

organizations over the years have also exacted their toll from our nation and our people. Go back to that statistic I quoted earlier. Sixty percent of all people arrested in New York City by the DEA and the DEA Task Force were identified as being foreign born. Over the years, how many people may have lost their lives or suffered terribly at the hands of narcotics traffickers? What of the impact of other criminal aliens? We have seen the rise of ethnic organized crime throughout our nation. How many more people have fallen victim to these criminals? The most effective way of dealing with these criminals is to beef up the interior enforcement program of the INS. Any law enforcement agency has two primary goals. Goal one is the detection of crime and the successful investigation, apprehension and prosecution of the criminal who commits the crime. The second goal is to be a credible deterrent to those who would violate the laws which fall under the jurisdiction of that law enforcement agency. This goal is directly dependent on how effectively the agency carries out its first goal. Without an effective interior enforcement program, criminal aliens are emboldened to attempt to enter our nation to commit their crimes. They are not deterred by a program that lacks manpower and leadership. We need to change the reality and consequently, the perception. Not only to prevent future terrorist attacks, but to also deter criminal activities of a wide spectrum of criminals who still find America to be a "Land of Opportunity".

Please understand, I am not opposed to the lawful entry of aliens who come to the United States to share the "American Dream", I only take issue with those who come here in violation of law and who end up creating America's nightmares. Indeed, my own mother was welcomed by this country shortly before the Second World War, enabling her to survive, while her mother, for whom I am named, perished in the Holocaust. We simply need to know who we are admitting and having an agency that possesses the resources to not only track aliens who end up violating their Immigration status, but also has the resources to track them down and ultimately, when appropriate, remove them from the United States. This capability is a matter of nothing less than national security.

ESSAY BY PHILIP ALDRIDGE

HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 2001

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of September 11th, our view of America has shifted. It is as if someone cleaned the window of our perspective, removing the dirt of cynicism and distrust and allowing us to see anew the opportunities that being Americans offers us. Suddenly, we have joined together, united in our resolve to both fight for freedom and to appreciate the freedoms we have. Rather than bickering over petty differences, we find ourselves more willing to reach out to each other, more aware of the basic truths on which our country was founded, and more thankful to those who fought and died to ensure that we can enjoy freedom.

Our renewed sense of patriotism and gratefulness is expressed through the eyes of our young people. Philip Aldridge, an eighth grader from Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, reminds us about how blessed we are to call ourselves

Americans. His essay, "America's Heroes", was written in honor of Veteran's Day on November 11th. I would like to thank Philip for sharing his thoughts with me. His words inspire us to show appreciation for the freedoms we enjoy but often take for granted.

AMERICA'S HEROES

(By Philip Aldridge)

Have you ever stopped and thought about how nice it is to live in America? More often than not, our society takes the hard-earned freedoms that have been bestowed upon us for granted. These rights and freedoms upon which our country was built have been challenged many times and yet we still stand strong and united. For this we can recognize all the men and women of America who have fought with great pride and who gave their lives for what they so strongly believed in. These are our veterans.

Our country enjoys many freedoms not recognized by many. But do you realize that these are what make our nation strong? One of these rights is freedom of religion. Our country was inhabited and founded by men and women who unfortunately had religion forced upon them. Religious tolerance, which means the willingness to accept faith different from your own, was put into place during the birth of our country.

Every four years we elect a president. And every four years, people complain about who was elected. If you look at other countries, the people don't even choose who their leader is. In most cases, the leader either comes from a line of royalty or he assembles himself with full power. We the people of America, are very fortunate to have a freedom to vote.

The most well-known freedom in our society is freedom of equality. In the Declaration of Independence, it states that all men are created equal. This means that whether you're of a different race or if you're a male or female, everyone has equal rights.

Any citizen of the United States should be deeply grateful for these freedoms for which soldiers have fought and defended. We can show appreciation for these privileges by serving our country, respecting its laws, and honoring America's heroes and patriots . . . our veterans.

IN HONOR OF RITA J. KAPLAN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 2001

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Rita J. Kaplan, who is the driving force behind the new mammography clinic at Bellevue Hospital in New York City.

Ms. Kaplan is an inspiration to us all. She is a known fighter and victor for important causes. She fights for what she believes in and never loses her sense of compassion for others.

Ms. Kaplan realized the need for a new clinic at Bellevue Hospital when a family member was diagnosed with breast cancer. Ms. Kaplan's four grandparents, who arrived in the early 1890's, had a history of receiving extraordinary and caring treatment at Bellevue, and she wanted to make sure that today's Bellevue patients continue to receive first class care. Recognizing that Bellevue's mammography clinic needed refurbishment and new equipment, Ms. Kaplan devoted her con-

siderable energies and resources to making Bellevue's facility the finest available. In her honor, Bellevue is naming the new center, the Rita J. Kaplan Breast Imaging Center.

As a child, Ms. Kaplan wanted to be a doctor, but while in college at the University of Wisconsin, she turned to a career in social work. She continued on with her education, receiving a master's degree in social work from Columbia University. She was trained as a clinical social worker and received advance training at the Ackerman Institute, in family therapy.

In the early 1980s, she and her husband, Stanley H. Kaplan, donated a fund to found the Rita J. and Stanley H. Kaplan Comprehensive Cancer Center. They also donated \$2 million to help establish a new home for the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services, which was named in their honor.

Ms. Kaplan, a life-long crusader and political activist, is a member of the Board and Executive Committee of the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services; Chairperson of the Management Committee of Jewish Connections, Divisional Committee of JBFC; Member of the Management Committee at Kaplan House; and a Member of the Board of Sutton Place Synagogue where she sits on the Rabbi's Committee. She also sits on various UJA-Federation committees.

