

Further progress will not be possible without a significant reduction in the level of violence.

Both sides now have an important opportunity to break from the events of the past year to begin to build a new relationship. Both sides must follow through on their commitments to fully implement the Mitchell Committee recommendations.

The President and the Secretary have been deeply engaged and will continue to do everything possible to help the two sides end the violence and encourage the resumption of a meaningful political dialogue. Thank you again for your support.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. KELLY,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Legislative Affairs.

UNITING AND STRENGTHENING
AMERICA BY PROVIDING APPROPRIATE
TOOLS REQUIRED TO INTERCEPT
AND OBSTRUCT TERRORISM (USA PATRIOT) ACT OF
2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 2001

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, recently the House considered its version of the Counter Terrorism bill H.R. 2975. I voted against that measure. I voted against that bill for many of the very same provisions in H.R. 3162, the anti-terrorism measure before us today. As such, I must also vote against H.R. 3162. I would, first, like to commend the work of Mr. Conyers. He has stood steadfast and vigilant in attempt to protect the civil liberties of our nation's citizens. I, like many in this body, fear that our nation's tradition of civil liberties will be sacrificed at the altar of our war on terrorism. Do not be mistaken, for I realize that terrorism is a clear and present evil that our country faces—worthy of vigorous combat to defeat it. However, if, in our effort to stamp out terrorism, we stamp out the very freedoms that make us Americans, we will have made a grave mistake.

I will vote against this bill and express my opinion that vigilance must abide to ensure that our nation does not succumb to terrorism from beyond, but also to ensure that we do not succumb to tyranny from within as well. I raise my voice to state forthrightly that I will be vigilante of all of those who seek to take advantage of the predicament that our new war on terrorism presents. This measure grants our nation's legal apparatus new and unprecedented powers. Power that, if unchecked, could easily be used to trample over our hard won liberties.

It is true that many objectionable measures have been eliminated from the bill. No longer does the bill allow the indefinite detention of aliens prior to trial. I am particularly pleased that the measure provides for a new Inspector General in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to ensure that these laws are not used to trample our freedoms. It is also good to know that a person cannot be convicted of evidence from a foreign country that would not be admissible in U.S. courts.

Although these important changes have been made, the measure still raises significant

concerns. The bill contains language sunseting its provisions in a 4-year period. While this is better than nothing I have no doubt that we should revisit these laws in two years time to assess the government's administration of them. This bill allows the use of roving wiretaps. This means one judge can issue an order that allows the authorities to listen to any phone that a suspect may potentially use. Here, I fear any shaky justification given by authorities can be used to order wiretaps on a broad and sweeping level, possibly leading to tapping the lines of many who are not at all related to the neither a terrorist, nor criminal plot.

The bill also expands the authority of the government to conduct so-called sneak and peak searches. Imagine your house was wiretapped based on inadequate suspicion giving rise to the authorization of a roving wiretap of a third-party suspected terrorist. Imagine further that based on evidence from this roving wiretap, the police are authorized to come in and search your home and personal belongings without notifying you. Surely these powers should be reviewed at least within a two-year period.

These scenarios could play out in infinite ways. There are unforeseen variables that we just cannot quantify that may allow authorities to abuse the rights of our citizens. If we had truly been given the opportunity to debate these issues in their entirety on the floor of the House, we probably could have resolved them in a way that sufficiently balanced our security needs against our civil rights. After all, following vigorous debate, the measure presented by the House Committee on the Judiciary passed with unanimous support. It was my desire to see vigorous debate on the floor of the House so that at Conference a measure could be crafted that would have received the unanimous vote of both the House and Senate and the support of the White House. Unfortunately, the Republican Majority and the White House had alternative plans.

It is unfortunate that my only hope is that the new Inspector General will be vigorous in its assessment of the government's activity. The Inspector General will need to act decisively and with authority given the unprecedented authority we bestow on the government today.

In light of this, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

TRIBUTE TO ALLENE MITCHELL
PENROD

HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 2001

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, Allene Mitchell Penrod was born September 3, 1911, weighing in at a mere two pounds, and as she celebrates her 90th year, continues to be active both mentally and physically. She has been a wife, is a mother, a career woman, and since 1985, a breast cancer survivor.

Allene is a very talented seamstress who discovered her talent for sewing skills at an early age, making rag dolls, doll clothes, and toys with which to play. Later, she honed her skills by taking sewing classes in school. From that time on, she made her own clothes,

clothes for her children, and even made her first bra at age 20. Perhaps her abilities can best be described by the following article that was published in The Daily Oklahoman. This article appeared in the Women's Section on July 15, 1984, when Allene was awarded the "Oklahoma Golden Thimble Award", an honor bestowed on expert seamstresses in the state.

