consider a new generation of international partnerships, regional security alliances, more flexible financial institutions, and treaties to help manage increasing economic, political, and military complexity.

Over the past year, despite the unifying force of the war on terrorism, an undercurrent of unilateralism has strained our relations with allies in Europe, Asia and Latin America. Instead, we need to redouble efforts to strengthen NATO and reinvigorate bilateral pacts with South Korea and Japan. In this hemisphere, we should take advantage of the recently invoked Rio Pact to harmonize security arrangements and pursue democratic and economic objectives. And we must leverage all of these ties to forge wider regional alliances.

I commend the Bush Administration for its work to construct a stronger partnership between NATO and Russia. This new arrangement should ultimately break down lingering suspicions and allow us to maximize strengths to confront shared threats.

At the same time, we must intensify our bilateral work with Russia on a range of issues, especially the need to destroy unneeded nuclear weapons and keep others out of the hands of terrorists and rogue nations. Former Sen. Sam Nunn has identified this threat as the new nuclear arms race, and I join him in calling for immediate steps to avert what is no longer the unthinkable—the use of a weapon of mass destruction by an unknown enemy. Our government must allocate additional funds to secure these weapons and their components, and accept no more excuses for the proliferation of dangerous materials from Russia to Iran and elsewhere.

The severe consequences of proliferation are on vivid display in the current tensions between India and Pakistan. We must do everything possible—on our own and with our allies—to diffuse this stand off, because the terrorists who have fueled it will be the sole beneficiaries of an all-out war. This is the new world in which we live. Disputes once considered remote can have deadly consequences if met with American apathy.

We must also continue to encourage China's participation in bilateral and regional endeavors, provided that it agrees to the price of admission—adherence to international standards including human rights, trade practices and nonproliferation rules. As former Defense Secretary Bill Perry proved a few years ago in helping to develop a visionary policy toward North Korea, the United States and China can make great progress if we recognize the common, long-term interests that our people share.

We should also look to new regional structures for projecting strength and stability, especially in places where our government is not willing to commit U.S. forces. A case in point is Africa, which some have claimed is not a national security priority for the United States. I disagree, and I was disappointed when the Bush administration cut funding for the Africa Crisis Responsive Initiative. This program was designed to build indigenous capability within Africa that could respond when needed, and help regional leaders like Nigeria calm trouble spots so the United States would not have to.

We must be prepared to build alliances in regions that flare up unexpectedly. Afghanistan is the best example of this today. The Administration deserves credit for the military victory there. However, it will be short-sighted if we stop now and withhold support for expanding the international security presence beyond Kabul, as Interim President Karzai has urgently requested. Instead, we must take steps to make that nation a prime example of the coalition's unbending commitment to democracy and development.

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

The last challenge I'd like to discuss today is to instill all these initiatives with a new energy of civic involvement at home and abroad.

In a new, more interconnected world, individuals or small groups can pose a serious threat to America's heartland. Nineteen hijackers did what Germany and Japan failed to achieve in the entire Second World War. This is a new front involving our firefighter and police, our EMS, the INS, the Customs Agency, the Coast Guard and all other organizations responsible for protecting the United States.

This is a completely new threat to our home front, and I am deeply concerned that the appropriate sense of urgency is absent from our civil defense efforts.

After Pearl Harbor, we moved with speed to mobilize our nation in defense of democracy. Almost nine months after Sept. 11th, America has still not crafted a strategy to significantly strengthen our nation's security, despite a series of recent warnings from our government.

We need to reorganize our homeland defense agencies in order to maximize the safety of all Americans. Not only does the Homeland Security Director need to be a cabinet officer—he needs budgetary authority. He needs operational authority. And he must provide a comprehensive plan to the Congress on our national strategy for homeland security. Such a plan should involve all Americans in our civil defense effort.

As the Intelligence Committees begin their hearings today, we all know that our ability to coordinate information gathered at home and abroad needs to be improved. A task force led by former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft has developed proposals to better integrate the work of our intelligence agencies. Given the urgency of collecting and utilizing intelligence effectively, I hope the Administration will act upon these ideas.

Finally, we must harness the spirit that defined people's response to the Sept. 11th attacks. American citizens who have enjoyed the rich benefits of democracy and free markets possess a unique capacity to energize these values across the world.

