

Army will be lasting. Quite simply, he made a difference.

There are no words that can lessen the sorrow his family, friends, and colleagues are experiencing. It is always difficult to cope when someone is taken before their time, but the sense of loss is somehow amplified by the tragedy of these horrific circumstances. I hope that his family is comforted by the knowledge that he was admired, respected, and appreciated by all of us who knew him on Capitol Hill. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting General Maude. We will miss him.

STATEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 225—
EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT EVERY CITIZEN IS
ENCOURAGED TO DISPLAY THE FLAG

SPEECH OF

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 2001

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to vote for this resolution that I co-sponsor with my colleagues urging people to fly the American flag. Tuesday's act of terrorism is one of the greatest challenges in the history of our country. In times of austerity, in times of national tragedy—and this is the greatest we have ever seen on U.S. soil—it is important to unite, to come together, to comfort, indeed, to 'rally around the flag.'

In light of the tragedy that has struck directly thousands of families, we urge people to fly the flag as a show of solidarity with all the victims of this horrible assault on humanity, on the United States. The flag is an enduring symbol of American democracy and American freedom. It is a symbol of the courage and the bravery and the essential human kindness of our people. Its display—especially at times of national tragedy—is yet another in a number of spontaneous and empowering, very human responses that we have witnessed in the last 48 hours.

Let the flags around the country as they fly and are displayed in neighborhoods and on our buildings, send the signal that the United States remains united. We are so sorry and in such sorrow at the horrible loss of life and the unspeakable agony of those affected by this event. We are equally determined to ensure that the perpetrators of this crime will be found and properly punished. We will do everything in our power to make sure that what happened a couple days ago never, ever happens again. Finally, we are determined to adjust and adapt to this new world to give our government and our country and our people and institutions the support and unity which all of us need at this most trying moment for America and the American people.

TO CITY OF KEWAUNEE

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 2001

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 788 is special legislation which transfers a surplus

piece of Federal property to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin. This piece of property is no longer needed as an Army Reserve Center nor is it needed for any other federal government purpose.

I would like to thank the Gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN, for working with me to address my concerns regarding this piece of legislation. I know it was his desire to have H.R. 788 passed prior to the House breaking for summer recess. However, by waiting until today, we were able to work together over the recess period and produce a stronger bill.

The bill before us is significantly different from the bill as it was originally introduced. I will highlight the differences quickly. The bill specifies that the property must be used and occupied only by the City, or by another local or State government entity approved by the City. In addition, the bill includes a reversionary clause which states that, during the next 20 years, if the property is not used as intended, it will revert to the federal government. Furthermore, the bill states that the property cannot be used for commercial purposes.

In the 1949 Property Act, Congress lays out how surplus federal property is to be disposed. GSA is instructed to sell property for the most profit possible. Monies received are used for a number of things including environmental clean-up and land preservation.

However, the Act also listed a number of ways a piece of property can be transferred free of charge under what is called a "Public Benefit Conveyance" exception. Congress decided that the public interest in giving property away for "public benefit" outweighs potential profit from public sale. Included in the 1949 Act were four such public benefit exceptions: health, education, park and recreation, and historical monuments. Since 1949, the Act has been amended numerous times to add more public benefits. These additions are wildlife refuge, ports, prisons, airports, homeless, self-help housing, and law enforcement/emergency response.

The City of Kewaunee is interested in using this former Army Reserve Center to house its city hall, city council, and senior center. Those types of use do not fit into any of the 11 current exceptions. Therefore, the federal government cannot transfer this property free of charge without special legislation like that which is before us today.

Although I am pleased that the City of Kewaunee is able to benefit from this property transfer, this bill should not in any way be seen as setting a precedent for future special legislation. Congress can and should amend the Act if it determines that city halls or other exceptions should exist. With proper hearings and mark-ups, the Committee on Government Reform may decide that the definition of public purpose should be expanded. It may decide otherwise.

THOUGHTS ON THE WAR AGAINST
TERRORISM

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share these thoughts by Mark Helprin

in the September 12, 2001 Wall Street Journal. His argument makes an excellent case for a total and committed defense of our nation against the elements of international terrorism.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 12, 2001]

WE BEAT HITLER—WE CAN VANQUISH THIS FOE, TOO
(By Mark Helprin)

America, it is said, is slow to awaken, and indeed it is, but once America stirs, its resolution can be matchless and its ferocity a stunning surprise.

