed approach to this central question of the government. Will we or will we not pay for the operations that we fund? If we do not, our children will, and that is simply not fair. I very much appreciate his observations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Just a brief comment. While we were standing here talking, I was pleased to observe that we have done something else that is important to restoring trust to our process here in Congress, trust to the very idea of Americans being able to govern ourselves. And, that is we have picked up, I believe, the last signature, a Democratic member, a member of our party, signed the discharged petition to bring campaign finance reform to the floor for a vote. This is a historic step. It happened even as we spoke right here and I am pleased to acknowledge it.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has made an important announcement. The discharge petition for campaign finance reform has hit the mark; 218 Members have signed it and this bill will now come to the House floor. This is a tremendous achievement for this body.

At a time when the country is sickened by what has happened with the Enron Corporation and is looking carefully, as we all are, at what political shenanigans occurred in the process of this bankruptcy, this large company using phony books and pouring tens of thousands of dollars into the political system, the hue and the cry, enough is enough, address campaign finance reform grew louder and louder and louder.

We have been stymied by a very determined Republican majority leader-

ship that has done everything possible to keep the body from joining the Senate in passing campaign finance reform. And yet, tirelessly the work went on to get the signatures. We have a provision that majority rules around here. And when you have got most of the Members to sign a discharge petition to bring something to the floor it comes to the floor whether the majority leadership likes it or whether they do not.

Just now, moments ago, very important signatures of the last remaining Members were placed onto the campaign finance reform discharge petition, 218 signatures were reached. This bill will come to the House floor. The House will act like the Senate will act and we will send to the President a campaign finance reform bill.

I yield with this happy news to my colleague from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who has been a leader in the effort to get campaign finance reform.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. This is a very important day. As the gentleman mentioned, for a very long time now the House leadership has fought to prevent campaign finance reform coming to the floor under a set of rules that would be fair and appropriate. But today with the gaining of the final signature, we reached 218 signatures on this discharge petition. We know that that legislation, the Shays-Meehan bill, will come to the floor. I think a lot of credit goes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the Democrat who has been pushing this bill for a long time, and to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the Republican who has worked tirelessly to make this a possibility. Against the leadership of his own party, he has worked extraordinarily hard to make this happen.

Most of the signatures on that petition are Democratic signatures, but there are some Republicans who are willing to stand up to their leadership and say that the time for campaign finance reform has come. It is embodied by the Shays-Meehan bill, a bill which has already passed the United States Senate under the name the McCain-Feingold bill. And now we will have a chance, the leadership cannot deny us a chance any more to vote on this legislation. So it is a great day, and that certainly will be the big story.

But let me come back, I want to make a couple of comments about the budget.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time for a minute just before we leave this wonderful breaking news, we have got to credit the minority leadership for their role in getting the signatures. We do not have a majority here on the Democrat side, so we surely would not hit the target without some very brave participation from the Republican side of the aisle. And, after all, the very name McCain-Feingold represents on the bill that passed the Senate it is a bipartisan provision there. It ought to

be a bipartisan provision here. But what our leadership had to encounter was a very different posture from the majority leadership.

We believe the time came for campaign finance reform and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) drove it as hard as he could. He has met the absolutely unyielding opposition, to even allow for a vote by majority leadership, the idea of campaign finance reform. I did not fault them for opposing it, but at least let us vote. The people want campaign finance reform. Let us vote. They did everything they could to stop it, but finally the people will have their way. This House gets to vote on campaign finance reform. And I applaud every single Member that put their signature on that discharge petition. This was not to be denied and now it no longer will be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great development. We have to say that maybe finally with the collapse of Enron there is a recognition in this country that big money and politics is not a combination that is healthy for ordinary Americans, and I hope that we can change that.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make just a couple of comments about the budget. I have not been here for the whole debate, but I wanted to say that those of us last year who said over and over again as the President rushed this enormous tax cut through the Senate and through the House, we said this is a reckless proposition. It is an irresponsible proposition because it leaves no room for error, no room for error. They were making the assumption, in fact, the gentleman may have a chart available there that shows how the tax cut basically over the next 5 years would simply eat up, and that is the chart I was referring to, would eat up all of the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus. That really is what did the damage. And though certainly other factors have come into play since then, that you need to spend more money to defeat the terrorist network, the decline in the economy, it was that miscalculation that really was the more serious mistake.

I do not know whether others have mentioned it, but right now as a result of a downturn in the economy, virtually every State in this country is facing a State budget shortfall and all of the stimulus packages which came before the House and the Senate late last year, all of them would have made the predicament of our State governments much worse.

In my home State of Maine, it does not matter what the proposal was, we have been faced with a \$250 million shortfall over the next 2 years. And all of the stimulus packages were designed in such a way as to make that situation worse. The basic problem is that when you change Federal tax law, State tax law changes automatically in 44 of the States. And when we act here,

it is very important that we keep in mind our colleagues in State government who are trying desperately to protect Medicaid, education funds, all of those things that State governments do, and do so well.

Mr. POMEROY. I appreciate very much the gentleman's comments, as well as his ongoing participation in the Budget Group and his advocacy for sound fiscal policies in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, about 4 minutes remaining as our time is expiring, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who year in and year out has been the leading proponent for balanced budgets and sound fiscal policy. I am very pleased he has joined me for the conclusion of the special order, and I yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I apologize for being a little bit late.

I want to commend the gentleman for beginning this discussion, one which I predict we will see day after day after day now talking about the economic situation facing our country.

The gentleman has joined me, as I joined him last year, in pointing out that there were perhaps some better ways to go about our economic planning, that we should have first, last year, fixed Social Security for the future. We should have fixed Medicare and Medicaid. We should have sat down and had open and honest discussions and debate and then votes on the floor of the House as to how we should provide for the future of Social Security, and how we should provide for the current future of Medicare and Medicaid. Most of our rural hospitals and now urban hospitals are facing the problems that we have created by nonaction or by passing an economic game plan that has now got us into the predicament we are now in less than 12 months after we stood on this floor.

I stood where the gentleman now stands and I looked at my friends on the other side of the aisle and said I disagree with you, but I hope you are right. And I sincerely did hope they were right, because the country would have been much better off had they been right. But then September 11 comes along and we had an unforeseen circumstance. We also now know we are in a recession, all of which had a major effect on the short-term implications of the budget.

But the economic game plan we are under for the next 10 years also has had a major implication, and one in which we are now going to have to have serious and open and honest discussion about where do we go. We cannot undo what we have not done. We should have dealt with Social Security first, we should have dealt with Medicare and Medicaid first. The leaders of this House on that side of the aisle chose not to do that. They chose to put in place an economic game plan that will now require us, this House, to increase the national debt limit from \$5.95 tril-

lion to \$6.7 trillion sometime next month or the month after. We cannot escape from that.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield back at this point. I look forward to participating in the future with the gentleman and others as we talk about and hopefully can have some more honest debate on this subject.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments and even more for his ongoing leadership. We have major work ahead of us trying to once again dig out of the hole that we put ourselves into, and I appreciate working with him.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with about 2½ minutes remaining, I would yield the balance of the time to the other gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) that has joined us, an excellent colleague of mine on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY). I appreciate the leadership he has shown on this and in our committee.

Let me take this opportunity to discuss the link between the two subjects that the gentleman has been discussing: the mess we have with growing amounts of red ink in the budget and the mess we have with special interest money here in Washington.

Today is truly historic. During my entire career in Congress no one has succeeded in securing the signature of 218 members on a petition to discharge a bill for the House to act on. Since 1993, it has just not happened, and rarely has it happened in the entire history of this Congress.

□ 1300

Today, this historic step is taken; and it is closely related to what we have been talking about this last hour, because the reason we confront much of this mess is a direct result of special favors purchased by special interest lobbyists who come up here to avoid paying their fair share of taxes and ask to be treated in a different way than all the rest of us. We saw one after another approved last year, one after another being considered this year, cloaked under the term "economic stimulus." Enron, for example, paid no taxes and gave more in "soft money," banned by our reform bill, than all of its contributions to House and Senate candidates combined.

We can do something about the entire agenda of this Congress by approving this campaign finance bill. I want at this time to call under the discharge petition and applicable House rules for a full and fair debate of campaign finance on February 11, the second Monday of the month. I call on the Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); and the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), even though they are 100 percent against campaign finance reform, to immediately schedule

the House in session on the second Monday in February. The House has spoken: "Delay no more."

I also want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our new whip, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She is doing a wonderful job; and while many people deserve some credit, certainly the decision of these fine individuals who have come forward and signed, I believe it would not have happened without the leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She is reinvigorating our caucus. It is appropriate that we see the first indication of her new leadership in the fact that we have joined together and are ready to cooperate with our Republican colleagues to make genuine reform a reality.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for his leadership and Ms. PELOSI for her crucial leadership because now that the House has forced the Republican leadership to schedule debate, as set forth in the discharge petition, it is essential that we work together to prevent those who have obstructed campaign finance reform for so long from further delays. Those responsible for delay are so wedded to the same special interests that are creating the budget mess that we have. We must work together to ensure that this reform is enacted immediately because genuine campaign finance reform is connected to every other issue—Social Security, cleaning up the Enron mess, creating a fair tax system, and setting the Pentagon's budget—the Congress will consider this year.

#### THE CASE FOR DEFENDING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AKIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

##### DISCHARGE PETITION ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my Special Order that deals with foreign policy, in which I make the case for defending America, I would like to make a few comments about the campaign finance reform and the discharge petition that was just mentioned by our previous colleagues.

I do not share the enthusiasm that they do about bringing such a bill to the floor. I certainly do not share the enthusiasm of passing such legislation, because it sets us backwards if our goal here is to defend liberty and minimize the size of government.

The one thing I agree with him entirely on is that the problem exists. There is no doubt there is a huge influence of money here in Washington, and even in my prepared statement I mention how corporations influence our foreign policy and that something ought to be done about it; but campaign finance reform goes in exactly

the wrong direction. It just means more regulations, more controls, telling the American people how they can spend their money and how they can lobby Congress and how they can campaign. That is not the problem.

The problem is that we have Members of Congress that yield to the temptation and influence of money. If we had enough Members around here that did not yield to the temptation, we would not have to have campaign finance reform, we would not have to regulate money, we would not have to undermine the first amendment, and we would not have to undermine the Constitution in that effort.

I agree we have a problem, but I believe the resistance could be here without much change. The ultimate solution to the need for campaign finance reform comes only when we have a constitutional-type government, where government is not doing the things they should be doing. There is a logical incentive for corporations and many individuals to come to Washington, because they can buy influence and buy benefits and buy contracts. The government was never meant to do that.

The government was set up to protect liberty, and yet we have devised a system here where money talks and it is important; but let me tell my colleagues one thing, the Campaign Finance Reform Act that is coming down the pike will do nothing to solve the problem and will do a lot to undermine our freedoms, a lot to undermine the first amendment and do nothing to preserve the Constitution.

My Special Order, as I said, has to do with foreign policy. It is entitled "The Case for Defending America." As we begin this new legislative session, we cannot avoid reflecting on this past year. All Americans will remember the moment and place when tragedy hit us on September 11. We also know that a good philosophy to follow is to turn adversity into something positive, if at all possible.

Although we have suffered for years from a flawed foreign policy and we were already in a recession before the attacks, the severity of these events has forced many of us to reassess our foreign and domestic policies. Hopefully, positive changes will come of this.

It is just as well that the economy was already in a recession for 6 months prior to the September attacks. Otherwise the temptation would have been too great to blame the attacks for the weak economy rather than look for the government policies responsible for the recession. Terrorist attacks alone, no matter how disruptive, could never be the source of a significant economic downturn.

A major debate over foreign policy has naturally resulted from this crisis. Dealing with the shortcomings of our policies of the past is essential. We were spending \$40 billion a year on intelligence gathering. That, we must admit, failed. This tells us a problem

exists. There are shortcomings with our \$320 billion DOD budget that did not provide the protection Americans expect. Obviously, a proper response to the terrorists requires sound judgment in order to prevent further suffering of the innocent or foolishly bringing about a worldwide conflict.

One of the key responsibilities of the Federal Government in providing for national defense is protection of liberty here at home. Unwisely responding to the attacks could undermine our national defense while threatening our liberties.

What we have done so far since last September is not very reassuring. What we do here in the Congress in the coming months may well determine the survival of our Republic. Fear and insecurity must not drive our policy. Sacrificing personal liberty should never be an option. Involving ourselves in every complex conflict around the globe hardly enhances our national security.

The special interests that were already lined up at the public trough should not be permitted to use the ongoing crisis as an opportunity to demand even more benefits. Let us all remember why the U.S. Congress was established, what our responsibilities are, and what our oath of office means.

It has been reported that since the 9-11 attacks, Big Government answers have gained in popularity and people fearful for their security have looked to the Federal Government for help. Polls indicate that acceptance of government solutions to our problems is at the highest level in decades. This may be true to some degree, or it may merely reflect the sentiments of the moment or even the way the questions were asked. Only time will tell. Since the welfare state is no more viable in the long run than a communist or fascist state, most Americans will eventually realize the fallacy of depending on the government for economic security and know that personal liberty should not be sacrificed out of fear.

Even with this massive rush to embrace all the bailouts offered up by Washington, a growing number of Americans are rightfully offended by the enormity of it all and annoyed that powerful and wealthy special interests seem to be getting the bulk of the benefits.

In one area, though, a very healthy reaction has occurred. Almost all Americans, especially those still flying commercial airlines, now know that they have a personal responsibility to react to any threat on any flight. Passengers have responded magnificently. Most people recognize that armed citizens best protect our homes because it is impossible for the police to be everywhere and prevent crimes from happening. A homeowner's ability to defend himself serves as a strong deterrent.

Our government's ridiculous policy regarding airline safety and prohibiting guns on airplanes has indoctrinated us all, pilots, passengers and airline owners, to believe we should never

resist hijackers. This sets up perfect conditions for terrorists to take over domestic flights just as they did on September 11.

The people of this country now realize more than ever their own responsibility for personal self-defense, using guns if necessary. The anti-gun fanatics have been very quiet since 9-11, and more Americans are ready to assume responsibility for their own safety than ever before. This is all good.

Sadly, the Congress went in the opposite direction in providing safety on commercial flights. Pilots are not carrying guns, and security has been socialized in spite of the fact that security procedures authorized by the FAA prior to 9-11 were not compromised. The problem did not come from failure to follow the FAA rules. The problem resulted from precisely following FAA rules. No wonder so many Americans were wisely assuming they better be ready to protect themselves when necessary.

This attitude is healthy, practical, and legal under the Constitution. Unfortunately, too many people who have come to this conclusion still cling to the notion that economic security is a responsibility of the U.S. Government. That, of course, is the reason we have a \$2 trillion annual budget and a growing \$6 trillion national debt.

Another positive result of last year's attack was the uniting of many Americans in an effort to deal with many problems this country faces. This applies more to the people who reflect true patriotism than it does to some of the politicians and special interests who took advantage of this situation. If this renewed energy and sense of unity could be channeled correctly, much good could come of it, if misdirected, actual harm would result.

Give less credit to the Washington politicians who sing the songs of patriotism but used the crisis to pursue their endless personal goal to gain more political power; but the greatest combination should be directed toward the special interests' lobbyists who finance the politicians in order to secure their power by using patriotism as a cover and a crisis as a golden opportunity. Indeed, those who are using the crisis to promote their own agenda are many. There is no doubt, as many have pointed out, our country changed dramatically with the horror that hit us on 9-11.

The changes obviously are a result of something other than the tragic loss of over 3,900 people. We kill that many people every month on our government highways. We lost 60,000 young people in the Vietnam War; yet the sense of fear in our country then was not the same as it is today. The major difference is that last year's attacks made us feel vulnerable because it was clear that our Federal Government had failed in its responsibility to provide defense against such an assault, and the anthrax scare certainly did not help to diminish that fear.

Giving up our civil liberties has made us feel even less safe from our own government's intrusion in our lives. The two seem to be in conflict. How can we be safer from outside threats while making ourselves more exposed to our own government's threat to our liberty? The most significant and dangerous result of last year's attacks has been the bold expansion of the Federal police state in our enhanced international role as the world's policeman. Although most of the legislation pushing the enhanced domestic and international role for our government passed by huge majorities, I am convinced that the people's support for much of it is less enthusiastic than Washington politicians believe.