Let's be clear: Americans face a special challenge in this conflict: to educate ourselves as never before, to participate in decisions that affect all out lives, and to make connections with people across the globe. We need to encourage citizens of all ages to get involved in the Peace Corps, the diplomatic corps, Americorps, the CIA and the FBI.

One of the efforts I am most enthusiastic about helps experienced Americans go overseas and share their skills with people in developing countries.

I met a retired businessman from Chicago on my most recent trip to the Middle East. He had volunteered to run a start-up microloan program in Morocco. With his project nearing completion, I asked him what he was planning to do next.

''I thought about going home to play golf,'' he said. ''But I have decided to stay in the Middle East. I've seen what can be achieved here in Morocco, and I am going to another country and do it all over again.''

For every American like him, we counteract a book of lies. For every business he helps succeed and every person who finds a job, we diminish the pool from which the haters recruit.

At home, government, industry, and individuals must also participate in this effort to expand knowledge of other peoples, and foster interaction between nations.

In 1994, Newt Gingrich and I sponsored a pilot exchange program devised by the San Francisco-based Center for Citizen Initiatives. Individual families in St. Louis and Atlanta hosted a handful of Russian entrepreneurs who came here to learn skills from American business people. Today, hundreds of Russians are coming to the U.S. each year to get hands-on training and Americans in more than 40 states are participating in the program.

The challenge for every American is to convince the world that it is better to live together than at war, looking toward the promise of the future rather than the grievances of the past.

Updating our public diplomacy requires updating our politics. In the 1990s, with the Cold War over, it seemed like the parties could play politics with any issue. But today we need a new politics based on an open exchange of approaches. We must be free to propose ideas and work together to implement the best ones. This may well be the most important public policy question of our lifetimes. We must be doing our very best, thinking our very best, working together at our very best.

If we do, I think there is every reason for optimism.

Extremist leaders who advocate violence against America must constantly worry that their own rhetoric will consume themselves and their cause. To quote Churchill once more, ''dictators ride on tigers which they dare not dismount.'' In contrast, we have the luxury of trusting in democracy and the good sense of our fellow citizens.

Just as we battled the Soviets through 50 years of the Cold War as a united America, so will we battle terrorists and their supporters for as long as it takes. Today, we enjoy a new and productive relationship with Russia; one day, we will hopefully enjoy a new and productive relationship with those who distrust us now.

We know that civilization requires protection, and that freedom demands commitment and sacrifice. But it also requires imagination and clear thinking.

In 1947, in an address to a joint session of Congress, Harry Truman spoke about the communist threat in Europe, and the struggle for freedom and democracy in Greece and Turkey. He ended his speech with the reminder: ''Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events.''

Twice in the last century, and now again, our nation is being asked to measure itself. If we fail, the consequences are severe. For ourselves, and for the world, let us succeed.

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

(Mr. HOYER 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 Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SUPER NAFTA MEANS SUPER TORNADO FOR U.S.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this week the House was scheduled to take up a measure relating to fast track trade authority but, for some reason, it got pulled from the schedule and we were not told why. We know President Bush has called fast track one of his top legislative priorities, even though it will lead to more lost jobs and even higher trade deficits for our country. So it is a bit of a mystery why we did not take up this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, the President wants fast track to pave the way for the so-called Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, a kind of super NAFTA. This super NAFTA would extend NAFTA provisions to all of the countries in our hemisphere except Cuba. But why would we want a super NAFTA, considering the damage that NAFTA has caused in the past 8 years? NAFTA has been like a tornado, ripping up jobs and tearing apart communities from the textile areas of the Carolinas to the agricultural valleys in California and Florida, to the automobile industry in the Great Lakes region.

Now, according to the Los Angeles Times, the latest of our exports are high-wage jobs. Before NAFTA, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. We sent them more than they sent us. In 1993, in fact, before NAFTA, America held a surplus of over $6 billion with Mexico. Yes, that was a surplus. Where are we today post-NAFTA? Well, we had a trade deficit, a record deficit of nearly $30 billion with Mexico in one year; that is billion, translated into over 600,000 more lost jobs in our country.

Do we think the balance of accounts was any better with Canada? Wrong. Our trade deficit with Canada for the year 2001 was over $50 billion. That translates into 1 million less jobs in our country.