The enemy we face today, though barbaric and ingenious, is hardly comparable to the masters of the Third Reich, whose doubts about our ability to persevere we chose to dissuade in a Berlin that we had reduced to rubble. Nor is he comparable to the commanders of the Japanese Empire, whose doubts about our ability to persevere we chose to dissuade in a Tokyo we had reduced to rubble. Nor to the Soviet Empire that we faced down patiently over half a century, nor to the great British Empire from which we broke free in a long and taxing struggle that affords a better picture of our kith and kin than any the world may have today of who we are and of what we are capable.

And today's enemy, though he is not morally developed enough to comprehend the difference between civilians and combatants, is neither faceless nor without a place in which we can address him. If he is Osama bin Laden, he lives in Afghanistan, and his hosts, the Taliban, bear responsibility for sheltering him; if he is Saddam Hussein, he lives in Baghdad; if he is Yasser Arafat, he lives in Gaza; and so on. Our problem is not his anonymity but that we have refused the precise warnings, delivered over more than a decade, of those who understood the nature of what was coming—and of what is yet to come, which will undoubtedly be worse.

The first salvos of any war are seldom the most destructive. Consider that in this recent outrage the damage was done by the combined explosive power of three crashed civilian airliners. As the initial shock wears off it will be obvious that this was a demonstration shot intended to extract political concessions and surrender, a call to fix our attention on the prospect of a nuclear detonation or a chemical or biological attack, both of which would exceed what happened yesterday by several orders of magnitude.

It will get worse, but appeasement will make it no better. That we have promised retaliation for decades and then always drawn back, hoping that we could get through if we simply did not provoke the enemy, is appeasement, and it must be quite clear by now even to those who perpetually appease that appeasement simply does not work. Therefore, what must be done? Above all, we must make no promise of retaliation that is not honored; in this we have erred too many times. It is a bipartisan failing and it should never be repeated.

Let this spectacular act of terrorism be the decisive repudiation of the mistaken assumptions that conventional warfare is a thing of the past, that there is a safe window in which we can cut force structure while investing in the revolution in military affairs, that bases and infrastructure abroad have become unnecessary, that the day of the infantryman is dead, and, most importantly, that slighting military expenditure and preparedness is anything but an invitation to death and defeat.

Short of a major rebuilding, we cannot now inflict upon Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden the great and instantaneous shock with which they should be afflicted. That requires not surgical strikes by aircraft based

in the United States, but expeditionary forces with extravagant basing and equipment. It requires not 10 aircraft carrier battle groups but, to do it right and when and where needed, 20. It requires not only all the infantry divisions, transport, and air wings that we have needlessly given up in the last decade, but many more. It requires special operations forces not of 35,000, but of 100,000.

For the challenge is asymmetrical. Terrorist camps must be raided and destroyed, and their reconstitution continually repressed. Intelligence gathering of all types must be greatly augmented, for by its nature it can never be sufficient to the task, so we must build it and spend upon it until it hurts. The nuclear weapons programs, depots, and infrastructure of what Madeleine Albright so delicately used to call “states of concern” must, in a most un-Albrightian phrase, be destroyed. As they are scattered around the globe, it cannot be easy. Security and civil defense at home and at American facilities overseas must be strengthened to the point where we are able to fight with due diligence in this war that has been brought to us now so vividly by an alien civilization that seeks our destruction.

The course of such a war will bring us greater suffering than it has brought to date, and if we are to fight it as we must we will have less in material things. But if, as we have so many times before, we rise to the occasion, we will not enjoy merely the illusions of safety, victory, and honor, but those things themselves. In our history it is clear that never have they come cheap and often they have come late, but always, in the end, they come in flood, and always in the end, the decision is ours.

IN MEMORY OF LINDA M. GEORGE
AND CHRISTOPHER ZARBA

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week I offered remarks on three of my constituents who were lost in Tuesday’s tragic attacks. As the days have progressed, I have learned that other people from my district were also killed.

I would like to take just a minute of the House’s time to honor two people: Linda M. George and Christopher Zarba.

Linda George, 27, was one of seven employees from the TJX Companies who died on American Airlines Flight 11, which was hijacked and crashed into the World Trade Center.