As time progresses, the full impact of homeland security and the unintended consequences of our growing overseas commitments will become apparent, and a large majority of our Americans will appropriately ask why did the Congress do it. Unless we precisely understand the proper role of government in a free society, our problems will not be solved without sacrificing liberty.

The wonderful thing is that our problems can be easily solved when protecting individual liberty becomes our goal rather than the erroneous assumption that solutions must always be in conflict with liberty and that sacrificing some liberty is to be expected during trying times. This is not necessary.

Our Attorney General established a standard for disloyalty to the United States Government by claiming that those who talk of lost liberty serve to erode our national unity and give ammunition to America's enemies and only aid terrorists. This dangerous assumption is, in the eyes of our top law enforcement officials, that perceived disloyalty or even criticism of the government is approximating an act of terrorism.

□ 1315

The grand irony is that this criticism is being directed towards those who, Heaven forbid, are expressing concern for losing our cherished liberties here at home. This, of course, is what the whole war on terrorism is supposed to be about, protecting liberty, and that includes the right of free expression.

Our government leaders have threatened foreign countries by claiming that if they are not with us, they are against us, which leaves no room for the neutrality that has been practiced by some nations for centuries. This position could easily result in perpetual conflicts with dozens of nations around the world.

Could it ever come to a point where those who dissent at home against our military operations overseas will be considered too sympathetic to the enemy? The Attorney General's comments suggest just that, and it has happened here in our past. We indeed live in dangerous times. We are unable to guarantee protection for outside

threats and may be approaching a time when our own government poses a threat to our liberties.

No matter how sincere and well motivated the effort to fight terrorism and provide for homeland security, if ill-advised it will result neither in vanquishing terrorism nor in preserving our liberties. I am fearful that here in Washington there is little understanding of the real cause of the terrorist attacks on us, little remembrance of the grand purpose of the American experiment with liberty, or even how our Constitution was written to strictly limit government officials and all that they do.

The military operation against the Taliban has gone well. The Taliban has been removed from power, and our government, with the help of the U.N., is well along the way toward establishing a new Afghan government. We were not supposed to be in the business of nation building, but I guess 9-11 changed all that. The one problem is that the actual number of al-Qaeda members captured or killed is uncertain. Also, the number of Taliban officials that had any direct contact or knowledge of the attacks on us is purely speculative. Since this war is carried out in secrecy, we will probably not know the details of what went on for years to come.

I wonder how many civilians have been killed so far. I know a lot of Members could care less, remembering innocent American civilians who were slaughtered in New York and Washington. But a policy that shows no concern for the innocent will magnify our problems rather than lessen them. The hard part to understand in all this is that Saudi Arabia probably had more to do with these attacks than did Afghanistan. But then again, who wants to offend our oil partners?

Our sterile approach to the bombing with minimal loss of American life is to be commended, but it may generate outrage toward us by this lopsided killing of persons totally unaware of events of September 11. Our President wisely has not been anxious to send in large numbers of occupying forces into Afghanistan. This also guarantees chaos among the warring tribal factions. The odds of a stable Afghan government evolving out of this mess are remote. The odds of our investing large sums of money to buy support for years to come are great.

Unfortunately, it has been seen only as an opportunity for Pakistan and India to resume their warring ways, placing us in a very dangerous situation. This could easily get out of control since China will not allow a clear-cut Indian victory over Pakistan. The danger of a nuclear confrontation is real. Even the British have spoken sympathetically about Pakistan's interest over India. The tragedy is that we have helped both India and Pakistan financially and, therefore, the American taxpayer has indirectly contributed funds for the weapons on both

sides. Our troops in this region are potential targets of either or both countries.

Fortunately, due to the many probable repercussions, a swift attack on Iraq now seems unlikely. Our surrogate army, organized by the Iraqi National Congress, is now known to be a charade, prompting our administration to correctly stop all funding of this organization. The thought of relying on the Kurds to help remove Hussein defies logic, as the U.S.-funded Turkish army continues its war on the Kurds. There is just no coalition in the Persian Gulf to take on Iraq and, fortunately, our Secretary of State knows it.

Our terrorist enemy is vague and elusive. Our plans to expand our current military operations into many other countries are fraught with great risk, risk of making our problems worse. Not dealing with the people actually responsible for the attacks and ignoring the root causes of terrorism will needlessly perpetuate and expand a war that will do nothing to enhance the security and the safety of the American people.

Since Iraq is now less likely to be hit, it looks like another poverty-ridden rudderless nation, possibly Somalia, will be the next target. No good can come of this process. It will provide more fodder for the radicals' claim that the war is about America against Islam. Somalia poses no threat to the United States, but bombing Somalia, as we have Afghanistan and Iraq for 12 years, will only incite more hatred towards the United States and increase the odds of our someday getting hit again by some frustrated, vengeful, radicalized Muslim.

Our presence in the Persian Gulf is not necessary to provide for America's defense. Our presence in the region makes all Americans more vulnerable to attacks and defending America much more difficult. The real reason for our presence in the Persian Gulf, as well as our eagerness to assist in building a new Afghan government under U.N. authority, should be apparent to us all. Stuart Eizenstat, Under Secretary of Economics, Business and Agricultural Affairs for the previous administration, succinctly stated U.S. policy for Afghanistan testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Trade Committee October 13, 1997. He said, "One of five main foreign policy interests in the Caspian region is to continue support for U.S. companies and the least progress has been made in Afghanistan, where gas and oil pipeline proposals designed to carry Central Asian energy to world markets have been delayed indefinitely pending establishment of a broad-based, multi-ethnic government."

This was a rather blunt acknowledgment of our intentions. It is apparent that our policy has not changed with this administration. Our new Special Envoy to Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalilzad, was at one time a lobbyist for the Taliban and worked for Unocal,

the American oil company seeking rights to build oil and gas pipelines through northern Afghanistan. During his stint as a lobbyist, he urged approval of the Taliban and defended them in the U.S. press. He now, of course, sings a different tune with respect to the Taliban, but I am sure his views on the pipeline by U.S. companies has not changed.

Born in Afghanistan, Khalilzad is a controversial figure, to say the least, due to his close relationship with the oil industry and previously with the Taliban. His appointment to the National Security Council, very conveniently, did not require confirmation by the Senate. Khalilzad also is a close ally of the Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz in promoting early and swift military action against Iraq.

The point being, of course, that it may be good to have a new Afghan government, but the question is whether that is our responsibility and whether we should be doing it under the constraints of our Constitution. There is a real question of whether it will serve our best interests in the long term.

CIA support for the Shah of Iran for 25 years led to the long-term serious problems with that nation that persists even today. Could oil be the reason we have concentrated on bombing Afghanistan while ignoring Saudi Arabia, even though we have never found Osama bin Laden? Obviously, Saudi Arabia is culpable in these terrorist attacks on the United States, and yet little is done about it.

There are quite a few unintended consequences that might occur if our worldwide commitment to fighting terrorism is unrestrained. Russia's interest in the Afghan region are much more intense than Putin would have us believe, and Russia's active involvement in a spreading regional conflict should be expected.

An alliance between Iraq and Iran against the United States is a more likely possibility now than ever before. Iraqi Foreign Minister Naji Sabri is optimistically working on bringing those two nations together in a military alliance. His hope is that this would be activated if we attacked Iraq. The two nations have already exchanged prisoners of war as a step in that direction.

U.S. military planners are making preparations for our troops to stay in Central Asia for a long time. A long time could mean 50 years. We have been in Korea for that long and we have been in Japan and Europe even longer. But the time will come when we will wear out our welcome and have to leave these areas. The Vietnam War met with more resistance, and we left relatively quickly in a humiliating defeat. Similarly, episodes of a more minor nature occurred in Somalia and Lebanon.

Why look for more of these kinds of problems when it does not serve our interests? Jeopardizing our security violates the spirit of the Constitution and inevitably costs us more than we can

afford. Our permanent air bases built in Saudi Arabia are totally unessential to our security, contributed to the turmoil in the Middle East, and they continue to do so. We are building a giant new air base in Kyrgyzstan, a country once part of the Soviet Union and close to Russia. China, also a neighbor with whom we eagerly seek a close relationship as a trading partner, will not ignore our military buildup in that region.

Islamic fundamentalists may overthrow the current government of Saudi Arabia, a fear that drives her to cooperate openly with the terrorists while flaunting her relationship with the United States. The Wall Street Journal has editorialized that the solution to this ought to be our forcibly seizing the Saudi Arabian oil fields and replacing the current government with an even more pro-Western government. All along I thought we condemned regimes that took over their neighbors' oil fields.

The editorial, unbelievably explicit, concluded by saying, "Finally, we must be prepared to seize the Saudi oil fields and administer them for the greater good." The greater good? I just wonder who they are referring to when they talk about the greater good.

If the jingoism of the Wall Street Journal prevails and the warmongers in the Congress and the administration carry the day, we can assume with certainty that these efforts being made will precipitate an uncontrollable breakout of hostilities in the region that could lead to World War III. How a major publication can actually print an article that openly supports such aggression as a serious proposal is difficult to comprehend.

Two countries armed with nuclear weapons on the verge of war in the region, and we are being urged to dig a deeper hole for ourselves by seizing the Saudi oil fields? Already the presence of our troops in the Muslim holy land of Saudi Arabia has inflamed the hatred that drove the terrorists to carry out their tragic act of 9-11. Pursuing such an aggressive policy would only further undermine our ability to defend the American people and will compound the economic problems we face here at home.

Something, anything, regardless of its effectiveness, had to be done, since the American people expected it and Congress and the administration willed it. An effort to get the terrorists and their supporters is obviously in order and, hopefully, that has been achieved. But a never-ending commitment to end all terrorism throughout the world, whether it is related to September 11 or not, is neither a legitimate nor a wise policy. H.J. Res. 64 gives the President authority to pursue only those guilty of the attack on us, not every terrorist in the entire world.

Let there be no doubt, for every terrorist identified, others will see only a freedom fighter. That was the case when we aided Osama bin Laden in the

1980s. He was a member of the Mujahidien, and they were the freedom fighters waging a just war against the Soviet army. Of course, now he is our avowed enemy. A broad definition of terrorism outside the understanding of those who attacked the United States opens a Pandora's box in our foreign policy commitments.

If we concentrate on searching for all terrorists throughout the world and bombing dozens of countries, but forget to deal with the important contributing factors that drove those who killed our fellow citizens, we will only make ourselves more vulnerable to new attacks.

□ 1330

How can we forever fail to address the provocative nature of U.S. taxpayers' money being used to suppress and kill Palestinians and ignore the affront to the Islamic people that our military presence on their holy land of Saudi Arabia causes, not to mention the persistent 12 years of bombing Iraq?

I am fearful that an unlimited worldwide war against all terrorism will distract from the serious consideration that must be given to our policy of foreign interventionism, driven by the powerful commercial interests and a desire to promote world government. This is done while ignoring our principal responsibility of protecting national security and liberty here at home.

There is a serious problem with a policy that has allowed a successful attack of our homeland. It cannot be written off as a result of irrational, yet efficient, evildoers who are merely jealous of our success and despise our freedoms.

We have had enemies throughout our history, but never before have we suffered such an attack that has made us feel so vulnerable. The cause of this crisis is much more profound and requires looking inwardly as well as outwardly at our own policies as well as those of others.

The founders of this country were precise in their beliefs regarding foreign policy. Our Constitution reflects these beliefs, and all of our early Presidents endorsed these views. It was not until the 20th century that our Nation went off to far-away places looking for dragons to slay. This past century reflects the new and less-traditional American policy of foreign interventionism. Our economic and military power, a result of our domestic freedoms, has permitted us to survive and even thrive while dangerously expanding our worldwide influence.

There is no historic precedent that such a policy can be continued forever. All empires and great nations throughout history have ended when they stretched their commitments overseas too far and abused their financial system at home. The overcommitment of a country's military forces when forced with budgetary constraints can only

lead to a lower standard of living for its citizens. That has already started to happen here in the United States. Who today is confident the government and our private retirement systems are sound and the benefits guaranteed?

The unfortunate complicating factor that all great powers suffer is the buildup of animosity of the nation currently at the top of the heap, which is aggravated by arrogance and domination over the weaker nations. We are beginning to see this, and the Wall Street Journal editorial clearly symbolizes this arrogance.

The traditional American foreign policy of the founders and our Presidents for the first 145 years of our history entailed three points: one, friendship with all nations desiring of such; two, as much free trade and travel with those countries as possible; three, avoiding entangling alliances.

This is good advice. The framers also understood that the important powers for dealing with other countries and the issue of war were to be placed in the hands of Congress. This principle has essentially been forgotten.

The executive branch now has much more power than does the Congress. Congress continues to allow its authority to be transferred to the executive branch as well as to the international agencies such as the U.N., NAFTA, IMF and the WTO. Through executive orders, our Presidents routinely use powers once jealously guarded and held by the Congress.

Today, through altering aid and sanctions, we buy and sell our "friendship" with all kinds of threats and bribes in our effort to spread our influence around the world. To most people in Washington, free trade means internationally managed trade, with subsidies and support for the WTO, where influential corporations can seek sanctions against their competitors. Our alliances, too numerous to count, have committed our dollars and our troops to such an extent that, under today's circumstances, there is not a border war or civil disturbance in the world in which we do not have a stake. And more than likely, we have a stake, foreign aid, on both sides of each military conflict.

After the demise of our nemesis, the Soviet Union, many believed that we could safely withdraw from some of our worldwide commitments. It was hoped we would start minding our own business, save some money, and reduce the threat to our military personnel. But the opposite has happened. Without any international competition for superpower status, our commitments have grown and spread so that today we provide better military protection to Taiwan and South Korea and Saudi Arabia than we do for New York and Washington.

I am certain that national security and defense of our own cities can never be adequately provided unless we reconsider our policy of foreign interventionism. Conventional wisdom in Wash-

ington today is that we have no choice but to play the role of the world's only superpower. Recently we had to cancel flights of our own Air Force over our cities because of spending restraints, and we rely on foreign AWACS to fly over to protect our air spaces.

The American people are not in sync with the assumption that we must commitment ourselves endlessly to being the world's policemen. If we do not reassess our endless entanglements as we march toward world government, economic law will one day force us to do so anyway under very undesirable circumstances. In the meantime, we can expect plenty more military confrontations around the world while becoming even more vulnerable to attack by terrorists here at home. A constitutional policy and informed relations of nonintervention is the policy that will provide America the greatest and best national defense.

#### SAFETY NETS SHOULD BE NUMBER ONE PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AKIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, beginning the second half of our congressional session, there are a lot of items on our agenda. There is a great deal of talk about many issues, and I worry very much about the possibility that the American people will be confused if we let all of the various discussions of the various issues become a babble with no focus, a babble which does not prioritize and show us what is most important and what are the key items that we should focus on.

It is difficult to hold the attention of the constituents, it is difficult to hold the attention of the voters, and the voters need to know more than ever what is going on so they can make intelligent decisions and defend their own interests and the interests of the country when the election comes around in November 2002.

We have a lot of sensational, highly-visible problems that are getting a lot of attention; but even that attention sometimes degenerates into a babble, and it becomes confusion, sometimes deliberately so.

The Enron scandal is one of the big items that has a lot of media attention and a lot of discussion here in Congress. There are several committees investigating it, and I think Enron is one of those important things that we have to address. But as we address Enron, both the details of the Enron scandal, the Enron swindle, the conspiracy, the details are important, but we also ought to look very closely at the implications of what is going on with Enron. What are the implications for our budget. That is now a number one consideration.

The President will give his State of the Union address next Tuesday. Shortly after that he will be releasing his

budget, and what are the implications in terms of the emphasis of where Federal expenditures go at a time when we do not have a surplus? Some cuts are necessary, and some increases are necessary. And how those cuts and increases are made and who is taken care of and who is not taken care of is very important. It is very important that we understand that in the Enron conspiracy we have some examples of the worst things that can happen in our very civilized democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we have the best-run, the best-structured government probably in the world; but even within that structure, we can have bandits make off with a lot of the public's money. We saw that in the savings and loan scandal of a little more than a decade ago, which is still with us in many ways. They are still finding culprits, and they are still being prosecuted. We are still paying the debt service on the \$500 billion or more that taxpayers paid out as a result of the savings and loan scandal which was less of a conspiracy than Enron. The savings and loan scandal was widespread.