GRANDMA TEACHES KIN TO LOVE STITCH PROJECTS

"Love what you are doing," is the advice Allene Penrod of Roosevelt gives beginning seamstresses. But this advice is not always necessary. Granddaughter Krystal Mahoney sews and learns from her. Allene see that Krystal studies patterns and follows instructions.

"Mother is a unique woman," Krystal's mother, Beth Mahoney, wrote as she nominated Allene for the Golden Thimble award. "She has the ability to make that sewing machine create anything. Taking advantage of her skills, I never learned to sew. She has taken on the task of teaching my 11-year-old daughter to sew. Mother's patience has paid off. Krystal has won blue ribbons on her blouse, skirt, and other 4-H projects. For her grandchildren, Mother has designed and made costumes, doll clothes, and even sheep blankets for their show animals. For the community's haunted house, she made a gorilla suit and a werewolf costume and others."

"I have three chairs in my living room that she upholstered for me. She also knits and crochets afghans, stocking caps, doll clothes, stuffed animals, and Christmas stockings. We are very proud of the handmade tablecloths and quilts she has made us. In addition to the fun things, she even does my patching, and when patches are not available, she reweaves wool garments. This 72-year-old is a quiet, sweet lady, and I love her dearly."

Allene remade countless sports uniforms so that her grandsons would look neat on the field and court. She continues to make prom dresses for her daughter, Beth, who is no longer a student, but attends school proms with her husband, who is a school board member. A Roosevelt Roughrider pillow, an afghan, and window shades personalize grandson Jeff's room. Other grandsons have received crocheted tablecloths, place mats, and afghans. Each of her three children, seven grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren has one or more treasures made by Allene. Her family treasures a flower garden quilt Allene made in 1934.

Beth describes Allene as a perfectionist who usually has two projects going simultaneously—while she attends basketball and baseball games and sheep shows.

Allene is a devout Christian who is much loved by her family. We wish her the best for her 90th birthday with many more to come.

ECONOMIC SECURITY AND
RECOVERY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 24, 2001

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for enacting an economic stimulus package, and to voice my opposition to H.R. 3090, the Economic Stimulus and Recovery Act in its current form.

A more fiscally responsible approach to induce economic growth would combine tax cuts and increased spending within the confines of Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan's cost recommendations. Mr. Greenspan recommended a total package not to exceed 1 percent of GDP or \$100 billion including the relief measures already enacted by Congress. The tax cuts must contain taxpayer rebate checks for those who did not receive them last summer, enhanced expensing for business capital purchases, and marginal tax rate adjustments to foster spending. The elements of the package should be limited to those projects which will provide immediate economic impact, such as extended unemployment benefits, health care coverage for furloughed workers, and increased security measures. In order to continue bipartisanship in our Congress, Democrats and Republicans should work together to enact a measure containing these provisions.

An effective plan must focus on the people most impacted by the economic downturn. Immediate relief and direct payments through rebate checks for the 30 million Americans who were omitted from the tax relief provided earlier this year must be an integral part of the stimulus package. These individuals are most in need and most likely to spend their rebates, making both common sense and economic sense.

Tax cuts should be temporarily targeted to induce investment and encourage cash flow in the economy. The temporary nature encourages individuals and business to immediately take advantage of proposals rather than wait several years to invest in new infrastructure or capital markets. Changes in expensing and capital loss will meet these goals by proving short term investment incentives to businesses and individuals. H.R. 3090 contains many unnecessary provisions, such as the repeat of the corporate alternative minimum tax retroactive to 1986. This will give 50 of the wealthiest corporations \$20 billion in refunds.

Sufficient funds should be available to ensure continued health coverage and unemployment benefits in the case of a prolonged recession. Providing COBRA health—insurance should be a top priority to guarantee the continued health for those unable to purchase their own coverage, such as victims and their families or displaced workers. H.R. 3090 is inadequate to address the nation's needs in these areas. We must increase security infrastructure spending. We should also include additional investments, such as those contained in the Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2001, in our nation's public health system to better respond to bioterrorism threats. Not only does this protect our country from future attacks, it provides jobs and cash flow into the economy. Irresponsibly spending too much without offsetting the cost will lead to future long term budget deficits and interest rate increases.

Mr. Speaker, I support a bipartisan economic stimulus package that will effectively and responsibly improve our economy and win the war on terrorism without raiding Social Security and Medicare.

WORKING WITH REPRESSIVE REGIMES IN CENTRAL ASIA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 2001

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for United States policy in our war on terrorism. The President has my full backing in what will clearly be a long and arduous battle to track down and stamp out terrorist organizations. In the end, I am confident that we will prevail over these forces of evil and barbarism.

