

on devised tactics. A truly international coalition is essential. Real authority would derive from such a coalition. We must treat each other as true partners. The United Nations members must work towards trust among themselves in order to fight terrorism, which is a complex process and calls for an international effort.

The United Nations' primary task at this time in history is to assume leadership in the establishment of peace in our very fragile world. Each nation must begin to compromise its wants and needs to this end. The wealthier and more powerful countries must become more aware that peace cannot be achieved by isolationist policies. Through a united world view, problems of poverty and hunger (which often are the roots of wars) can begin to be solved and in time, hopefully, ended. If the United Nations continues to solve these societal ills, then terrorism will have failed in their objectives.

This is Miss Panno's essay, entitled "Combating Terrorism":

Recently, terrorism has been thrust into the limelight and seen by many as a frightening entity that may cause devastation without warning. To allay these fears, the United Nations has approached this problem from three different angles: conflict prevention, peace building and peace making. By using methods that look at the problem both preventatively and in retrospect, the United Nations helps countries avoid devastation and recuperate quickly when disaster strikes.

The problem of terrorism is decidedly not a simple one; therefore, the solution is not a simple one either. To deal with this quandary's complexity, the United Nations is implementing multiple preventative tactics, attempting to quell the threat of terrorism by using every possible front. Some of the main strategies include dissuading dissatisfied groups from committing terrorist acts, denying groups the means to carry out acts of terrorism and sustaining international cooperation. Since terrorism often emanates from areas where human rights are routinely violated, the United Nations is attempting to protect the rights of those in other countries and expand the lines of communication between us and them, thus dissuading groups from causing us harm. It often occurs, however, that attempting to open lines of communication still fails to elicit the positive relationship we desire. This is generally due to differences in beliefs. Many terrorists claim to be Islamic, but their views are radical with a disregard for the value of human lives and do not accurately portray Islam. The true form of Islam denounces wars and violence. We could attempt to deter some radicals by exposing them to the root of their religion, rather than the extreme sect they've always known. This could be done by encouraging Muslims to spread the true voice of their religion and dissuade radicals from causing more harm. This sounds a bit implausible, but if it changes even a few terrorists, we've lessened the threat.

A big, big part of prevention comes from denying terrorists the opportunity to obtain weapons or to strike. The United Nations is doing its best to locate known terrorist groups, and monitor them closely, making sure to keep them from accessing weapons of mass destruction. Locating the terrorists may be the most difficult aspect of fighting terror. This can only be done through persistence and monitoring suspects. Also, international cooperation is the key. As we have seen many times in the past, there is "strength in numbers." Terrorists may not fear punishment from one country, but an entire group of countries all banded together may seem more imposing and help prevent

attacks from happening. Another advantage of uniting countries together would be an improved ability to weed out terrorist activity. With nations all over the world working together, different countries could monitor certain areas for suspicious activity. We may even consider enlisting the help of groups such as MEK (Mujahedeen-e Khalq) who have been jilted by former terrorist friends. These people, who have a grudge against some terrorists, have a good knowledge of the inside of the terror business and may be willing to help discover new and helpful information.

When danger seems imminent, or after a war, peace building and peace keeping are also a necessity. Peace building tries to uncover the foundations of problems between countries. Once unearthing the basic problem, the peace builders begin to encourage democracy and respect for human life. Peace keepers are also put in place to keep violence from breaking out between disagreeing parties. Even when faced with difficult situations, the peace keepers do their best to resist using force. For this reason, they are only lightly armed, providing little, if no, danger to civilians. The peace keepers are intentionally impartial, to avoid causing further conflicts. While our biggest efforts are preventative, peace building and peace keeping is just as important because it maintains the balances that we struggled to create.

Combating the strength of terrorism requires a collective effort from many different fronts. By banding countries together to deny groups the ability to commit acts of terrorism and educate them about more peaceful solutions, the United Nations can provide a true defense against terror. The United Nations also maintains a sense of harsh reality, acknowledging that, despite the great defenses they've set up, there is always the threat of terrorism. To be prepared for this, peace builders and peace keepers are kept on hand, always ready to pick up the pieces. By having plans for both before and after terror attacks, the United Nations has a firm plan to significantly reduce the danger of violence.

TEACHER TRAINING ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 2004

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4409 and H.R. 4411, despite my concerns that they do not do enough to address the problems facing colleges and K through 12 schools in this country.

In the past year, college tuition has increased an average of 14 percent a year at public institutions and by 6 percent at private colleges.

Under President Bush, students are taxed more on college loans. College students in this country will be taxed an additional \$3.8 billion over the next 10 years.

While campaigning in 2000, President Bush promised to raise the Pell grant to \$5,100—which would help make college more affordable for the students who need scholarships the most. But the Pell grant has been frozen at \$4,050 for the 3rd year in a row. It freezes funding for Pell Grants and cut funding for Perkins loans by nearly \$100 million.

Since No Child Left Behind was enacted in 2002, it has been underfunded by \$27 billion. This year, President Bush's budget under-

funds No Child Left Behind by \$9.4 billion. It provides only half of the funding promised to after school programs. And it cuts \$316 million from vocational education and community colleges—again.

What do those numbers mean to the young boy or girl in San Bernardino? What do they mean to our children across the country?

It means that 2.4 million children will not get the help with reading and math they were promised. It means that over 1 million children who were promised after school programs will not get them. It means that many of them will not be able to afford the cost of college.

There should be more Title III funding, which provides for bilingual programs for LEP (Limited English Proficient) students. California will receive over \$138 million in Title III funding, but this is not enough to reach these students' needs.

Last school year, 25.3 percent of students in California were English learners. And this number is likely to grow significantly.

I am grateful that this House passed my amendment to H.R. 2211, the Ready to Teach Act, last summer which will allow the use of funds for teacher training on technology for bilingual students. I am also looking at legislation to address teacher retention and an increase in incentives for teaching in minority serving institutions.

There is a long list of problems not addressed by H.R. 4409 or H.R. 4411 and more must be done. Our students and teachers deserve more than merely lip service. They need the funds and support from this Congress to provide equal educational opportunities for all.

IN VERMONT, FOOD FROM FAMILY FARMS IS GOOD BUSINESS

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 2004

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize that two businessmen in Vermont, Steve Birge and Mark Curran, the owners of Black River Produce of Proctorsville, VT, were recently selected runners-up for the National Small Business Person of the Year by the Small Business Administration.

Twenty-five years ago Steve Birge began Black River Produce, today a \$27 million produce company, when he saw the poor quality of the produce used in the local restaurant in which he worked. Black River originally delivered fresh, local produce to local restaurants in the Proctorsville area of central Vermont. But after he met Mark Curran (while hitchhiking), the two expanded the company, working with local farmers so that they could supply restaurants with the freshest and most healthful produce available. Today, Black River delivers high-quality produce not only throughout Vermont, but also into parts of western New Hampshire, northern Massachusetts, and eastern New York. It supplies not just restaurants, but grocery stores, schools, hospitals, ski areas, and nursing homes.

Black River Produce has sales of more than \$27 million a year, a work force of 100 employees, and a fleet of 30 refrigerated trucks and two tractor trailers.

I salute Black River Produce's commitment to providing its customers with the highest