We ought to look at Enron as a conspiracy, and the implications of how it operated are certainly important. There are those who say Enron is not critical in light of the urgency of the present situation, and that people are suffering from unemployment and the Nation is at war as a result of September 11, and therefore Enron is a minor matter. I say that the implications and the kind of inroads that Enron made into the decision-making and the impact on our overall economy, all of that is very important; and we have to look at those implications very closely.

I want to talk today about the safety-net principle that was introduced in our government during the New Deal by Franklin Roosevelt. The principle of safety net certainly might have existed before, but he made it an institutionalized part of government operations. He said that in a democratic society, government ought to at least stand by and help people out when they begin to fall into dire circumstances. Government ought to help people stay alive when they are elderly.

Now we have Social Security which is the most widespread and revered safety net. Social Security did not happen automatically. It was fashioned under the New Deal. I do not think that at that particular time they got any votes from the Republican Party on Social Security; but I am certain that no party, no individual in government would dare try to take Social Security away at this point. That is a safety net, people understand. It is a very tiny safety net when you look at what it costs to live even for an elderly person versus the kinds of Social Security payments that they get; but it is a vital part of people being able to stay alive with some dignity. It is a part that some people cling to.

The New Deal did many other things. It said if you have a situation where

the economy is in trouble, and it was in total collapse almost at the time the New Deal was created, the government should provide jobs for people. We had the WPA which ranged across sectors, laborers digging ditches to artists who needed income, painters, writers. The WPA provided a safety net in terms of producing income. We had unemployment insurance. That came out of the New Deal, and the list goes on.

We established aid to families with dependent children, welfare in short. That safety net existed for a lot of desperate people. That safety net was much maligned. That safety net did not do what some other safety nets did. It established no political clout here in Washington.

We had another safety net which is a farm subsidy program which reached out and helped to build our agricultural industry grow into what it is today. When we compare the farm subsidy safety net to the aid to families with dependent children safety net, one wonders about whether we have not corrupted totally the principle of a safety net, and I am here to argue that we should return to a focus on making our safety nets our number one priority.

□ 1345

Unemployment insurance is a safety net. It is very important for a whole lot of people, not just people who are low-income and laid off in factories. There are a lot of people who were computer programmers at this time last year, and they have no job this year. They might have been making \$60,000 a year or \$70,000 a year last year, but temporarily, and it is temporary, because the economy will come back, the aspects of the economy which support high-tech industries will come back strong. So they are temporarily without a job. Temporarily they do not have the money to pay the rent or mortgage. Temporarily.

There is one case I know of where a woman was making \$60,000 last year, and she is hysterical because she sees herself as not being able to pay the mortgage and maybe becoming homeless. There may be a few people already who were very well off last year at this time and already are in dire circumstances. A lot of people who were temporarily laid off will become homeless who are middle-income people, educated people; and they need a safety net.

The one safety net that we could improve right away is unemployment insurance. Unemployment insurance is like Social Security: it is not going to give you your monthly paycheck amount, but it can give you enough to sustain yourself and begin to put other pieces together with some dignity.

Unemployment insurance in many States has been eroded. The amount of the package, the amount you get, has been cut back, because we had quite a number of years of prosperity where unemployment was not an issue, and

money for unemployment insurance has been diverted to other purposes, or governments have saved money by lowering the amount of money being put into unemployment insurance. We need to do something about that immediately. It should be one of our priorities for this half of the Congress.

Why is it that we do not understand and cannot act in Congress on an obvious need for this safety net? At the time of the 9-11 disaster when the World Trade Center was wiped out by the terrorists, we rushed to take care of an emergency that the airline industry had. This is a safety net that was not there already.

There was no authorization in law, no tradition of bailing out industries from these kinds of emergencies; but we rushed in, and we provided a safety net for the airline industry. That is unparalleled. We put forth large amounts of cash, put cash on the line, for the airlines that had suffered losses as a result of being grounded during the 9-11 emergency. Then we promised them \$11 billion in low-cost loans beyond that.

So never before have we rushed so rapidly and provided such a great safety net for anybody. So the airline industry stands out as the number-one benefactor of the principle of the safety net.

But at the same time we passed the funding for the airline industry, we were told, and many of us fought, certainly on this side of the aisle, Democrats had a proposal in the same package that we should provide for the airline industry workers unemployment insurance, and attached to that would be health benefits, because health benefits are as important as the amount of money you take home in your salary nowadays.

So we were told at the time, next week. Come back next week and we will put the package on. Well, like Shakespeare, tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow; next week and next week and next week. Next week is still not here.

So on the agenda of this Congress this year, a number-one item must be unemployment insurance; not just for the people who suffered specifically on 9-11, not just the people who are the victims of the terrorist attack on 9-11, but also the people across the country who are suffering because the Nation is in a recession. The Nation was in a recession before 9-11. The terrorist attacks certainly exacerbated the situation and probably created a more rapidly escalating recession. All of those are facts. But whatever the facts behind the tragedy, the hardships faced by working people, certainly the need for the safety net is there.

The safety net principle is very important. We might claim it, and it is an American idea. We invented it, and it is time for us to not turn our back on a very important moral plank that was put into the functioning of government, the safety net for the elderly and Social Security, the safety net for

farmers and the farm subsidy, the safety net for children who lose their parents, who are able to get Social Security payments all the way to age 18. We have always had the safety net.

We have gone further with respect to what happened after 9–11. I think the Victims Assistance Fund, we also passed that in the same legislation where we bailed out the airline industry. The Victims Assistance Fund is another giant leap forward by the Federal Government in providing a safety net. It is a dual safety net. It is a safety net for the insurance industry, who could be sued forever and ever as a result of what happened on September 11. The State of New York, where the incident took place, says the airline industry is responsible for whoever the victims are, and the insurers of the airlines certainly would have to be responsible for the compensation of the victims if we did not pass legislation already, right away, immediately, that provides a Victims Assistance Fund. It is unparalleled.

I applaud that. I voted for the bill because that factor was in there, and I think it is important that we work it out. There are some difficulties involved in terms of a special master who was appointed. The special master said what the results are, what the formula will be for determining what people get. I think all of that can be worked out. I do not think that necessarily we should assume the special master has all the wisdom and not make some changes in what has been proposed.

One obvious change is I do not see why a person who was going to be a possible recipient of a Victims Assistance Fund has to, before they know the amount they will get from the fund, give up their right to sue the insurance companies. Why should they have to give up their right before they see what is going to be produced by the Victims Assistance Fund? Why? I see no reason why they cannot know that ahead of time. Considering all they have gone through and the complications of this whole process, I think we ought to at least certainly yield on that point.

There are many other items that are being contested by the survivors of the victims; and I will not go into that because I am not knowledgeable about it, but I think that principle is very clear. Why should one have to give up their right to sue before they know the outcome of what the process of the Victims Compensation Fund might be?

Let us not smear, let us not downgrade or trivialize the principle of the safety net by acting like bullies. We have got the money. We are the government. You take it or leave it. I do not think that that is a principle that should be applied here.

The safety net principle has been there; and the abuses of it, the misuses of it, is what I want to talk about today, because I am very troubled by the fact that as of the end of December, December 31, we have had the results of a new welfare law going into effect.

A provision of that law said that anybody who has been on welfare, anybody who has been receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, is what Roosevelt and the New Deal called it, anybody who was receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children for 5 years would be cut off the welfare rolls and never again, regardless of their circumstances, would they be eligible for welfare. That means whole families are cut off. If you have been on it for 5 years, you are off; and whatever your circumstances are, you have got to go find some other way to survive.

Now, Aid to Families with Dependent Children gives varying amounts of money across the country. I think that generally my State, New York State, has been accused as being the most generous, or too generous, and that the Aid to Families with Dependent Children in New York has been higher than almost anywhere else in the country.

I have a chart here that says that those "high amounts" that were given, amounts that were considered high, turn out to be something like a family of four would be receiving between \$7,000 and \$8,000 a year. Aid to Families with Dependent Children in New York, a family of four would receive between \$7,000 and \$8,000 a year. That is considered far too generous. In many States, I assure you, they receive much less.

I think New York also has one of the largest numbers of people on welfare, and we have been criticized for that. But as we go into an era starting January 1 where all the people, 30,000 people I think were found to have been on the welfare rolls as of December 31 who had run out of their 5 years of tolerance on the welfare rolls, those 30,000 people are off now.

Let us say many of those 30,000 people were in families that receive at least \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year. When you compare what they were receiving to the amount of money received by the recipients of the safety net in the farm subsidy program, you will find that they were receiving pennies.

The farm subsidy program, which also started during the New Deal, pays thousands of dollars to families. There is no requirement that you get off of it at a certain point. There have been some efforts to phase it out, some efforts to sunset it. None of that has succeeded. The farm subsidy program is booming more than ever before. So the principle of the safety net is such where it goes on and on forever and gets larger and larger, and fewer and fewer people in the farm subsidy program are getting the benefits of that safety net.

The safety net principle was a great innovation, a great civilizing step forward. We ought to be applauded for that. The New Deal was a great step forward in understanding the plight of ordinary people and providing for ordinary people and providing for anybody who was facing a problem with their survival.

Later on Lyndon Johnson and the Great Society program added to that

by adding Medicare and Medicaid so that the actual physical health of a person was also considered of concern to the government. Nobody should suffer and die because they cannot get adequate health care.

So given this great step forward, and there are some people who are cynics, and I am not a cynic at all, some people who say, well, civilization has really not moved forward, we still have the same old wars we had before. In fact, the 20th century had more wars than any other century. In the 21st century now there are wars raging all over the world; people have less liberties in most of the world than they had before, et cetera.

There are all kinds of actual disasters, governmental disasters, governance disasters, that can be cited to show that we have not really moved forward, that it is only an illusion. It is not an illusion. It is very much not an illusion.

During the celebration of the Martin Luther King Federal holiday and the birthday of Martin Luther King, we talked to young people about certain kinds of things that were accomplished by Martin Luther King. They sit starry-eyed wondering how could that have ever been. How could you ever have had segregation, where you could not drink at a water fountain unless you were white; where blacks could not eat at certain restaurants, stay at certain hotels? How could you have an institutionalized government-supported system like that? They cannot comprehend it. They are too young to remember.

But just yesterday in the history of our Nation, we had unspeakable injustices that no longer exist. Once upon a time we had slavery. Slavery was probably one of the cruelest crimes ever perpetuated on the face of the Earth, the American Atlantic slave trade; but that no longer exists. You can go on and on and cite the reasons why we have every reason to be optimistic about the slow, but forward, march of civilization.

In the industrialized nations of the world the kinds of things I have just talked about, Social Security, Medicare, health care, unemployment compensation, all those things are features. Pensions, and Social Security is a form of pension, but we have private pensions as well as Social Security pensions.

Getting back to the Enron case, one of the terrible things about Enron is it wiped out pensions for certain people, large numbers of people; and that ought to be a concern of government, how did we let that happen. But we will get back to that.

My point now is that civilization may move forward slower than we want it to move forward. Some folks say it is like an inch worm: it crawls forward very slowly and sometimes doubles back in circles, and it looks like it is going backwards.

We have had some terrible things happen in the last 20 years. The slaughter of nearly 1 million people in Rwanda is cited as an example.

□ 1400

The Balkan wars, going back to ethnic cleansing and Hitler doctrines, all kinds of atrocities can be cited. Pol Pot killing hundreds of thousands of people in Cambodia, and we could cite a lot of atrocities and a lot of terrible things that have happened as evidence that civilization is really not going forward. But, on the other hand, would we ever have had a situation even 100 years ago where the women who are enslaved in Afghanistan by the Taliban, who turned out to be a few thousand thugs with the guns and the tanks and the weapons to enslave the rest of their people, and certainly women in particular moved into a status which can only be called slavery, would they ever have been set free, or would they have been in that condition for 100, 200, 300 years if it had not been for a modern society responding to injustice, a modern society responding to the attack from people who had that kind of base.

Barbaric people have done barbaric things and built up tremendous amounts of power and gone on to conquer more civilized people. The history of the world is not a history where people who had the best knowledge, the most knowledge, the most sophistication, the most humanity, the best governance prevailed. The Romans conquered the Greeks, and the Huns came in and conquered an Arab civilization that was very sophisticated. On and on it goes. There is no guarantee that the most humane, most civilized, best governed will prevail.

Under the fabric of the industrialized nations, combined with the United Nations, combined with a morality that has come into being in most of the industrialized nations, it is less and less likely that a great oppressive nation could arise and be able to work its will anywhere in the world. No nation, including our own, should aspire to that, and if it were tempted, I think there is enough morality, enough common sense about where we have to go as a people, as a species, a species of *Homo sapiens*; human beings have to deal a certain way in order to survive on this planet, and it is not in our best interests to allow anybody to run roughshod over human life.

So we have gone forward. The United States of America took a giant leap forward when it established the principle of the safety net. Now is the time to come forward and defend the principle of the safety net. We cannot defend the principle of the safety net if the Congress is going to stand here and refuse to pass unemployment compensation laws which upgrade the amount of money available for unemployment, unemployment compensation laws which are attached to some kind of health care benefit. The prin-

ciple of the safety net has to go forward instead of backwards. We must include health care benefits as well as increase the amount of money for unemployment insurance in the package and extend the amount of time that people can be on unemployment and collect unemployment. A simple safety net.

How can we defend some of the other safety nets that are being so abused if we do not operate and act on a clear and present crisis? We have a crisis in front of us.

The farm subsidies are not a crisis, but they are a good example of an abuse of the safety net principle, and we cannot, on the one hand, allow that kind of abuse to go forward and ignore, on the other hand, unemployment insurance. We cannot, on the one hand, allow the farm subsidies to continue and insist that people have to get off welfare in 5 years and we do not care what happens to them after that, and the amount of money that each welfare family takes is so much smaller than the amount of money being poured into farm subsidies every day.

So I want to get back to my original proposition, which is that the safety net principle is very important as we look at the total agenda for the last half of this Congress, this year, 2002, as we go forward.

I have a list here from the National Conference of State Legislatures on what their priorities are and I agree very much with their priorities, and we ought to address that. Election reform is a priority. I think that the National Conference of State Legislatures are rather conservative, just as the election bill that we passed here is very conservative, but at least we go forward a few steps.

Election reform will take us into exposing and taking a hard look at the procedures by which we conduct our most important democratic activity. That is the point of voting and selecting people who are going to lead us and make decisions for us. We have been very sloppy over the years in allowing our procedures to become too localized and too much left to the States, and people who are in power have been given the opportunity to maintain power by the way they operate the election process. So we shined a bright light on that. We need to focus more on it and think more about the implications, including the Electoral College, the implication of the Electoral College. Nothing is written in stone, and the fact that we established an Electoral College at the time of the founding of the country in protection of the smaller States in order to compromise and have all of the States feel that they could be part of the Union, we ought to take a look at it and see what evil does the Electoral College spawn now. It denies one man, one vote, the one-man, one-vote principle as we saw in the last election. When we do not have the one-man, one-vote principle, what other evils do we set in motion?

What does it have to do with Enron? What does it have to do with the corruption of the safety net of the farm subsidy? Can getting votes out of a particular State be guaranteed by maintaining unjust farm subsidies? Is that one of the problems that we have to look at, that some of the smaller States have power out of proportion to their size because of the fact that they are able to finance a system that does protect them and part of that system is the use of Federal dollars that come from the farm subsidy?

The Patient's Bill of Rights. That is on the agenda of the National Conference of State Legislatures, a Patient's Bill of Rights, including a concern with the prescription drug benefits. We must get back to a real Patient's Bill of Rights and we must take care of the prescription drug benefit.

The third item on the list of the National Conference of State Legislatures happens to be a reauthorization of Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant. They want to make sure that we are prepared to deal with some of the problems that are obvious from the passage of that law. After 5 years of experience, some of the exploitation of the loopholes must be dealt with.

They want a reauthorization of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, which the Committee on Education and the Workforce that I serve on will be addressing, and we hope to be able to address the Federal promise of 40 percent funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act so that that money is released at the local and State level to go to some other educational activities.