At the same time, we must strike a balance between our need for allies in the region and our commitment to advancing the cause of freedom and human rights. In Central Asia, for example, I support our efforts to work closely with Uzbekistan and appreciate that the fact that we have received permission from that nation to use its military bases. However, Uzbekistan is an authoritarian state which has also reportedly imprisoned over 7,000 political prisoners in poor conditions. Next door, in Kazakhstan, the repressive and corrupt regime of Nursultan Nazarbayev has also offered to provide as yet unspecified assistance to the coalition.

All of us welcome support from the nations of Central Asia and hope to welcome them someday into the family of democracies, but I am concerned that there may be an implicit quid pro quo in such assistance. I hope that these countries do not expect the U.S. to ease the pressure to end human rights abuses and to promote democratic reform. In this connection, both the Financial Times and the Washington Post have recently printed editorials warning about the pitfalls of cooperation with repressive regimes in Central Asia and elsewhere.

The Financial Times, for example stated on September 17 that "the US must be careful not to align itself too closely with authoritarian regimes that have dreadful records of suppressing minority groups. An anti-terrorist campaign must never be used as a convenient excuse for repressing political opponents . . ."

Similarly, a Washington Post editorial of September 24 warned that "In forming tactical bonds with such nations, America must not forget what it is fighting for as well as what it is fighting against." The editorial goes on to say that "in the long run, democracy will be the best antidote to religious extremism." In this connection, it is important for the U.S. to be seen as clearly promoting the freedoms that President Bush championed in his address to Congress on September 20: "our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other."

I believe that as we work with the governments of Central Asia to destroy the al-Qaeda terrorist network, we should also caution that repression and corruption are creating ideal conditions for Islamic extremism to flourish within their borders. Islamic extremist groups will never run out of recruits as long as the Soviet era dictators in Central Asia continue their repressive and corrupt ways. In this regard, I am particularly concerned about Kazakhstan, which is the crown jewel of the region because of its oil, gas and mineral

wealth. I shudder to think what an Islamic extremist government would do with that country's wealth.

As we have done in other regions of importance to the United States, we must expand our efforts to promote pluralism, tolerance, and openness in Central Asia. The people of these nations deserve a political avenue to express their opinions and grievances. Extremist Islam must not be the only outlet for Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tajiks, and other Central Asians as it unfortunately has become for so many other people in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full texts of the Financial Times and Washington Post editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Financial Times, Mon., Sept. 17, 2001]

DOUBTFUL ALLIES IN CENTRAL ASIA

Colin Powell, the US secretary of state, has said that the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington create a new benchmark by which the US will measure its allies. Just as Washington's relations with other states during the cold war were determined by their alignment towards the Soviet Union, so the US will now judge nations by how fiercely they oppose international terrorism. This tilt of the prism could lead to some surprising—and potentially disturbing—new alignments.

So far, the US has done an impressive job in marshalling international support. It is now trying to court the countries near Afghanistan, including Pakistan, Russia, and China, which Washington has previously accused of giving succour to rogue states. The US is also trying to win support from the five former Soviet central Asian states. All these countries realise that they have a common interest in pre-empting terrorism in a world in which every commercial airliner has been turned into a potential bomb. But some may also see domestic tactical advantages in backing any forthcoming US offensive.

In prosecuting its new war against terrorism the US must therefore be careful not to align itself too closely with authoritarian regimes that have dreadful records of suppressing minority groups. An anti-terrorist campaign must never be used as a convenient excuse for repressing political opponents or turned into an anti-Muslim crusade.

FOCUS ON PAKISTAN

The immediate focus is on Pakistan, which is one of the few countries to recognize the Taliban leadership in neighbouring Afghanistan. As it shelters an estimated 2m Afghan refugees, Pakistan well knows the tragedies of its troubled neighbour. The US provided strong support to Pakistan during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan but has since distanced itself from the military regime of General Pervez Musharraf. Washington continues to uphold sanctions against Pakistan first imposed after Islamabad exploded a nuclear bomb. It has also expressed concern that Pakistan supports militants in Kashmir.

CO-OPERATION WITH US

In spite of the presence of Muslim extremists within Pakistan, Gen Musharraf can doubtless see the advantages of co-operating with the US. But he will, in turn, surely expect the US to legitimise his regime and help persuade the International Monetary Fund to release fresh funds for Pakistan. He may also want foreign powers to tone down their criticisms of his military rule and quietly forget about his promises to restore democracy by October 2002. Washington should resist making such explicit trade-offs.