

was able to make any necessary adjustments to keep the ship running smoothly.

I speak for everyone on my staff when I say that I hold a deep respect and admiration for Janelle, as a professional and as a human being. The quiet strength and grace with which she has faced incredibly challenging times is something for which we are all very proud. Even in the depths of her deepest struggles, she never lost her spirit, integrity and professionalism. She has made a deep and lasting impression on each of us. Her caring heart and infectious laugh will be dearly missed.

I would like to personally thank Janelle on behalf of my family and myself. Janelle has worked with extraordinary effectiveness and patience to ensure that the demands of my service don't come at the expense of my family.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Janelle Garcia today. All of my best thoughts are with her and her daughters as they open this next chapter in their lives.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO  
PROVIDE HEALTH CARE COV-  
ERAGE AND FOOD STAMPS TO  
THE UNEMPLOYED

**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to provide health care insurance and food stamp benefits to the unemployed.

There are 8.4 million unemployed Americans. These Americans live week to week by depleting their savings and relying on meager unemployment compensation payments. They live in fear of emergencies that could send themselves, or one of their children, to a hospital. In this desperate situation, how can a family pay for health insurance, which costs an average of \$4,358 per year?

To help these people through a difficult period in their life, I am introducing legislation to provide health care and food stamp benefits to the unemployed.

Most people who receive unemployment compensation cannot obtain food stamps. The food stamp program treats unemployment compensation as "income" even though the unemployed are not really earning income. To prevent the wealthy from abusing this benefit, the bill retains the food stamp asset test. The asset test prevents people with large savings, stocks, etc. from receiving food stamps. To receive food stamps an eligible household's liquid assets may not exceed \$2,000. This asset test excludes the value of a residence, business assets, household belongings, and certain other resources.

The bill provides a subsidy to cover laid-off workers' COBRA premiums. The COBRA program will allow individuals to continue to use the insurance plans they know and trust. For unemployed workers who do not qualify for COBRA, the bill includes language to provide Medicaid coverage for the uninsured and their spouses and dependents.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and provide a helping hand to unemployed workers.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE  
TONY HALL

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, July 26, 2002*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a junior Member of Congress, I have not known TONY HALL nearly as long as many of our colleagues who have spoken with such eloquence of his accomplishments and his record as a leader in the fight against hunger.

But even in the brief time I have known him, I have been greatly impressed with his deep commitment to trying to make life better for people throughout the world. And I have also greatly appreciated the way he has helped me to do a better job in representing my constituents and to be a better and more effective Member of the House of Representatives.

In particular, I have benefited from his cooperation and assistance with my efforts to expedite the cleanup and closure of Rocky Flats—a former DOE nuclear-weapons site in my District—and to assist the people who work there to make the transition to new careers or secure retirement. Because of his own first-hand experience with a site in his District, Tony understood the challenges and opportunities at Rocky Flats. And because of his generosity and readiness to help, great progress has been made in meeting those challenges and making the most of those opportunities.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleagues in praising TONY HALL for his leadership and breadth of vision and in wishing him every success in the important new duties he will be assuming. And I also want to add a personal note of thanks and to say that I deeply respect him and am very glad to have had the chance to benefit from our brief time together here in the House of Representatives.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 5005, HOMELAND SEC-  
URITY ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 25, 2002*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose this rule because I would like to consider this important issue, but I am very concerned with the process of bringing this legislation before this body.

Mr. Speaker, since we began looking at proposals here in the House of Representatives, more questions have arisen than have been answered. We have put this legislation on a "fast track" to passage, primarily for reasons of public relations, and hence have short-circuited the deliberative process. It has been argued that the reason for haste is the seriousness of the issue, but frankly I have always held that the more serious the issue is, the more deliberative we here ought to be.

Instead of a carefully crafted product of meaningful deliberations, I fear we are once again about to pass a hastily drafted bill in order to appear that we are "doing some-

thing." Over the past several months, Congress has passed a number of hastily crafted measures that do little, if anything, to enhance the security of the American people. Instead, these measures grow the size of the Federal Government, erode constitutional liberties, and endanger our economy by increasing the federal deficit and raiding the social security trust fund. The American people would be better served if we gave the question of how to enhance security from international terrorism the serious consideration it deserves rather than blindly expanding the Federal Government. Congress should also consider whether our hyper-interventionist foreign policy really benefits the American people.

Serious and substantive questions about this reorganization have been raised. Many of these questions have yet to be resolved. Just because a bill has been reported from the Select Committee does not mean that a consensus exists. Indeed, even a couple of days before consideration, this bill it was impossible to get access to the legislation in the form introduced in the committee, let alone as amended by the committee.

In the course of just one week, the President's original 52-page proposal swelled to 232 pages, with most members, including myself, unable to review the greatly expanded bill. While I know that some of those additions are positive, such as Mr. ARMEY's amendments to protect the privacy of American citizens, it is impossible to fully explore the implications of this, the largest departmental reorganization in the history of our Federal Government, without sufficient time to review the bill. This is especially the case in light of the fact that a number of the recommendations of the standing committees were not incorporated in the legislation, thus limiting our ability to understand how our constituents will be affected by this legislation.

I have attempted to be a constructive part of this very important process. From my seat on the House International Relations Committee I introduced amendments that would do something concrete to better secure our homeland. Unfortunately, my amendments were not adopted in the form I offered them. Why? Was it because they did not deal substantively with the issues at hand? Was it because they addressed concerns other than those this new department should address? No, amazingly I was told that my amendments were too "substantive." My amendments would have made it impossible for more people similar to those who hijacked those aircraft to get into our country. They would have denied certain visas and identified Saudi Arabia as a key problem in our attempt to deal with terrorism. Those ideas were deemed too controversial, so they are not included in this bill.

I also introduced four amendments to the bill itself, including those that would prohibit a national identification card, that would prohibit the secretary of this new department from moving money to other agencies and departments without congressional oversight, that would deny student visas to nationals of Saudi Arabia, and that would deny student and diversity visas to nationals from terrorist-sponsoring countries. All of these amendments, which would have addressed some of the real issues of our security, were rejected. They were not even allowed onto the floor for a debate. This is yet more evidence of the failure of this process.