Who can call this kind of policy a success? Most estimates indicate that more than 3 million jobs, direct and related, have been lost post-NAFTA. Analysis shows State-by-State job loss figures range from a low of 6,838 in North Dakota to a high of over 364,000 in California. Other hard-hit States include my own of Ohio, but add Texas, New York, California, Michigan, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Illinois, Tennessee, Florida, Indiana, Georgia, New Jersey, each with a loss of over 100,000 good jobs. Those may sound like numbers to the White House or some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but each one of those numbers is a family fighting to put food on the table, to pay for college and medical costs, and is a strong indicator as well of America's waning manufacturing and agricultural strength. If that is the wave of the future, I sure do not want any part of it.

Under the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, the ''Super NAFTA,'' instead of just covering Mexico and Canada, now we are going to add 31 more countries into the mix, like Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela. In the first 3 months of this year alone, we already had a trade deficit with those countries of $6 billion. So why would anyone want to exacerbate a situation which is already working against the interests of our people?

This appears to be what the administration is fighting for: more lost jobs, more trade deficits. When will this job hemorrhage end? When we have no manufacturing base to speak of? When our markets are flooded with agricultural products from every place else in the world?

Mr. Speaker, many of our working families are suffering. In fact, millions of them are. America is becoming a bazaar to the world's goods and, at the same time, we are hollowing out our own productive strength here at home. It is no surprise to us here to tell the American people that 75 cents of every farm dollar today is Federal subsidy.

□ 1500

Farmers are farming the government, not the market. Our agricultural policies are only working to hold the farm credit system together so we do not have a depression in rural America, and in manufacturing America we have had a depression. I do not know why it is not on the front pages of every newspaper in the country. We have lost over 2 million jobs, more in the last 2 years. Talk to anybody in the integrated steel industry. Talk to anybody in the machine tool industry. Talk to the electronics industry.

It seems to me we ought to have trade policies that work for America again. We should not be trading away our good jobs, and fast track is not a responsible plan for a secure economic future. Why should we have a fast track for more lost jobs and higher trade deficits?

Someone ought to pay attention, and we ought to reject any fast track proposal that is brought to this floor.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address this whole issue of prescription drugs. It is an issue that is on the forefront of the minds of just about every senior in my district.

Over the past year, I have visited at least 25 senior centers, and the stories that we are told over and over again would bring tears to almost anyone's eyes. Just the other day, we had a young lady, I say young, 70 years young, who in a meeting of seniors said to me, Mr. CUMMINGS, I worked all my life. I worked very hard. Now that I am older, I find myself unable to afford my prescriptions. I go from drugstore to drugstore trying to collect samples, because I simply cannot afford the cost of prescription drugs. I wish that the Congress would be in tune with me and give me back my dignity.

Then there was the gentleman at the Jewish senior citizen home in my district who stood up and said, You know, I cannot afford my prescription drugs anymore. What I am doing is cutting them in half and taking half of the prescribed dosage. I am 77 years old, and I am getting older and sicker every day. I want you to do something about it. Then he said something that is embedded in the DNA of every part of my memory bank. He said, Mr. CUMMINGS, if the Congress does not do something fairly soon, I will be dead.

We have other people in our districts throughout the country who are purchasing half of a prescription because they simply cannot afford the entire prescription. So I was very pleased today to hear and participate as the Democrats proposed a prescription drug plan. I know the Republicans have done the same thing.

The issue now is that this Congress, Mr. Speaker, must act. There are many people who are depending upon us to come up with a reasonable plan so that they can live. While we are about the business of protecting our country against outside forces, we have to make sure that we do not deteriorate from the inside. These are people who have given their blood, sweat, and tears to lift up this great country; and they are in their senior years. It is a time when they should be resting and relaxing and feeling comfortable about their lives, but they are coming to a point where they are not only losing their dignity, but slowly but surely losing their lives.

So I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that we will take the words of those seniors who are not only in the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland, but those seniors who are throughout our entire country waiting and praying that we will take action.

Last but not least, I have often said, Mr. Speaker, that we have one life to live, and that this is no dress rehearsal. This so happens to be that life. I think it should be our goal to bring the very best life to our very, very valued citizens, the very best life that we can.

After all, this is one of the greatest countries in this world, and we should treat our seniors in a way that reflects the greatness of our country.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first indicate Florida's pride in the gentleman's being in the chair today. We are delighted to see the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) as Chair of the House and Speaker pro tempore.

We are also delighted to have a conversation today in calm and measured tones about an issue that is vitally, vitally important, to every American.