They want some relief for people who are suffering from the present recession. They want an economic stimulus, economic recovery package which makes sense in terms of bringing benefits to the people on the bottom. The Progressive Caucus that I am a member of is repeating what it said 6 months ago, that we want an economic package that is big enough to really bring some relief to the people on the bottom.

We have a massive drop in overall demand, which is one of the problems of our economy. When the consumer demand drops massively, that is the factor that drives the economy and the engine of the economy is stalled. We know that. It is a fact. Nobody disputes it. So let us keep the consumer demand up by making certain that the people are the real consumers and are the ones who get the benefit of any governmental action. We will not stimulate consumption. The consumers will not come back when we give large tax cuts to people who are already rich. I assure my colleagues, they are buying whatever they want to buy at the pace that they want to buy it, and more money will only be an opportunity to use it somewhere for purposes other than consumption.

I will not get into all the economics of that. I do not know what the position of the Democratic Party is at this

point, but I certainly am in favor of tax cuts. The only difference is I am in favor of tax cuts starting with the poor guys on the bottom who have been paying too much payroll taxes. We need a big tax cut for the people who have been paying too much payroll taxes. We should go up from there to the medium people who need a tax cut. The problem is not a tax cut, the problem is who is the target who benefits from the tax cut? I think tax cuts ought to be welcome, but the problem with the President's tax cuts as they were passed last year and signed into law is that they go to the wrong people. They do not stimulate the economy, they will not stimulate the economy.

So the Progressive Caucus calls for a package that will go to the bottom and give relief to people on the bottom.

We also again are calling for a real increase, a giant increase in our unemployment benefits. One item is that we proposed a \$200 billion economic stimulus package last year and probably will fashion this year something similar to that economic stimulus package. High priority programs are unemployment insurance, as I have just mentioned. First of all, extend unemployment benefits to 52 weeks, from the present 26 weeks to 52 weeks. We want to also supplement the amount of benefits available through unemployment by increasing them by \$100 a week, adding \$100 to the present package that they are receiving in any State, because those packages and their benefits, the amounts are far too low for the present situation.

We are calling for expanding health care coverage, job training, State revenue-sharing, a close look at TANF. That is the aid to dependent children's program that was transformed into a punitive program at this point. We want to take another look at that.

We want to take a hard look at the use of government funds for public works construction to generate jobs also, starting with school construction. We are proposing \$10 billion for school construction. We proposed that last year, and we will be proposing it again this year. Another \$10 billion for small business economic development programs at the local level. Again, as I said before, we need a tax cut for the people on the bottom, and that is again being proposed by the Progressive Caucus.

Just to focus first on the safety net principle being abused and misused with respect to the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, TANF, TANF has become the kind of stain on the record of our Nation with respect to safety nets that we do not want to continue. We do not want to continue to tell families who are destitute, have no other means of survival that after 5 years the government will not have anything to do with them except to find them a job, help them find a job. If they do not find a job, they are still not eligible for assistance. What do they do if they do not find a job?

In an economy which is in recession, and people, even well-educated people with a lot to offer, are temporarily finding it difficult to find jobs. How will we find jobs for welfare recipients who in many cases have very poor and limited education? So we must do something to remove the stain of TANF. We need a revision of that.

There is no great hue and cry in Congress, I must say, because people who are on welfare have no power. The poorest people in our society, part of the reason they are that way is because they have limited education, they have absolutely no capital, they do not make contributions to anybody's campaign, and it is their fault but they are not organized.

When we look at the farm subsidy, we see the fact that the farm population of America is less than 2 percent of the population, and yet the amount of money they can demand in the Federal budget is far exceeding anything that urban communities can command with much greater populations. The fact that they are a small group does not mean that they cannot in our American democratic system command the attention of Congress, but they cannot get subsidies, they cannot get a place in the budget.

□ 1415

On the one hand, welfare people are treated atrociously. On the other hand, we are bowing to the power of the farm subsidies and the people who manipulate those programs.

Today in the Washington Post, for example, there is a long story which in my opinion we might title "An Exposé on How a Safety Net Has Been Grossly Abused." The safety net of the farm subsidy program has been grossly abused, and there is a discussion of that here in the Washington Post today, January 24.

The article is entitled "More Subsidy Money Going to Fewer Farms." They start off with a description of one man, David B. Griffin, "a man of undeniable means, a prominent and well-respected businessman who lives in a million-dollar home, sits on the local bank board and serves as president of a tractor dealership with sales last year of \$30.8 million. He is also, by some definitions, a farmer—the principal landlord of a 61,000-acre spread known as Tyler Farms." This is near Elaine, Arkansas.

"But Griffin did not get where he is without government help. From 1996 through 2001, records show, Tyler Farms received more than \$38 million in Federal crop subsidies for its bountiful yield of cotton, rice, corn, sorghum, soybeans, and wheat"; \$38 million to Tyler Farms from the government, \$38 million to a man who is already a millionaire.

"Griffin's story and others like it suggest that Federal crop programs ostensibly aimed at struggling families do not always hit their intended targets." In another paragraph they talk about numbers telling a story of unintended consequences.

"According to the Department of Agriculture, 47 percent of commodity payments now flow to large commercial operations with average household incomes of \$135,000." We hear people with an average household income of \$135,000 are getting subsidies from the government, with a \$135,000-a-year income. Here is a family in New York of four on welfare and they get \$7,000, and we say, "You are a threat to the economy of the Nation. You can only get this money for 5 years; no matter what circumstances you and your children may be in, we will take you off."

These farms make up 8 percent of the Nation's 2.2 million farms. Sixty percent of the American farms get no crop subsidies at all. We are allowing abuses to take place which not only hurt Americans and take our tax monies in the wrong direction, but we are also hurting farmers, the little guys out there who are probably more like the welfare mothers than like the millionaire farmers. Obviously, they do not belong to the right organizations, do not make the right contributions, and they are left out.

I am reading from an article that appears in today's Washington Post, January 24. Members may get it if they want the full article. I want to continue.

Another paragraph says: "But new payment limits would address only one aspect of the 'Alice-in-Wonderland' system that underpins much of the Nation's farm economy—a system that Congress thought it had junked 6 years ago in favor of the free market but that has since proved impossible to kill."

We were going to phase it out starting 6 years ago, and it has only mushroomed and gotten bigger.

"Established in 1933 as a rural antidote to the Depression, crop payments have mushroomed into a \$21 billion-a-year entitlement program that almost everyone agrees is broken but that no one can agree how to fix." That is \$21 billion a year. At the height of the welfare program, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, I think the program for the whole country was costing less than 2 percent of the total budget; and here we are talking about a \$21 billion program for 2 percent, less than 2 percent of the population that would be eligible. But of that 2 percent eligible, only a tiny percentage of those are absorbing this \$21 billion a year that they are receiving.

"It is a system that reserves almost half of its benefits for just six States." That is important, too, when we consider the Electoral College and why we maintain that, because those States have power out of proportion to their membership, out of proportion to their size, and out of proportion to the number of voters that they have. But six States are receiving most of the farm subsidies, according to the United States Department of Agriculture.

"Notwithstanding the return of budget deficits, to say nothing of its stated

commitment to free trade, the Bush administration has bowed to congressional demands for \$73 billion in new farm spending over the next decade. That is almost three times the \$26 billion cost of the landmark education package that President Bush signed into law this month." That is \$26 billion from the Federal Government over a 10-year period that would deal with education.

Education is for the whole Nation. Education is the foundation for our national security system. If we do not have more educated people, if we have more high-tech weapons, high-tech weapons will become a joke. If we do not have more educated people to become the scientists to conduct the missions to build the missile system, first of all we are going to pay extravagant amounts of money bidding for the few scientists in the world who are able to deal with the problem, and we would probably fail, and at the same time a large number of foreign scientists will be educated to do the same thing.

The antidote to the defense missile system will be in development somewhere in the world before we even get it completed; and the scientists that are used to develop the opposition will probably be educated here in America, because we have not given enough money to educate all of our population that has talent to the fullest extent of their talent and their ability to contribute to the Nation's education brain power.

To get back to the article, "More than \$40 billion would go for crop subsidies, with the rest reserved for conservation, nutrition and rural development."

But "Congress has been more aggressive when it comes to addressing other entitlement programs." Congress has been more aggressive, not aggressive in terms of increasing the amounts of money, but cutting the amount of money.

In 1996, Congress passed "a massive revision of welfare that ended the 6-decade-old cash assistance program known as Aid to Families With Dependent Children. The new law also trimmed food stamp benefits, which are funded under the farm bill."

In other words, in 1996 we committed this horrible atrocity, and that is what it is, a legislative atrocity that was committed in 1996 when we not only cut Aid to Families with Dependent Children and laid down a mandate that you cannot have more than 5 years of assistance from the Federal Government no matter how desperate you are, but we also cut food stamps at the same time.

To continue: "With prices for some crops at their lowest level in more than a decade, many farmers are in genuine distress, and even the harshest critics of the farm programs acknowledge the need for some form of government safety net."

As an urban dweller from the heart of New York City, I say farmers should

have a government safety net. We should help farmers the way we help everybody else, but we should not abuse the principle of the safety net for farmers because farm subsidy program advocates have special privileges here in our government and are able to manipulate certain forces and get large hunks of the taxpayers' money that they do not deserve.

Continuing with the article here in today's Washington Post, "Congress has been trying for more than a decade to wean farmers from the Federal Treasury. The effort peaked with the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act, which provided transitional payments to farmers with the aim of phasing out subsidies by this year."

In other words, I was here when we debated the Freedom to Farm Act. We are all capitalists; we are all advocates of capitalism. We cannot live with the socialism that has taken over the farm subsidy program, especially since the socialism is a socialism of the rich, in many cases. Everybody wanted to do something, but since 1996 and the great speeches that were made then, we have gone backwards, not forwards.

"But a combination of factors—including worldwide recession and a global oversupply of food—pushed crop prices lower, and Congress has rushed in to fill the breach with a series of 'emergency' supplemental appropriations bills."

Now, when the NAFTA and other trade bills and world trade agreements occurred, they created a situation where factory workers were laid off, plants were closed; and we have never rushed in with a subsidy for urban workers. We have never rushed in with subsidies which would average \$135,000 for a family, or \$28,000 per family. We barely have been willing to give money for worker retraining. A lot of that money has gotten bogged down in the bureaucracy.

"In 2000, crop subsidies reached a record high of \$22 billion. That is nearly as much Federal assistance in one year as Amtrak has gotten for the last quarter century. But in some respects, the farm subsidies have made matters worse, encouraging farmers to grow more crops without regard to market demand."

As capitalists, we cannot tolerate a situation where we distort the free market, but we are funding at very high levels a program which distorts the free market. On the one hand, this safety net is abused greatly, all out of proportion to reality. On the other hand, the safety net set up for welfare mothers has been turned off completely.

Can we as a civilized Nation live with what we have done to the welfare mothers, one? And, two, can we, as a civilized Nation and a group of responsible Members of Congress, sit here and continue the farm subsidies, which are an abuse of the principle of the safety net?

"The outcome of debate is especially important to Arkansas, where the top

10 percent of subsidy recipients—or 4,822 of the total—received more than 73 percent of the Federal farm subsidies, with an average payment of more than \$430,000 per recipient."

Let me repeat that. In Arkansas, 4,822 farm recipients of the subsidy program, who account for 10 percent of the subsidy, received an average payment of more than \$430,000 per recipient, according to an analysis of USA Data by a group called the Environmental Working Group. That is \$430,000 per recipient, a safety net to help people survive and get by, \$430,000 in taxpayers' money to help people survive. The principle of the safety net is wiped out completely in that kind of scandal.

The Environmental Working Group is a Washington nonprofit organization that wants more money to be shifted to conservation. "The group has caused a stir in Congress by posting subsidy data—including farmers' names and how much they receive—on its Web site."

I invite Members of Congress to use the Web site of the Environmental Working Group: ewg.org, ewg.org. If Members want the exact names of individuals and how much they received, how much they are receiving, Members can go to this Web site and get the information by State, State by State. We can get the information on how the safety net for farmers is being grossly abused and the process is draining away billions of dollars that could be used for people who need the safety net, the unemployed, the uninsured, with respect to health care.

I am not in favor of increasing the Federal budget at all. I think we have enough money in the overall Federal budget. But I am in favor of re-directing, redirecting the money in the Federal budget to those people who really need it, and here is a case where we can start taking from the abusive safety net to give to safety nets that really help people.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD in its entirety the article entitled "More Subsidy Money Going to Fewer Farms" in the Washington Post on January 24, 2002.

The material referred to is as follows:

MORE SUBSIDY MONEY GOING TO FEWER  
FARMS

SKEWED PROGRAM DRAWS SENATE SCRUTINY  
(By John Lancaster)

ELAINE, ARK.—David B. Griffin is a man of undeniable means, a prominent and well-respected businessman who lives in a million-dollar home, sits on the local bank board and serves as president of a tractor dealership with sales last year of \$30.8 million. He is also, by some definitions, a farmer—the principal landlord of a 61,000-acre spread known as Tyler Farms.

But Griffin did not get where he is without government help. From 1996 through 2001, records show, Tyler Farms received more than \$38 million in federal crop subsidies for its bountiful yield of cotton, rice, corn, sorghum, soybeans and wheat.

Griffin's story and others like it suggest that federal crop programs—ostensibly aimed at struggling family farms—do not always hit their intended targets.

For all the congressional hand-wringing about the plight of the hardy souls who scrape their living from the soil, the hugely expensive New Deal-era subsidies for grain and cotton producers—which Congress only six years ago voted to phase out altogether—are funneling more money to fewer farms than ever before.

Numbers tell a story of unintended consequences: According to the Department of Agriculture, 47 percent of commodity payments now flow to large commercial operations with average household incomes of \$135,000. These farms make up 8 percent of the nation's 2.2 million farms. Sixty percent of American farms get no crop subsidies.

"A lot of these payments, the majority of them, are going to big farms, and these big farms are wealthy farms," said Bruce L. Gardner, an agricultural economist at the University of Maryland and a former assistant secretary of agriculture in the first Bush administration. "This is not a poverty program in any way."

The skewed distribution of farm benefits is sure to receive more scrutiny when the Senate next month resumes debate on a bill to chart farm programs for the next decade. Embarrassed by revelations about the amount of money some farmers are reaping from federal farm programs—information recently made available on the World Wide Web—some lawmakers are calling for much lower limits on payments to individual recipients.

But new payment limits would address only one aspect of the "Alice in Wonderland" system that underpins much of the nation's farm economy—a system that Congress thought it had junked six years ago in favor of the free market but that has since proved impossible to kill.

Established in 1933 as a rural antidote to the Depression, crop payments have mushroomed into a \$21 billion-a-year entitlement program that almost everyone agrees is broken but that no one can agree how to fix. It is a system that reserves almost half of its benefits for just six states; lavishes subsidies on grain and cotton farmers while excluding most ranchers and growers of fruits and vegetables; and—according to the USDA's own studies—worsens the very problems it seeks to correct by encouraging overproduction, thereby depressing crop prices while driving up the cost of land.

Yet farm subsidies endure, underscoring the daunting challenge faced by those who would dismantle entitlements for groups with special stature on Capitol Hill—in this case, mostly middle-class white men and their families.

Notwithstanding the return of budget deficits, to say nothing of its stated commitment to free trade, the Bush administration has bowed to congressional demands for \$73 billion in new farm spending over the next decade. That is almost three times the \$26 billion cost of the landmark education package President Bush signed into law this month. More than \$40 billion would go for crop subsidies, with the rest reserved for conservation, nutrition and rural development.

"We kind of hit this farm thing with a sledgehammer just by throwing dollars out without really analyzing where the dollars are going," said Dan Glickman, who was agriculture secretary in the Clinton administration. "This is an area where an awful lot of members of Congress kind of view these programs as out of sight, out of mind."

Congress has been more aggressive when it comes to addressing other entitlement programs. In 1996, Congress passed—and President Bill Clinton signed—a massive revision of welfare that ended the six-decade-old cash-assistance program known as Aid to

Families with Dependent Children. The new law also trimmed food stamp benefits, which are funded under the farm bill.