Linda lived in Westborough, and was planning to get married on October 20 in Worcester. She graduated from St. Peter-Marian and Providence College. She was a passionate worker, a terrific athlete and a great friend to those who knew her.

She leaves behind her parents, Richard and Carolyn and her fiancee, Jeff Pereira.

Christopher Zarba, 47, was from Hopkinton. He was a software engineer for Concord Communications, Inc. He was also killed on American Airlines Flight 11.

His loss has been deeply felt by his family and his colleagues at Concord. Saturday would have been his 48th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of my colleagues join me in mourning the loss of these and every victim of Tuesday’s tragedy. Our deep-

est sympathies go out to their families at this difficult time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

URGING TOLERANCE IN THE WAKE
OF TUESDAY’S ACTS OF TER-
RORISM

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the terrorist acts perpetrated in New York City and Washington, DC, I am heartened by the American people’s extraordinary display of kindness and cooperation. I have been moved by how our diverse Nation has come together in a united show of support—men and women, children and adults, Christians and Muslims, Jews and Buddhists, Hindus and Catholics, Latinos and Caucasians, Asian Americans and African Americans.

However, I am concerned about reports of anti-Arab and anti-Muslim acts committed by some in our communities. American Muslims and Arab Americans share our commitment to the American ideals of freedom, justice, and democracy. They live, work, and have established businesses in our communities. Their children attend schools alongside our children. They support our community organizations. They are our neighbors and our friends.

Acts of discrimination only serve to divide our Nation and weaken our strength.

Our Nation is made stronger when we embrace our diversity. We know that any discrimination stands in direct opposition to the ideals our founders set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Today I joined my Congressional colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution condemning acts of hatred or discrimination against people of Middle Eastern and South Asian descent. The resolution encourages “people of every faith and heritage to stand together in this time of national crisis.”

I urge all United States citizens to reject misguided acts of prejudice and to continue their unwavering support for our Nation and its ideals of freedom and peace.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF THE LAND TRUST OF
NAPA COUNTY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous contributions of the Land Trust of Napa County over the past 25 years. The Land Trust has experienced great success since two of its founders, F.S. (Si) and June Foote, realized their hopes of preserving the environmental identity of the Napa Valley.

In 1976, Harry Tranmer, Vic Fershko, John Whitridge joined the Footes as founding board members just as other land trust organizations were beginning to have success across the nation. From its humble roots in the Foote’s

living room, the Land Trust of Napa County has now become a model for land trusts around the country.

The Land Trust achieved great success because of the hard work of its members and the dedication of people in Napa County to protect and enrich the environment in which they live. The first piece of land donated to the Land Trust was a 640-acre parcel on Mt. George in eastern Napa. Since then, the Land Trust has succeeded in securing over 25,000 acres of land for future generations of residents in the Napa Valley.

At a time when commercial and residential development of land is destroying the natural characteristics of agricultural lands and open space, the Land Trust has been instrumental in preserving the Napa Valley’s unique beauty and heritage. In addition to purchasing land, the Land Trust works to monitor and enforce programs for conservation easements. Its monitoring program, for which it has recently hired an Easement Monitoring Coordinator, is used by organizations in the Bay Area, across California, nationwide to develop a standard monitoring and enforcement process.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the Land Trust of Napa County’s 25th Anniversary, I would like to recognize its outstanding contributions to our generation and future generations in the Napa Valley.

HOW WILL WE ACT!

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the comments of my Chief of Staff, Kurt Schwartz, which reflects the feelings of many Americans in reacting to the terrorist attack. “Will we forget? Will the sick, sinking feeling fade? Will we once again fail to follow through on fine words and dramatic promises? Or will “Remember the Trade Center” replace “Remember Pearl Harbor?” Will we act with resolve, or will we do too little?

As Margaret Thatcher noted at another time of crisis, “This is no time to go wobbly.” We have implacable enemies. We must deal with them implacably. They do not hesitate to spill blood, including their own. We must not hesitate to return their wrath. Anything else is futile.

Democracy is self-absorbed, and can underestimate threats from abroad. But it can also rouse itself to righteous anger in crisis. Our duty is to direct that anger, give it purpose, use it to defend democracy and freedom. Before forgetfulness seeps in.”

VICTIMS OF TERRORISM RELIEF
ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to offer my support for H.R. 2884, Victims of Terrorism Relief Act of 2001. We have all heard and read stories of the heroic acts of these individuals, which bestows a