During debate on the farm legislation in December, Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.) proposed to double spending on food stamps by throwing out crop programs in favor of a much less costly voucher system that would help farmers buy crop insurance. Farm lobbyists rallied in opposition to Lugar's proposal, and it failed 70 to 30.

With prices for some crops at their lowest level in more than a decade, many farmers are in genuine distress, and even the harshest critics of farm programs acknowledge the need for some form of government safety net.

Farmers themselves are divided on the issue. Some, especially those on smaller acreage, want a reallocation of benefits. But owners of larger operations generally defend the current system. They say it is natural for big farms to claim the majority of subsidies, since they grow the most food with the greatest efficiency. They note that many foreign governments provide far more support to their farmers, creating barriers to American exports.

"No one would disagree that the largest farms are getting the bulk of the benefits," said Robert G. Serio, a colorful country lawyer in Clarendon, Ark., who makes his living setting up partnerships—including Tyler Farms—that allow farmers to maximize those benefits. "Are you going to penalize Wal-Mart for being bigger than the Family Dollar store? In America, everyone is rewarded, supposedly, for being bigger and more efficient."

Congress has been trying for more than a decade to wean farmers from the federal treasury. The effort peaked with the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act, which provided transitional payments to farmers with the aim of phasing out subsidies by this year.

But a combination of factors—including worldwide recession and a global oversupply of food—pushed crop prices lower, and Congress has rushed in to fill the breach with a series of "emergency" supplemental appropriations bills.

In 2000, crop subsidies reached a record high of \$22 billion. That is nearly as much federal assistance in one year as Amtrak has gotten in the last quarter century. But in some respects, the farm subsidies have made matters worse, encouraging farmers to grow more crops without regard to market demand. Rice is a good example.

Citing weak global demand for rice, Congress has sharply increased direct assistance to the farmers who grow it. Rice subsidies rose from \$448 million in 1997 to more than \$1.3 billion in 2000, according to USDA's Economic Research Service. The normal response to soft markets would be to cut production. In this case, however, farmers have no incentive to do so because Congress has guaranteed a set price for every bushel of rice they grow.

As a result, the amount of American farmland devoted to rice swelled from 2.5 million acres in 1997 to 3.3 million acres last year—the same year rice prices hit a 15-year low.

The Bush administration has sharply criticized farm programs, and Agriculture Secretary Ann M. Veneman last year initially expressed support for Lugar's far-reaching proposal. At the same time, the largest share of farm subsidies flows to the same midwestern and southern states that Bush won in the 2000 election. That limits the administration's political maneuvering room, especially with midterm elections looming in the fall.

The administration last year ultimately threw its support behind an alternative farm bill offered by Sens. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.)

and Thad Cochran (R-Miss.). Among other things, the measure would establish 401(k)-style savings accounts for all farmers—not just those who participate in commodity programs—with matching government contributions of as much as \$10,000 a year.

But the GOP bill is not the radical departure some had hoped for. It preserves most major subsidy programs, including one that pays farmers a set amount based on historical production, even if they let their fields lie fallow.

Farm groups hold enormous sway on Capitol Hill; the largest and most influential, the American Farm Bureau Federation, spent \$3.2 million on lobbying in 2000, according to a federal disclosure report. Moreover, many key leadership positions in Congress are occupied by farm-state lawmakers, such as House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) and Senate Majority Leader Thomas A. Daschle (D-S.D.).

The politics of farm subsidies was much in evidence in December, when a bipartisan group of senators led by Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.) and Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) floated a proposal to reduce the ceiling on annual crop payments to individual farmers from \$460,000 to \$275,000. The measure has considerable support among farmers of more modest means, many of whom are in the upper Midwest. It is bitterly opposed by owners of large cotton and rice farms in southern states such as Arkansas. Both Arkansas senators—Blanche Lincoln (D) and Tim Hutchinson (R)—share that opposition.

After Daschle came under pressure from Lincoln and other southern lawmakers, the majority leader prevailed upon Dorgan to drop his sponsorship of the amendment, if not his support for the idea. Aides from both parties say they expect it to resurface next month.

The outcome of the debate is especially important to Arkansas, where the top 10 percent of subsidy recipients—or 4,822 of the total—received more than 73 percent of federal farm subsidies, with an average payment of more than \$430,000 per recipient, according to an analysis of USDA data by the Environmental Working Group, a Washington nonprofit organization that wants more money shifted to conservation. The group has caused a stir in Congress by posting subsidy data—including farmers' names and how much they receive—on its Web site, ewg.org.

A number of the state's largest farms can be found in the fertile but economically depressed Mississippi Delta region of eastern Arkansas. Tyler Farms is headquartered in Phillips County, which borders the Mississippi River about 80 miles east of Little Rock.

From 1996 to 2000, the county of about 26,000 people received more than \$101 million in federal farm subsidies, according to the environmental group's analysis. Farm groups say such subsidies help sustain rural communities. But the picture in Phillips County is anything but prosperous. According to Arkansas state figures, 8,319 county residents—31.5 percent of the population—received food stamps in December 2001.

Griffin is one of the county's biggest private employers. His other interests include Producers Tractors Co. (which operates five John Deere dealerships), a cotton-gin company and a petroleum distributorship, according to Dun & Bradstreet and his attorney. Griffin lives just south of Elaine, a tiny crossroads town in an ocean of flat cultivated fields, in a 13,233-square-foot mansion on 15 acres with an estimated market value of \$964,750, according to county records.

Griffin did not respond to several requests for interviews, but Serio, his lawyer, said it was wrong to assume that Griffin owed his

success to government subsidies. He emphasized that Griffin merely leases his land to Tyler Farms—a complex partnership involving 39 local investors—and receives no direct government payments. Serio said Griffin owns 33,500 acres of the farm; his father owns 14,000; and the rest is leased from other landowners.

Griffin set up the farm in 1993 with landowners and local farmers “who were going out of business” because they could not get financing, Serio said.

Like other large operations, Tyler Farms was structured to get the most from government programs. Its 39 owners are organized into 66 separate “corporations,” an arrangement that allows the farm to maximize benefits under allowable payment limits and also limits owners’ liability, Serio said.

To qualify for federal payments, which are supposed to benefit family farmers, each of the owners is supposed to be “actively engaged in farming.” Serio said 22 of the owners perform management duties and therefore meet that requirement. Griffin puts his assets at risk, Serio said, by guaranteeing 40 percent of the farm’s annual crop loan.

With crop prices so low, the lawyer said, “farms are getting bigger for the sake of survival.”

Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Working Group will be happy to tell us all we need to know State by State what the farm subsidies are. If Members are not interested in looking at details for an individual, on that database Members will find State by State, ranked according to those who are getting the most to those who are getting the least, information on this.

Information is power, and it is power enhanced and power multiplied, depending on the way we use it. We have now information that can be put to good use in demonstrating to the American people that the principle of the safety net, which we all endorse, is being grossly abused on the one hand, and being denied to people who need it on the other hand.

□ 1430

The welfare mothers who are kicked off the rolls starting December 31 deserve better treatment from our government.

There are some people who are now Congresspersons, leaders in industry, leaders in education, large numbers of people who made it because their family was able to go on welfare not for 5 years, sometimes for many more. There are some youngsters whose family was on welfare until they were 18 years old. Like Social Security pays for survivors up to 18, why do we suddenly make a mandated, arbitrary, cruel rule that after 5 years you are off.

But we do not tell the farm subsidy recipient you are off after 5 years or you are off. We can find the money for unemployment insurance by cutting the money that is going to recipients who do not deserve it in the farm subsidy program.

I do not have the statistics now, but we also have a farmer’s home loan mortgage report program which, I admit, 4 or 5 years ago on one of my committees, the Committee on Over-

sight and Investigations, and that committee discovered that there were people receiving farmer’s home loans that had not paid their interest or their principal in 4 or 5 years and that the amount of money outstanding at that particular time had reached as high as \$14 billion. I asked questions about it last year and I found that it had come down. Now it is less than \$10 billion, outstanding money owed because it is overdue.

So we have allowed the farm apparatus to stage a conspiracy on taxpayers’ money. The Department of Agriculture needs to be investigated because many of these farmers who got their home loans, these farmer loan mortgages and were not paying them back, they sat on the credit committees. They made the decisions about who got the loans and they got the loans for themselves in many cases, and nobody was there to confront them about paying them back.

The situation is grave. It is urgent right now to move our money away from those who abused the safety net to those who need it. In New York unemployment has gone from 4.5 percent in December of 2000 up to 5.8 percent now for the whole State. In New York City it is up to 6 percent for the city, and that is not anything unusual.

In Alabama the State has gone from 4.5 percent of unemployment to 5.9 percent presently. California has gone from 4.7 percent unemployment in December 2000 to 6 percent now, and on and on it goes. There are a few States that have escaped, but they are very much in the minority who do not have high unemployment rates at this point.

The Bush administration came in in January, and I will not argue at this point whose fault it is, but since last January unemployment in New York has risen by 1.6 percent. A large amount of that unemployment took place before the terrorist attack on September 11. September 11 has only exacerbated immediately in the New York area a great jump in unemployment. We lost 109,900 jobs in New York. The economic stimulus plan that was put forth with the tax cuts for the rich would cost us money. Instead of giving us more it would cost us another \$710 million.

At this point we have 134,548 more unemployed people than we had last January. They need help. The State unemployment benefits are, as good as they may be, far too small to deal with the emergency that we are facing.

We also have some examples of what unions have done to fill the gap. One example that I would like to put on record of a union filling the gap, specifically around the disaster that took place on September 11. Local 32B-J of the SEIU represents most of the workers at the World Trade Center and the surrounding buildings. Fortunately many of them work at night and they were not there when the plane crashed into the World Trade Center, so they escaped with their lives. They lost

about 32 people who were on duty. Most of them escaped with their lives, but they lost their jobs.

We have about 3,000 workers who were employed with health benefits, pension plans, et cetera, and now they have no jobs. I think Local 32B-J is to be congratulated with what it has done to fill that gap. They took action immediately to provide their own safety net for their workers. The point that has to be understood is that no union, and they did this with the help of the employers, the reality board that employed these workers and served as a bargaining unit for management, they joined with the union in providing a safety net.

I want to put on record that we have the real estate industry and the union working for that industry. The two bargaining contenders came together in an agreement which provided benefits for their workers for 6 months. And that is the point. They can only do it for 6 months. They do not have the capacity to go much further than that. So the Joint Building Service Industry Emergency Preferential Hiring Program is there so each worker who lost their job is given preference in hiring.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the agreement that was made by the union and the employers to give work to the members of Local 32B-J who lost their jobs in the World Trade Center disaster is as follows:

The Union, the RAB and the Trustees of the Building Service Benefit Funds have developed a program of job placement and enhanced benefits to ease the burden on all employees working under Local 32B-32J contracts at the World Trade Center and other nearby buildings which have been closed as a result of the destruction or damage caused by the terrorist attack. The comprehensive program includes job placement without loss of seniority, supplemental unemployment insurance, extended health benefits, and an enhanced pension benefit for certain employees who wish to retire.

The following is an explanation of each benefit under this program:

JOINT BUILDING SERVICE INDUSTRY EMERGENCY PREFERENTIAL HIRING PROGRAM

Each employee who lost his or her job either permanently, as in the case of those employees who worked at the World Trade Center, one of the other buildings that will not reopen or any employee employed at a building which has not yet reopened, will be placed on a Preferential Hiring List in the order of industry seniority. All cleaning contractors who have agreements with the Union must report all job openings to the Program, and will hire directly from the Preferential Hiring List in the order of seniority. Employees who accept the offered positions will retain their current hourly wage rate, benefits, and industry seniority. This means that employees will maintain their full industry seniority for bumping and vacation purposes. If you were getting five weeks vacation you will still get five weeks vacation on the new job. Unfortunately, were are unable to preserve your building seniority.

Once you are offered a job, you must decide within two days whether to accept the job. Whether or not you accept the job, you will be removed from the Preferential Hiring

List, will no longer be eligible for the Extended Health Benefits and the Supplemental Unemployment Benefit which are described below and you will lose your bumping rights within your employer's system.

Employees remaining on the Preferential Hiring List who have not been offered a job as of February 4, 2002 will be offered the right to bump within their employer's system.

#### 2. SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PROGRAM

This is a benefit being provided by the Building Service 32B-J Health Fund to all employees who meet the eligibility requirements set forth below. If you were employed as a security guard at the World Trade Center you will receive a benefit of \$93.00 per week. If you had any other full time job, you will receive a benefit of \$150.00 per week. If you held a part time job (less than forty hours per week), you will receive a benefit of \$112.50 per week.

In order to be eligible for this benefit you must;

(a) Have been eligible for health coverage under the Building Service Health Fund as of September 11, 2001, and

(b) Be named on the Preferential Hiring List described above at any time between October 2, 2001 and April 2, 2002, and

(c) Are not receiving a pension from the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund, and

(d) Have not held a full time job as of September 11, 2001 in addition to the one from which you were displaced on September 11, 2001.

You will continue to receive this benefit until the earliest of the following occurs:

(a) You are recalled to work by your employer.

(b) You accept a job from the Preferential Hiring List.

(c) You decline the offer of a job from the Preferential Hiring List.

(d) You fail to comply with rules established by the Health Fund to administer this benefit.

(e) You begin to receive a pension from the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund.

(f) You become ineligible for New York State Unemployment Insurance benefits because of any other job you may have taken.

(g) April 2, 2002, or the Health Fund has paid out a total of Six Million Dollars for this benefit, whichever shall first occur.

#### 3. EXTENSION OF HEALTH BENEFITS

Any employee who was terminated in connection with the World Trade Center disaster and who at any time between October 2, 2001 and April 2, 2002 is named on the Preferential Hiring List and his or her eligible dependents, shall continue to be covered for all benefits under the Building Service 32B-J Health Fund through April 30, 2001 or until he or she is removed from the Preferential Hiring List, whichever is sooner.

Remember, that you will be removed from the Preferential Hiring List if you decline a job offer or if you begin receiving a pension under the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund.

Upon the termination of your extended health coverage, assuming that you have not received a job which would otherwise entitle you to benefits under the Health Fund, you will be entitled to elect COBRA continuation coverage. This means you can continue to receive health coverage for up to eighteen months provided you pay the Health Fund for the coverage. Your dependents may also be entitled to elect COBRA continuation coverage.

#### 4. ENHANCED PENSION BENEFIT

Any employee who was terminated in connection with the World Trade Center disaster

who was on the Preferential Hiring List as of October 2, 2001 and who on or before September 11, 2001, has reached his or her fiftieth Birthday with at least five years of pension service credit, or has reached his or her Sixtieth Birthday, will be eligible to retire and receive an Enhanced Pension Benefit.

The Enhanced Pension Benefit will be equal to the pension benefit that you would be entitled to if you were five years older and had five more years of service credit. For example, if you are fifty years old and have ten years of service you would receive a pension benefit equal to the pension you would receive if you retired at fifty five with fifteen years of service, or if you were sixty years old with twenty years of service, you would receive the maximum benefit of \$1150.00 per month since you would be treated as though you were sixty-five years old with twenty-five years of service.

In order to be eligible for the Enhanced Pension Benefit you must elect this benefit and retire during the window period of October 4, 2001 through November 4, 2001.

If you accept the Enhanced Pension Benefit, you will be removed from the Preferential Hiring List and will no longer be eligible for the Supplemental Unemployment Benefit or Bumping Rights within your employer's system.

Additionally, you will no longer be entitled to the extended health coverage unless you had reached your fifty-seventh birthday by September 11, 2001. If you had reached your fifty-seventh birthday on or before September 11, 2001 you will receive health coverage until you reach the age of sixty-five as currently provided in the Health Plan for those who retire at age sixty-two or later.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a model for what other unions and what other private sector groups can do, taking the initiative, but it is not a substitute. There is no substitute for our government assuming its responsibility and providing a safety net for the victims and for the unemployed. We must do that, we can do that.

I urge this Congress to get on with the unfinished business of providing the safety net for those who need it most.

#### AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, after my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) had his presentation today on his perspectives on the United States foreign policy, I thought that it would be fitting that I present a similar point of view but not exactly in agreement with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). Although we are both people who love liberty and justice and value our freedom that we have here in the United States and in various countries throughout the world, we have a different view on exactly what policies the United States should follow to ensure that there is the maximum of peace and liberty and justice in this world.

Today I would like to talk a little bit about where we are at in the world and

why we are there and some thoughts, some basic thoughts about American foreign policy.

First and foremost on this subject, we must recognize that our military forces are at this moment in action in various parts of the world, especially in Afghanistan, and they are there and they are fighting and sometimes they are taking casualties in order to avenge the slaughter of nearly 3,000 of our fellow Americans on September 11 past. This forceful and deadly response in the form of American military forces being unleashed against persons in different parts of the world is totally justified. It will and, in fact, already has deterred other terrorist attacks upon us.

It is, yes, part of an act of vengeance, and I see nothing wrong with the United States Government avenging the death of 3,000 Americans who were killed, 3,000 innocent Americans, people who were not combatants who were slaughtered by evil forces overseas. And in this vengeance we will, as I say, deter other evil forces in this world from targeting Americans and from committing other heinous acts that have caused us so much grief here with the loss of friends and family.

All Americans should be grateful for the magnificent job that has been done by our military personnel, and let us remember as we are watching this great victory that we have just had in Afghanistan that there were naysayers who were warning us not to do anything militarily in Afghanistan, that it would become a quagmire and that any time we commit military forces anywhere that it is so risky that we should just forget it.

There is a saying of a captain of a ship, if a captain of a ship believes that his number one job is preserving the ship, well, then he will never leave port.

Well, the ship of the United States has one important purpose, they have many purposes, our ship of state, but the most important purpose of our Federal Government is to protect the people of the United States and to protect our freedom. It is not simply to watch events go by. It is not simply to have a military for which we pay for our military, only to see it there and to caress it and to salute it and to say good things about it. No, our military is there and the people who are in our military understand they have a job to do. At times that means that they must leave port and they must go to foreign destinations in order to protect the national security interests of our country and in order to prevent our people from suffering the kind of attacks that we suffered on September 11.

When we do not do that and when dictators and tyrants and evil-doers around the world see the United States has no more stomach for that type of conflict in distant places, then we will indeed become the target because there are evil people around the world who

hate everything that the United States stands for and envy the prosperity and freedom of our people.

The naysayers, if we remember, said the same thing about Saddam Hussein's attack and invasion and subjugation of Kuwait. The naysayers said we better not get into that war because Saddam Hussein kept playing on their psyche, the Vietnam psyche. This is going to be the mother of all wars.

Well, what happened in Kuwait and in Iraq 10 years ago and what just happened in Afghanistan in these recent months should indicate to us when America is on the right side and we are doing what is right and opposing aggression and supporting those people who believe in freedom and democracy, that we will, we will win, and that we will be on the side of those people in those areas on which we are fighting, and that it will not become a quagmire because we are doing what is right and just.

For the record, not aggressively responding to the invasion, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait or not aggressively responding to the atrocities committed against us on September 11 would have been a much riskier strategy than unleashing a military counterattack, which is what we did. But Americans need to understand that these two conflicts, while our military have went in in these conflicts and altered the course of history and defeated the tyrants, defeated the terrorists, the American people need to know that that military action might not have been necessary had we in place policies which would have prevented the attacks in the first place.

It was bad policy on the part of the United States that led Saddam Hussein to attack Kuwait. It was bad policy on the part of the United States that led bin Laden and the Taliban to conclude that they could conduct murderous attacks on the people of the United States and that they would not suffer the consequences.

The fact is in terms of Iraq, during the fast moving and somewhat confusing days at the close of the Cold War, a high ranking foreign policy official from George Bush's administration, meaning George Bush, Senior, the first President Bush, an Ambassador April Gillespie, misinformed Saddam Hussein as to our country's position on Iraq's claim to Kuwait. She stated that we considered Iraq's claim on Kuwait and the threats of Saddam Hussein to invade Kuwait to be an internal matter of Iraq.

□ 1445

She stated it very clearly and it has been printed since, an internal matter. That is what Saddam Hussein contemplated when he tried to decide whether to unleash his military forces against Kuwait. It was a miscalculation on his part, but due to a bad policy statement by our own government, a mistake by our own government, a mistake by the previous Bush administration.

Well, that classic misstatement on Ambassador April Gillespie's part led to the invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War that followed. That was a policy error, and I might add, when some people suggest when I criticized the last administration for its mistakes and misdeeds that they are claiming that I am being partisan, let me just note that I am fully recognizing that mistakes often have happened in Republican administrations, and I just gave an example of that.

What we must do in order to fully understand what happened on September 11 is to take a look at the government policies and the events that led up to September 11. I worked in the White House during the Ronald Reagan years, during those years when Reagan put an end to the Cold War, and ended those Reagan years with the dismantling of the Communist dictatorship that controlled Russia and the puppet states.

Part of that effort on the part of Ronald Reagan, of course, to bring the Soviet Union down or at least end the Cold War was President Reagan's strategy that the United States should support people throughout the world who are struggling to free themselves from Communist tyranny, especially those people who are struggling to free themselves from Soviet occupation.

The bravest and most fierce of these anti-Soviet insurgents were in Afghanistan, and the American people can be proud that we provided the Afghan people with the weapons they needed to win their own freedom and independence. That Cold War battle was a major factor in breaking the will of the Communist bosses in Moscow and thus ending the Cold War. By ending the Cold War, we made everyone on this planet, especially those people who live in the Western democracies, we made them safer, we made them more prosperous.

In our own country, it resulted in 10 years where spending on the military was able to decrease in the range of hundreds of billions of dollars, which then went into our economy in different ways, and all of this can be traced back to Ronald Reagan's strategies and traced back to the people of Afghanistan who fought for their freedom and independence and under the Soviet bosses and the crack in the Soviet leadership led to its downfall.

However, we must take a look here at this strategy and at this moment in history at the end of the Cold War to fully understand the crime of September 11. One of the common errors found in trying to understand September 11 is the suggestion that those holding power in Afghanistan today are the same people that we supported who were fighting against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s. This by and large is wrong. It is inaccurate.

Yes, some of those who are currently or were in power during the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, some of those in the Taliban regime did fight the Russians, there is no doubt about it, but by and large those people who were in the

leadership of the Taliban were not in the leadership of those people who fought with the Mujahedin that fought against the Russians, the Soviet Union. In fact, I do not know of one of the major factional leaders of the Mujahedin who fought the Russians when the Soviets occupied Afghanistan; not one of those became a major leader in the Taliban. So those who fought Soviet occupation, the Mujahedin, were different from those people who later took over as the Taliban.

During my time at the White House from 1981 to 1988, I had a chance to meet the leaders of the Mujahedin, and I found them to be a very interesting and many of them honorable men. Some of them were wild and woolly and others were quite a sight because I would take them sometimes to the dining room at the White House and would see these guys with their turbans and outfits there at the executive dining room at the White House.

I got to know them personally, and I got to admire them as individuals. Many of them were so courageous and they worked with me, and quite often I would be called when they needed help in procuring certain weapons systems, or time periods when even medical supplies were unable to get through they would call me to try to use my contacts at the National Security Council and the White House to break down the barriers, and I was able to do that successfully on some occasions.

I always told them that if I was going to help them I was going to personally be involved with their struggle against the Soviet army, that if, when I left the White House, if the war was still going on that I would join them at least for one battle, sort of put my body where my mouth is or my money where my mouth is, whatever we want to say it is, but I was willing to stand up with them rather than just give them moral support.

So after I left the White House and I was elected to Congress, I had 2 months between my election in November of 1988 and January of 1989 when I would be sworn in that were my last 2 months of freedom before I actually became a Member of Congress. During that time I disappeared and hiked into Afghanistan as part of a small Mujahedin unit and engaged with that unit in the battle against Soviet troops around the City of Jalalabad, and I marched in for several days through the Khyber Pass and around a side trail.

These people that I marched with, some of them were young, some of them were old. They were armed just with RPGs, rocket propelled grenades, and Kalashnikov rifles. These were very brave people, but let me suggest that they were not senseless killers and they were not people who would not have rather been with their families, but during the war in Afghanistan the Soviet Union had destroyed their ability to live at peace with their families. They destroyed their villages,

their water systems, et cetera, and more than that, they tried to destroy their ability to worship God as they saw fit.

As we were marching through the devastation of Afghanistan, as I have a sip of water right here, at times there was not even water for hours at a time and perhaps one full day of hiking, and these people did not have enough money to have canteens. They did not have enough money to have sunglasses. So they would put pencil lead into their eyelids and swirl it around so that a coating of pencil lead would serve as a shield against the sun as we marched across the desert. These people, as I say, had almost no food, very little water.

We gave them the arms they needed to fight for their independence, but every day they would pray five times, thanking God for what they did have. I got back right before Thanksgiving, and I had Thanksgiving dinner with my family that year, and we had so much, so much in abundance in the United States. Sometimes we forget how wonderful it is a place that we have. Sometimes we forget that we have so much to be grateful for, and in America, believe me, every day should be Thanksgiving Day. Every day should be a day when we thank God. These brave people did it five times a day when they had nothing, and it was their strength and courage, as I say, that helped bring the Soviet military to its knees and eventually forced them to retreat from Afghanistan.

After the Russians retreated from Afghanistan, the United States simply left. We had been providing them with a billion dollars a year to finance that war and then we simply walked away. We left the Afghans to their own fate after all of this destruction and death, after so many of them had become maimed, their children were maimed. They had no way to take care of their own families. We left them to sleep in the rubble. We did not even help them clear the land mines that we had given them during the fight against the Soviet army.

This was a sin that we committed against the people of Afghanistan, and it came back to haunt us. We left them, as I say, to sleep in the rubble, and we left them with no leadership. The leadership we supposedly left them with was that of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and these two countries, I might add, played a shameful role in Afghanistan in the years since the end of the Afghan war with the Soviet Union, and these two countries, supposedly our friends, the Pakistanis and the Saudis, they bear a great deal of the responsibilities, a great burden of the responsibilities for the fact that we suffered the attack on September 11.

So perhaps when we left Afghanistan, and then again this was not this administration or even President Clinton's administration, again it was at the Cold War, the end of the Cold War during President Bush, Senior's admin-

istration, perhaps that is one of the policies that we put in place that led to September 11.

After the collapse of the Communist regime in Afghanistan, the Mujahedin factions who had fought the Russians with no direction or no leadership from the United States began to bicker and to fight among themselves. This was one of my first years in Congress when this was going on, and I remember that even then I could see that it was important for us to try to support a positive alternative for Afghanistan. Why is it that the United States Government could not step forward with saying look, here is a positive alternative, let us push a plan of our own that, if it works, people will be able to live in peace, and if it works, the country can rebuild, but we had no plan of our own and in fact we left it to the Pakistanis and the Saudis.

I myself took it upon myself because I was involved in Afghanistan to go into the region and to go into Afghanistan and to argue aggressively that there was a strategy that would bring peace to Afghanistan and that was bringing back the old king of Afghanistan who had been overthrown in 1973, King Zahir Shah. Zahir Shah had been a coup. He had been removed from power in 1973, and that is what began the cycle which caused the horrible bloodshed.

All of the Afghan people had a warm place in their hearts for King Zahir Shah. King Zahir Shah was a man who, because he had such a good heart, some evil people felt that he was vulnerable and removed him in a military coup when he was visiting another country at one point, but Zahir Shah was so beloved by his people. I went to see Zahir Shah when he was in exile in Rome and he committed to me that if he would return to Afghanistan that he would lead a temporary government only that would stay in power long enough to institute democratic elections and permit the country's governmental infrastructure to be put in place, that would give the people of Afghanistan a chance, a chance to have a decent government and to have free elections and to bring in outside people to help them set up the democratic process and to observe the elections and permit the people throughout the country to form political parties. Zahir Shah had agreed to that because he wanted to go back to Afghanistan to prove to his people that during that time of their travail, when he had been forcibly removed from office, that he was with them and that he cared about them and that he wanted to make this last contribution because he was becoming an older man.

That was 10 years ago when I went to almost every area around Afghanistan, to almost every country around Afghanistan, as well as going into Afghanistan itself, to advocate that Zahir Shah be returned to Afghanistan, and guess what? Everywhere I went I was followed by a representative of the

United States State Department, and right after I would speak to the various leaders, the State Department official would announce that DANA ROHR-ABACHER is speaking for himself. It is not the position of the United States Government. In other words, they were saying do not listen to DANA ROHR-ABACHER because he is just a bunch of hot air, he represents nobody. What was the State Department's alternative? They had no alternative.

□ 1500

I do not mind people disagreeing with me. I do not mind people undercutting me. But the State Department was tearing my efforts down to bring back Zahir Shah to try to establish democratic government and they had no alternative. Their alternative was to let the turmoil continue in Afghanistan. Their alternative was to ignore what was going on in Afghanistan. That was our State Department's position. And that position continued into the Clinton administration, time and again undercutting Zahir Shah.

And what was their position on Zahir Shah? He is too old. Zahir Shah was too old. At that time, of course, he was younger than Ronald Reagan was when he ended the Cold War. Now, 10 years later, he is still alive and he is not too old now. No, there was something else at play. Whatever was at play, whatever convinced our State Department to undercut the efforts to have a democratic alternative during the early days after the Soviet troops left, they will have to explain someday. But as it was, this Member of Congress took enormous efforts, I took enormous efforts to try to have an alternative and offer that alternative to the people of Afghanistan. Because I knew that if our country did not do what was right, it would come back and hurt us someday.

And so I went forward over the years, and the confusion and the chaos continued in Afghanistan. And then, like a flash upon the sea, just a surprise move that was happening, being played by somebody, but all of a sudden there was another force at play in Afghanistan. And that was a force that was called the Taliban. In the mid-1990s, a fresh, well-equipped, well-armed, well-rested, well-trained military unit entered Afghanistan from Pakistan. These people by and large had not been fighting the Soviet Union but were, instead, kept out of the war and in schools in Pakistan. And at these schools, by the way, many of them were and continue to be illiterate.

The United States provided a great deal of money and resources for the Mujahadin during their war with the Soviet Army. That money went through the Pakistani, the equivalent of the Pakistani CIA. It is called the ISI. And apparently the Pakistani ISI had siphoned enough of our money off to keep that third force and to create that third force which would be used after the war to do their bidding. The

Taliban was the creation of Pakistan and the creation of the Saudis, and they were set up to be the attack dogs of these people in power in those countries so that they could dominate Afghanistan.

When the war with the Soviet Union was over, and after the bickering among the factions themselves, which of course had been instigated a great deal by Pakistan, who continued to support evil people like Hekmahtri Gulbahdeen, but when all the democratic forces, or people who wanted a decent government in Afghanistan, were blood white, the Taliban were just thrust upon the scene.

And, as I say the, Saudis were also involved. The Saudis bankrolled this effort. During the war with the Soviet Union, the Saudis had provided several hundred million dollars a year. The United States provided at times up to a billion dollars a year for the anti-Soviet insurgency in Afghanistan.

I once asked General Turki, who is the head of Saudi intelligence, why they should not bring back the King of Afghanistan, Zahir Shah, in order to end this bloody cycle; and that he could be someone who everyone could rally behind because they all trusted him not to kill them. Zahir Shah, while he was no one's first choice, everyone knew that Zahir Shah was incapable of committing atrocities against them, and they trusted him not to be someone who would hurt them. So at least he offered everyone safe haven. Well, General Turki, the Saudi general who was in charge of their intelligence, told me that the Saudis wanted nothing to do with King Zahir Shah and they had their own plan for this third force with Pakistan: the Taliban.

And when the Taliban arrived on the scene, let us admit that there had been so much chaos and confusion in Afghanistan, many people thought that they might become a force for stability; and they were welcomed in many parts of Afghanistan, mainly because the Taliban carried huge pictures of King Zahir Shah, claiming that they were going to bring back Zahir Shah. When I heard about those pictures, I said, well, maybe they will. Maybe they will create stability and bring him back. Maybe my conversations had some effect.

Well, it did not take long before the people of Afghanistan realized what the Taliban were all about. Luckily, they were not able to occupy the northern provinces of Afghanistan because the commanders there were very hesitant to let troops into their part of the country who they did not know anything about. So we soon learned that instead of a force for stability, the Taliban, which had been created by our Pakistani and Saudi friends, was a monster, a monster that threatened stability of the world, a monster that was eating up any chance for peace and any chance for a decent government and a decent standard of living in Afghanistan.

The Taliban were medieval in their world and religious views, they were violent and intolerant, they were fanatics; and, as such, they were an aberration of Islam. They were totally out of sync with Muslims throughout the world and even totally out of sync with the Muslims in Afghanistan.

Let us note the reason the Taliban were defeated so quickly was that the people of Afghanistan did not like the Taliban, which is exactly the opposite of what we were being told by the State Department and others all along. The Taliban are best known, of course, for their horrific treatment of women, but they were also the violators of human rights across the board. They jailed and threatened to execute Christian aid workers, allegedly for doing nothing more than espousing the belief in Jesus Christ. They ended personal freedoms, they ended freedom of speech and freedom of the press. These things were not even a consideration. They ruled by fear.

This is the Taliban that was put in place by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and it was clear that that was what was going on after a very short period of time. The Taliban believed they had a private line to God. The rest of us, who have different religious convictions, according to the Taliban, are not only wrong but we are evil, of course. And perhaps that is why they gave safe haven to the likes of bin Laden, a Saudi terrorist who has been in Afghanistan and was in Afghanistan for years training terrorists and planning his attacks on the United States and other countries.

Oh yes, by the way, bin Laden let us not forget this as well, had several thousand gunmen with him. We know that. We do not know where they have all gone, but during the time when the Taliban were in power in Afghanistan, bin Laden's armed militias or legions were marauding around Afghanistan murdering any Afghan that would try to resist Taliban power. So the Taliban and bin Laden were despised in Afghanistan, even though we were told by the State Department and others how horrific it would be for us to try to dislodge the Taliban from power.

Remember, during the years of the Taliban, they had the support from Saudi Arabia and Pakistan; and in fact during those years, during the 1990s, the Taliban captured all but a very, very small portion of Afghanistan. They beat back all of those people who were against them in the northern part of the country so only a sliver, only 10 percent, of the country in and around the Panjer Valley remained free of Taliban control.

The only reason they did not really take over the entire country is there was one leader in the northern part of Afghanistan who captured the imagination of his people and the people of Afghanistan and other people throughout the world. His name was Commander Masood. Commander Masood led his forces in the Shamali Plains and up in

the Panjer Valley, and he was never conquered by Soviet troops nor was he ever conquered by the Taliban.

I went to see Commander Masood in the mid 1990s, and through the years before and after that I maintained a relationship with him. I have spoken to his brother on many occasions and kept a line of communication going. Commander Masood was a very decent and honorable man and, as I say, a much beloved person. But the Taliban domination of Afghanistan was not bad enough for the United States to support Commander Masood or anybody else who was fighting against the Taliban.

For years during the Clinton administration I begged and I pleaded to provide some kind of help to the Northern Alliance, which were then resisting the Taliban in Afghanistan. In fact, the Taliban did not need to have taken over all of Afghanistan, except for that little 10 percent. The Taliban could have been stopped when it was holding perhaps 70 percent of the country or 60 percent of the country. But at no time was President Clinton and his administration willing to have anything to do with trying to resist the Taliban forces.

And every time I suggest that the Clinton administration policies of the last 5 years led to this atrocity committed against us on September 11, people go bananas. They automatically say that I am being partisan. Let me note that in this speech already I have highlighted several of the major mistakes made during Republican administrations. But let us not be so hesitant to place responsibility where it belongs when it comes to September 11. Today, I have no doubt that if the policies during the Clinton administration would have been different, the murderous attack on our people on September 11 would not have happened and we may well have spared the people of the world this horrendous, horrendous war that we are going through right now.

Of course, this war could be a lot worse than it is. The fact is our military is doing a terrific job. But this is not partisan. I am a senior member of the Committee on International Relations. And over the years, as I watched what was going on in Afghanistan, I realized that during the Clinton administration there was a pattern, a consistent pattern going on that appeared that the United States policy was not actually opposing the Taliban but, instead, we actually had a covert policy of supporting the Taliban.

Let me repeat that, in case anyone misses the significance of it. During the 1990s, when we had a chance to support those people who were opposing the Taliban, when we had a chance to undermine the Taliban's strength so that they could be replaced by others who were more closely aligned to democratic principles or even to bring Zahir Shah back and establish a democratic government, our government had exactly the opposite policies.

Every time the opportunity arose to overthrow the Taliban or to undermine the Taliban, the Clinton administration actually did things that helped bolster the strength of the Taliban.

When I noticed this trend as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I called on the Clinton administration and the State Department to provide me the documents so that I could peruse the official State Department documents, the cables coming in from overseas, the briefing papers, to determine what our policy was.

Now, I am a member, as I say, a senior member of the Committee on International Relations; I am on the upper rung there. When you see hearings, I am on the very top level of those hearings now because I have been a Member of Congress now for 14 years. My job in that committee is to oversee American foreign policy. Making a request to see documents of the State Department to determine what American foreign policy is is not only justified, it is something that should be expected of Members of Congress. Of course we should see the documents and find out what the policy is and talk with the administration and make sure that we are doing our oversight responsibility.

For 2½ years, the Clinton State Department refused to provide me the documents. It is called stonewalling.

□ 1515

The Assistant Secretary of State, Rick Inderfurth, repeatedly gave me documents that were irrelevant to the request that I made so he could claim that he gave me documents. Some documents included newspaper clippings, which is an insult, a Member of Congress asking for internal documents and getting newspaper clippings.

Why was the State Department stonewalling my request? Is it illogical for someone reading the RECORD or for me or my colleagues to believe that if I was stonewalled in a request for documents from the State Department and that I have a legitimate right to oversee that activity, that the State Department was trying to hide something from me and thus hide something from the American people? Is that irrational? No, I think that flows directly from that action.

During the latter part of the Clinton years, even though Secretary Albright agreed to provide me the documents necessary to determine America's foreign policy towards the Taliban, I was repeatedly thwarted from getting those documents, and I have to believe that Secretary Albright herself knew that I was being thwarted because she had been asked that in congressional hearings on the record in front of the whole world under oath.

Thus, the Clinton administration when it came to the Taliban made a joke out of Congress's right to oversee American foreign policy. Well, guess who the joke is on? The joke is on the American people, but nobody is laughing after September 11.

The Clinton administration, I repeat, was involved in policies that actually supported the Taliban. This at a time when we knew their nature. This at a time when we knew that they had terrorists there, bin Laden, who had already killed Americans; this when we knew they were some of the most horrendous human rights violators on the planet.

An example of ways the Clinton administration helped support the Taliban, in 1996, for example, the Taliban had overstretched their forces. This is at the beginning of their rule. Thousands of their best fighters were captured in northern Afghanistan. I was watching this very closely. The Taliban regime was vulnerable as never before and never since. It was a tremendous opportunity, and by then we knew that the Taliban were going to be the monstrous regime they proved to be.

The Northern Alliance, which existed then, had defeated the Taliban in a way that made the Taliban incredibly vulnerable. A knockout blow could have been unleashed easily by the Northern Alliance and the Taliban could have been kicked out.

At the time I was in personal contact with the leaders of the Northern Alliance, and I recommended to them a quick attack and bringing back the old King Zahir Shah until the democratic process could be established; and, thus, we could turn around the whole situation in a very quick movement. Who saved the day? Why did the Northern Alliance not take advantage of this opportunity? I can tell Members who saved the day. President Clinton saved the day. Probably personally he made the decision. Again, I beg Members of Congress, please do not dismiss what I say. Any time someone says anything bad about Bill Clinton, it is suggested to us that we are being partisan. Please, that is not the case. We are talking about policies that were in place. We are not talking about individuals. His actions and policies saved the day, and those decisions were made and responsibility should be placed.

What happened was at this moment when the Taliban could have been eliminated, President Clinton dispatched Assistant Secretary Rick Inderfurth and Bill Richardson, who was then our United Nations ambassador, to go personally to northern Afghanistan and convince the anti-Taliban forces not to go on the offensive, but instead to accept an immediate cease-fire and an arms embargo.

Mr. Speaker, these people in northern Afghanistan were pretty impressed by the United Nations ambassador and the President's personal representative flying into northern Afghanistan. They wowed the Northern Alliance, and the advice of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the State Department did everything they could to convince them to ignore what the gentleman from California was saying.

This was like having a time when Adolf Hitler could have been elimi-

nated, but we were convincing the forces in Germany to sit down and talk with old Adolf. Instead, they decided to accept a cease-fire and an arms embargo. The minute there was a cease-fire, the Saudis and the Pakistanis began a massive arms resupply of the Taliban.

So the Clinton administration instituted an arms embargo against the Taliban's opponents, at the same time that we knew, our CIA clearly knew what was going on, that there was a massive arms resupply of the Taliban. Within a very short period of time after the Northern Alliance was crippled by an arms embargo and the Taliban was smothered in new weapons and supplies, the Northern Alliance was driven almost completely out of the country. Only 10 percent was left after the Taliban offensive.

For years I begged the Clinton administration to support those who were resisting the Taliban regime. Not only did they not support those who resisted the Taliban, but they actually undermined their efforts. I said, what about King Zahir Shah? And again, Zahir Shah was not acceptable. Too old. There was every reason in the world why we could not do anything to oppose the Taliban in terms of actual actions instead of just words, confetti words that America's President was just throwing out.

Bin Laden was even able to kill Americans and kill military personnel while in Afghanistan, and we still did not take the actions necessary to try to overthrow the Taliban. We shot off a couple of cruise missiles. We destroyed a few mud huts. All of the while bin Laden, who has killed American military personnel already, was given a safe haven to set up a terrorist network throughout the world. During that time period, some of bin Laden's network tried to assassinate the Pope in the Philippines. Throughout Southeast Asia, terrorist groups were forming, all with the support of bin Laden having been given safe haven in Afghanistan.

I believe that the United States did this and that the Clinton administration was involved in this because they had made some kind of deal or had some kind of understanding with Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. And Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, they have their own reasons and their own motives and their own value system; but let us take a look. Pakistan is not a democratic country today. Musharraf, the guy who is in charge there, is a general who overthrew a democratically elected government. If he wants to bring peace to that country, I hope that he provides the reform and heads back toward a democratic regime. I suggested when he took power that he have a plebiscite to give himself the legal authority to conduct that reform. He decided not to do that.

The Saudis, of course, are a medieval dictatorship, a family that controls their country, these people who basically have some of the same anti-Western feelings that bin Laden has. No, the

Saudis do not have our same values. They have been allies to the United States, and I give them credit. We should not forget that during the Cold War, the Saudis were allies, as were the Pakistanis; and for that we should be grateful. But we cannot let our gratitude for Saudi support during the Cold War, and Pakistani support during the Cold War, to bind us into policies that will undermine our well-being in a totally different world that is emerging since the post-Cold War.

Bin Laden, of course, was a Saudi, and I say "was" because we still do not know where he is. Let us hope that bin Laden has moved on to his just rewards, and that would be burning in hell right about now. He was preaching that the killing of innocent people, of thousands of unarmed people was in some way consistent with his faith. There are Muslims all over the world that would call him to task for such an obscene statement. And I am sure that he is finding now that he is not surrounded by all these dark-eyed virgins that he was promising these people who committed these atrocities against us. He is finding that he and the rest of his gang are heading in a different direction than that.

I warned again and again, yet the Clinton administration did nothing; and it did come back to hurt us. I am on the record on at least 14 different occasions suggesting that unless we changed our policy against Afghanistan, it would have serious repercussions for the United States of America.

Bad policy is at fault. Something else is at fault for what we suffered, and we need to face that as well. The bad policy I hope has changed. Although since our offensive in Afghanistan, let me note that some of the same people in the State Department and elsewhere, even after the attack on September 11, were hesitant to suggest that the Taliban be eliminated from power. In fact, some were suggesting that our game plan should be a coalition government between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance, and all the Taliban had to do was give up bin Laden. That is like asking Rudolph Hess and some of the rest of the Nazi crowd to give up Hitler, and they can stay in power. Well, thank goodness we have a President of the United States that was smart enough and courageous enough to ignore that kind of advice and told the Taliban that they are part and parcel of this, and made a goal of eliminating the Taliban regime from power.

Our forces did this job in such a professional way. We worked with those people in the Northern Alliance. Remember when we were told that the Northern Alliance would take months and months and it would be such a quagmire. The Northern Alliance have proven to be fighters able to defeat the Taliban.

The Northern Alliance has won, and we have to make sure now that we do not walk away again. We have to make sure that we do not leave the Afghan

people to sleep in the rubble; that we stick with those people who are anti-Taliban who worked with us to eliminate bin Laden and the Taliban. Let us help them rebuild a democratic, strong, prosperous Afghanistan.

Already there is thought that the King of Afghanistan should be coming back to Afghanistan. This after 12 years. Let me say, 12 years ago I was told he is too old. The State Department would tell me he has no support. He is too old. The King of Afghanistan is the only one who has the loyalty of the hearts of the people of Afghanistan. They love that man because he is a father figure who was King at a time period when there was no killing.

□ 1530

There was no chaos. People lived at peace with their families. They remember that. The sooner the King gets back to Afghanistan, the better.

I was able to go to the conference in Bonn after we had basically won on the ground in Afghanistan in which the Afghan leaders got together and chose an interim leader, Prime Minister Karzai, who is there now. I was there to talk to them about the King and about Mr. Karzai and talked to the various factions in Bonn, and it was my honor to have been there, and I hope I made a small contribution to laying down a plan that would permit Afghanistan to have some stability and prosperity and peace in the future.

We do that by what was the original plan, and this is ironic. The King has agreed to come back and open a Loya Jirga, which is a meeting of the elders of his country. That meeting will help establish the rules for a constitution which, over a transition period, will become a democratic government for the people of Afghanistan. Finally. But we cannot walk away.

They had a meeting in Tokyo a few days ago for donor countries. The United States has committed, I think, about \$350 million or so. I will have to say I do not think that is legitimate. I will have to say that I think the United States Government over a period of time should be kicking in much more than \$300 million to help the people of Afghanistan.

To put that in perspective, we have been able to spend hundreds of billions of dollars less every year on our military for all these years since the end of the Cold War because the Afghans helped us end the Cold War. For pete's sake, let us help the Afghans build their country. They have only provided \$27 million for demining in that country, \$27 million. They think there are 8 million land mines. Three hundred children every month end up becoming maimed by land mines in Afghanistan that have been planted there. Think of the drain that would be on our society, much less their society.

Let us make sure we ensure the peace and do the right thing, and the right thing is making sure we do not walk away; that we bring the King back; and

we make sure there is an inclusive government, not like the Taliban. They had their exclusive clique who had their own vision of God, which they superimposed on everybody else. Let us instead, let us instead, support an inclusive government, and that is what Zahir Shah would do.

Unfortunately, now there are several people in Afghanistan, Mr. Khalili and some others, Ismail Khan and some others, who worked against the Taliban, who feel they may be being left out. We should not let any government leave anyone out, and our own United States Government should express its appreciation to those on the other side, whom Mr. Khalili and Ismail Khan and others are associated with, and others like that who fought against the Taliban, and everybody should be included.

By the way, the Iranians, the Iranians are promising \$560 million worth of support, 50 percent more support for Afghanistan than the United States of America. That is not right. We have benefited by the end of the Cold War. We should make sure we repay the Afghans amply, and that is what is right, and that will be good for us as well.

Let us remember as we move forward, now that the resistance of the Taliban is gone down to just a few areas, there are a few hot spots left there, but there is still a threat to democratic government in Afghanistan. We must play a positive role, both in the economy and in establishing democratic government. Mullah Omar, the head of the Taliban, is still there somewhere with a thousand or so fighters in Afghanistan. We have to make sure Mr. Karzai's interim regime is successful in establishing the foundation that will sweep away the Mullah Omars and bin Ladens forever, because the people of Afghanistan are not fanatics. They are not fanatics.

The people who flew the airplanes into our buildings on September 11 were not Afghans. They were, by and large, Saudis. The people of Afghanistan are devout in their faith, but they are not fanatic about their faith, and Muslims throughout the world resent bin Laden and his murderers for trying to talk for their religion.

President Bush has been magnificent in his outreach to the Muslim countries of the world, letting them know that we will not succumb to the temptation that bin Laden would like us to succumb to, which is making an enemy out of all Muslims in the world. In fact, we are not only not making enemies out of the Muslims from Afghanistan, we in fact are reaching out to them, and need to do so with a heavier financial commitment to help them rebuild their country.

Now, as we proceed, as I say, let us note that in the war against terrorism there will be steps one, two and three. Number one was in Afghanistan, and it is coming to a close, although it is not at a close right now. Step two may be in Southeast Asia. I just returned from

Malaysia where they have found bin Laden's network. In Singapore, they just arrested 13 people who were part of bin Laden's network who were planning to blow up a bus that carried American people from our embassy every day. So there would have been 60 or 100 Americans who would have been murdered there by bin Laden's terrorist network in Singapore.

In the Philippines we have already some Special Forces on the ground, after 10 years of ignoring, by the way, during the Clinton Administration. Again, I would say we have got to help the Philippines. I realized that. I went to the Philippines time and again to try to get them together. They were a target of the Communist Chinese and they were a target of bin Laden's network.

Today we have a chance to save the Philippines, but it will be close. We need to work with the Philippines. We have some Special Forces teams on the ground, and we need to make that commitment. I think President Bush has made that commitment. Whether or not that is going to be the next front in the war against terrorism or whether it will be to finish the job that we did not do against Saddam Hussein, this will be a war on terrorism, and it will be a war that is conducted sequentially, and it will be a war that we will be proud of because we will be standing for freedom and democracy and peace.

I salute the members of our Armed Forces who have conducted such a gallant fight, who are leading us on to victory and to create a better world, and to have a better world we must have the courage to do what is right and stand for the principles our country believes in.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. INSLIEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for January 23 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for January 23 and the balance of the week on account of illness.

#### 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. DICKS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 30 and 31.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 25, 2002, at 10 a.m.

#### MOTION TO DISCHARGE A COMMITTEE

JANUARY 24, 2002.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XV, I, JIM TURNER, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 203) entitled, a resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, which was referred to said committee on July 19, 2001, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Jim Turner.
2. Stephen Horn.
3. Christopher Shays.
4. Michael N. Castle.
5. Lindsey O. Graham.
6. Todd Russell Platts.
7. Marge Roukema.
8. Ken Lucas.
9. Brad Carson.
10. Thomas H. Allen.
11. Sherrod Brown.
12. Marion Berry.
13. James H. Maloney.
14. Leonard L. Boswell.
15. Ron Kind.
16. Robert E. Andrews.
17. Joseph Crowley.
18. Louise McIntosh Slaughter.
19. Nick Lampson.
20. John Lewis.
21. Hilda L. Solis.
22. Zoe Lofgren.
23. Steve Israel.
24. Gary L. Ackerman.
25. James R. Langevin.
26. Michael M. Honda.
27. Dale E. Kildee.
28. Ted Strickland.
29. Joseph M. Hoeffel.
30. James P. McGovern.
31. Jay Inslee.
32. Rush D. Holt.
33. Darlene Hooley.
34. Carolyn McCarthy.
35. Ellen O. Tauscher.
36. Charles A. Gonzalez.
37. Shelley Berkley.
38. Lynn C. Woolsey.
39. Ruben Hinojosa.
40. John B. Larson.
41. Amo Houghton.
42. Stephanie Tubbs Jones.

43. Mike McIntyre.

44. Baron P. Hill.

45. Earl Blumenauer.

46. Rick Larsen.

47. Brad Sherman.

48. John W. Olver.

49. Grace F. Napolitano.

50. James C. Greenwood.

51. Xavier Becerra.

52. Ciro D. Rodriguez.

53. Gene Green.

54. Steven R. Rothman.

55. Susan A. Davis.

56. Barney Frank.

57. Steny H. Hoyer.

58. David E. Bonior.

59. Charles W. Stenholm.

60. Peter Deutch.

61. Nancy Pelosi.

62. Charles B. Rangel.

63. Maurice D. Hinchey.

64. Michael E. Capuano.

65. Eva M. Clayton.

66. Edward J. Markey.

67. John F. Tierney.

68. Henry A. Waxman.

69. Jerrold Nadler.

70. Nita M. Lowey.

71. John Elias Baldacci.

72. Lois Capps.

73. Martin T. Meehan.

74. James P. Moran.

75. Sam Farr.

76. Chet Edwards.

77. Tom Udall.

78. Jim Davis.

79. Tim Holden.

80. Luis V. Gutierrez.

81. Tom Sawyer.

82. Frank Pallone, Jr.

83. Richard A. Gephardt.

84. Ken Bentsen.

85. Allen Boyd.

86. Diane E. Watson.

87. David E. Price.

88. Chaka Fattah.

89. Gerald D. Kleczka.

90. Jim McDermott.

91. Rosa L. DeLauro.

92. Bob Etheridge.

93. Ed Pastor.

94. Mike Thompson.

95. Melvin L. Watt.

96. Nydia M. Velazquez.

97. David D. Phelps.

98. Adam B. Schiff.

99. Betty McCollum.

100. Robert A. Borski.

101. Bob Filner.

102. Robert T. Matsui.

103. Peter A. DeFazio.

104. John M. Spratt, Jr.

105. Tammy Baldwin.

106. Ike Skelton.

107. Bob Clement.

108. Diana DeGette.

109. Dennis J. Kucinich.

110. Robert Wexler.

111. George Miller.

112. Janice D. Schakowsky.

113. Lane Evans.

114. Jim Matheson.

115. Constance A. Morella.

116. Brian Baird.

117. Benjamin L. Cardin.

118. Lucille Roybal-Allard.

119. Silvestre Reyes.

120. Harold E. Ford, Jr.

121. Anna G. Eshoo.  
 122. Marcy Kaptur.  
 123. Bill Pascrell, Jr.  
 124. Bart Gordon.  
 125. Adam Smith.  
 126. Eliot L. Engel.  
 127. Dennis Moore.  
 128. Lynn N. Rivers.  
 129. John J. LaFalce.  
 130. Patsy T. Mink.  
 131. Martin Frost.  
 132. Christopher John.  
 133. Thomas M. Barrett.  
 134. Max Sandlin.  
 135. Tom Lantos.  
 136. Major R. Owens.  
 137. Anthony D. Weiner.  
 138. Patrick J. Kennedy.  
 139. Karen McCarthy.  
 140. Barbara Lee.  
 141. Jane Harman.  
 142. Norman D. Dicks.  
 143. David Wu.  
 144. Earl Pomeroy.  
 145. Bernard Sanders.  
 146. Michael R. McNulty.  
 147. Tony P. Hall.  
 148. John D. Dingell.  
 149. Vic Snyder.  
 150. Gary A. Condit.  
 151. John Conyers, Jr.  
 152. Paul E. Kanjorski.  
 153. Lloyd Doggett.  
 154. James L. Oberstar.  
 155. Sander M. Levin.  
 156. Gene Taylor.  
 157. Elijah E. Cummings.  
 158. Karen L. Thurman.  
 159. Mark Steven Kirk.  
 160. Carolyn C. Kilpatrick.  
 161. Calvin M. Dooley.  
 162. Robert A. Brady.  
 163. Bill Luther.  
 164. Mark Udall.  
 165. William J. Coyne.  
 166. Jerry F. Costello.  
 167. Edolphus Towns.  
 168. Gregory W. Meeks.  
 169. Howard L. Berman.  
 170. Donald M. Payne.  
 171. William D. Delahunt.  
 172. John S. Tanner.  
 173. Carolyn B. Maloney.  
 174. Julia Carson.  
 175. William J. Jefferson.  
 176. Carrie P. Meek.  
 177. Nancy L. Johnson.  
 178. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.  
 179. James A. Leach.  
 180. Zach Wamp.  
 181. Frank Mascara.  
 182. Jose E. Serrano.  
 183. Rod R. Blagojevich.  
 184. Nick J. Rahall II.  
 185. Alan B. Mollohan.  
 186. Michael F. Doyle.  
 187. Bart Stupak.  
 188. James A. Barcia.  
 189. Neil Abercrombie.  
 190. Solomon P. Ortiz.  
 191. Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.  
 192. Rob Simmons.  
 193. Mike Ross.  
 194. Tim Roemer.  
 195. Danny K. Davis.  
 196. Sheila Jackson-Lee.  
 197. Bobby L. Rush.  
 198. Jim Ramstad.

199. Loretta Sanchez.  
 200. Robert C. Scott.  
 201. Robert Menendez.  
 202. David R. Obey.  
 203. Fortney Pete Stark.  
 204. Juanita Millender-McDonald.  
 205. Joe Baca.  
 206. Wayne T. Gilchrest.  
 207. Maxine Waters.  
 208. Cynthia A. McKinney.  
 209. Frank R. Wolf.  
 210. Stephen F. Lynch.  
 211. Alcee L. Hastings.  
 212. Eddie Bernice Johnson.  
 213. Greg Ganske.  
 214. Peter J. Visclosky.  
 215. Thomas E. Petri.  
 216. Charles F. Bass.  
 217. Corrine Brown.  
 218. Richard E. Neal.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5205. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting report pursuant to Section 1041 of Public Law 106-398, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2001, as amended by Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5206. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting appropriations reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

5207. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting appropriations reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

5208. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to the Requirements on Variability in the Composition of Additives Certified Under the Gasoline Deposit Control Program; Partial Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule [FRL-7132-3] (RIN: 2060-AJ69) received January 18, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5209. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Removal of Restrictions on Certain Fire Suppression Substitutes for Ozone-Depleting Substances; and Listing of Substitutes [FRL-7130-7] (RIN: 2060-AG12) received January 18, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5210. A letter from the Attorney, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Numbering Resource Optimization [CC Docket No. 99-200]; Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96-98]; Telephone Number Portability [CC Docket No. 95-116] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5211. A letter from the Legal Advisor, WTBB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of 911 Act [WT Docket No.

00-110]; The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements [CC Docket No. 92-105] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5212. A letter from the Attorney, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—2000 Biennial Regulatory Review—Comprehensive Review of the Accounting Requirements and ARMIS Reporting Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers: Phase 2 [CC Docket No. 00-199]; Amendments to the Uniform System of Accounts for Interconnection [CC Docket No. 97-212]; Jurisdictional Separations Reform and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board [CC Docket No. 80-286]; Local Competition and Broadband Reporting [CC Docket No. 99-301] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5213. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 107-174); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

5214. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 107-175); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

5215. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of September 30, 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

5216. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

5217. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Report on Withdrawal of Russian Armed Forces and Military Equipment, pursuant to paragraph 5(D) of the Senate's resolution of advice and consent of the ratification of the CFE Flank Document; to the Committee on International Relations.

5218. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2001, through December 31, 2001 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 107-176); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

5219. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airspace and Flight Operations Requirements for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games, Salt Lake City, UT [Docket No. FAA-2002-11332; SFAR No. 95] (RIN: 2120-AH61) received January 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5220. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of the National Invasive Species Act of 1996 (NISA)

[USCG-1998-3423] (RIN: 2115-AF55) received January 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5221. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pollution Prevention for Ongoing Ships and Certain Vessels in Domestic Service [USCG-2000-7641] (RIN: 2115-AF56) received January 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCNUITY):

H.R. 3622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the golden parachute excise tax to sales of company stock by corporate insiders occurring when the company prevents rank-and-file employees from selling company stock held in their 401(k) plan, and to ensure more accurate reporting of liabilities to workers and shareholders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 3623. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to prohibit knowing misrepresentations by fiduciaries of 401(k) plans which may induce participants and beneficiaries to act contrary to their own best interest in controlling the assets in their own accounts, and to amend title 11 of the United States Code to protect claims based on such misrepresentations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 3624. A bill to prohibit assistance to the Palestinian Authority and any instrumentality of the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3625. A bill to reauthorize and reform the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 3626. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an outpatient prescription drug benefit under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. GOSS):

H.R. 3627. A bill to protect the United States and its allies by imposing sanctions on countries and entities that aid and abet individuals or entities engaged in terrorist activity or fail to cooperate in the war against terrorism, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3628. A bill to authorize the President to present posthumously a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Sammy Davis, Jr. in recognition of his achievements and service to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. EHRLICH):

H.R. 3629. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for wages paid to employees while participating in mentoring programs for elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 3630. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida and the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. FARR of California):

H.R. 3631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the electric motor vehicle credit, including an expansion of the credit to certain 3-wheeled vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 3632. A bill to ensure that labor dues and fees are used only for collective bargaining purposes and exclusive representation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3633. A bill to provide compensation for the United States citizens or legal permanent residents who were victims of the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma on April 19, 1995, on the same basis as compensation is provided to victims of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3634. A bill to permit certain funds assessed for securities laws violations to be used to compensate employees who are victims of excessive pension fund investments in the securities of their employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution urging the Department of Justice to seek subrogation from the terrorists responsible for the attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, with respect to claims paid under the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and urging the President to deposit amounts belonging to such terrorists which have been blocked or confiscated by the United States in the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the

Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COX, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WICKER):

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the tax relief provided for by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 passed by a bipartisan majority in Congress should continue as scheduled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution expressing sympathy to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who were tragically affected by the eruption of the Nyiragongo volcano on January 17, 2002, and supporting an increase in the amount of assistance provided by the United States to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should appoint an independent counsel to investigate and report on campaign contributions made to the Democratic National Committee from the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 307. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should appoint an independent counsel to investigate and report on campaign donations made to federally elected officials by Enron Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 308. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should appoint an independent counsel to investigate and report on the granting of pilot's licenses to foreign nationals by the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. HART, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 335. A resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 111: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 116: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mrs. NORTHP.

H.R. 200: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 218: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 280: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. PICKERING.

- H.R. 281: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 292: Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 330: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 476: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 506: Mrs. CLAYTON.  
H.R. 536: Mr. SHAW.  
H.R. 537: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 579: Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 648: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 649: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 650: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 739: Mr. FRANK.  
H.R. 760: Mr. OSE.  
H.R. 831: Mr. FORBES and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 869: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
H.R. 938: Ms. WATSON.  
H.R. 953: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 969: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1110: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1144: Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 1198: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. DOYLE.  
H.R. 1296: Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MASCARA.  
H.R. 1331: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H.R. 1354: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1371: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.  
H.R. 1377: Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1412: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1438: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1444: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1450: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1459: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1613: Mr. LYNCH.  
H.R. 1645: Mr. TERRY and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1700: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. ROTHMAN.  
H.R. 1810: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 1822: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. UPTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
H.R. 1859: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 1904: Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 1948: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.  
H.R. 1984: Mr. STUMP.
- H.R. 1987: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. FLETCHER.  
H.R. 2074: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2138: Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2189: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 2332: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 2377: Mr. WEINER.  
H.R. 2574: Mr. BARR of Georgia.  
H.R. 2631: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 2638: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. JENKINS.  
H.R. 2667: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 2709: Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2755: Ms. KILPATRICK.  
H.R. 2847: Mr. HILLIARD.  
H.R. 2878: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 2942: Mr. BARCIA.  
H.R. 2946: Mr. GRUCCI.  
H.R. 2957: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 3014: Mr. SAXTON.  
H.R. 3022: Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 3124: Mr. CRANE.  
H.R. 3192: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.  
H.R. 3206: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 3236: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 3238: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 3244: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. PASTOR.  
H.R. 3247: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BERRY.  
H.R. 3284: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 3288: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H.R. 3296: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIMMONS, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3301: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 3324: Mr. FILNER and Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 3333: Mr. PICKERING.  
H.R. 3337: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
- H.R. 3339: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.  
H.R. 3347: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. GILMAN.  
H.R. 3351: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. REGULA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 3352: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. HART, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
H.R. 3358: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. HART, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. BOSWELL.  
H.R. 3412: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FROST, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 3450: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. HALL of Texas.  
H.R. 3461: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
H.R. 3482: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. HART, and Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 3565: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 3569: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 3594: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. TOWNS.  
H.R. 3614: Mr. CROWLEY.  
H. J. Res. 67: Mr. WALSH.  
H. J. Res. 81: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H. Con. Res. 99: Ms. SOLIS and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. SIMMONS.  
H. Res. 225: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.