Ms. Kaplan served on boards of the Hemlock Farms Community Association in the Poconos; the Brooklyn Philharmonic Orchestra; the Madeline Borg Community Services Divisional Committee; and the Board of the Solomon Schechter High School of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the work of Rita J. Kaplan, and I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in recognizing her contributions to the New York community and to our country. Thank you.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS IN HONORING THE CREW AND PASSENGERS OF UNITED AIR- LINES FLIGHT 93

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 5, 2001

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3248 and wish to fully express my gratitude to the crew of United Flight 93, and especially its captain, Jason M. Dahl. It was with immense sadness that I learned that the Dahl family and indeed all of Colorado had been robbed on September 11th of a good man and a good father. Mr. Dahl's family, to paraphrase President Lincoln, must feel enormous pride for having laid such a costly sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

According to a friend, Dahl learned to fly before he learned to drive. A neighbor remembered Dahl's football and baseball games in the street with neighborhood children and his commitment to his family and his community. Having read the statements of those who eulogized him, I cannot help but conclude that the gentleman flying that plane was one of America's best—a great father and husband alike. Since September 11th, America has rediscovered the importance of family, and turned to family members for comfort and understanding. It is no small tragedy that the

Dahl family does not have this luxury, having been left incomplete on September 11th.

Most of us saw evil on that day watching the pictures of the two planes collide with the World Trade Towers in New York City. Jason Dahl almost surely saw evil in a different form. He must have seen it in the faces of the hijackers and known that it was in their hearts.

The loss of Mr. Dahl and all of the passengers aboard Flight 93 will not be forgotten—certainly not by this body. This morning, we passed a resolution calling for a plaque to be placed on the grounds of the Capitol memorializing their deaths. I would suggest that their memory will go much farther. The fact that this great building and its dome—two irreplaceable symbols of American democracy—still stand today will always be a living memorial to their sacrifice.

My prayers, Mr. Speaker, are with all of the innocent civilians who died aboard that plane, and especially Jason Dahl and his family.

TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 2001

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my views on H.R. 3210, the Terrorism Risk Protection Act.

With the unexpected attacks on New York City and Washington, DC on September 11th, the United States has fought many battles in the past two months. The loss of lives, jobs, homes and businesses have had unforeseen effects on our country, and the world.

Under such circumstances, it is our duty as Americans to rise in support of our country. As a Member of Congress, it is my job to look out for the best interest of those affected by such tragedies. H.R. 3210, in its original state, did provide for the interests of Americans.

While I was supportive of the bipartisan bill as approved by the Financial Services Committee, I am very disappointed with the significant changes made by the majority leadership in the Rules Committee. Unnecessary provisions were added in an effort to open this legislation up for partisan tort reform.

The revised legislation limits the rights of a victim to seek legal action due to terrorist attacks. In addition, the restrictions include a complete ban on punitive damages, as well as non-economic damages. Such restrictions on damages will severely limit the possibility of victims to receive compensation for negligence.

The bill will force every legal action involving a terrorist-related claim into federal court even though states are the traditional arena for deciding such cases. This bill is written so broadly that its restrictions would apply to any future legal action involving terrorism, even if an insurance company were not a party to the action.

I supported a compromise in which the insurance industry was to assume appropriate financial responsibility. There is simply no need for such broad and controversial tort reform provisions to be attached to this measure.

The minority substitute, which I support, strikes the tort provisions, requires an industry

deductible, and ensures affordable and available coverage.

The underlying goal today is not only about helping the economy, and the insurance and reinsurance companies. Victim's rights should not be limited. H.R. 3210, without the Democratic substitute amendment, limits the rights of victims, and leaves who is left accountable in question.

It's true; the insurance industry faces a rough road ahead. It's true that this industry is essential to America's economy. While I do agree with the underlying concept of protecting the insurance industry, I could not vote for final passage of this legislation in its current form.

BIPARTISAN TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 2001

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3005, the so-called Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority legislation, also known as "fast track," proposed by Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Thomas.

While I believe deeply in the benefits of free trade, this shortsighted bill ignores the need to protect workers and the environment in our international trade agenda. It also jeopardizes the environmental, health, and safety laws here in the United States.

I have supported a number of trade agreements negotiated by Presidents in the past, but fast track is unique. As the mechanism that authorizes the President to negotiate trade agreements, it is the one chance Congress gets to direct the objectives and the scope of the U.S. trade agenda for the next seven years. It is the primary opportunity for Congress to design trade goals that reflect American ideals for human rights, labor rights, and environmental protection.

It is outrageous that recent trade agreements have given foreign companies veto power over our regulatory authority at the local, state, or federal level. I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), in part because Chapter 11 of the agreement gave foreign companies the right to sue the United States for trade-related financial losses. The result has been devastating to California and the Thomas bill would allow the same provisions to be placed in future agreements.

It is under Chapter 11, for example, that a Canadian corporation is suing the United States seeking \$970 million in compensation because of California's decision to phase-out MTBE, a toxic gasoline additive that leaked from pipelines and storage tanks, poisoning California water supplies and rendering them unusable.

In my district, the City of Santa Monica faced MTBE contamination of its drinking water supply and has had to import more than 80% of its drinking water. Sadly, this story has been repeated in other parts of the state, as well as other parts of the country. The Canadian company, which is trying to prevent the phase-out of MTBE, is seeking \$970 million in compensation, asserting that California's

phase-out impeded its business interests and profits. The case is pending before a closed door NAFTA tribunal with no possibility of consideration or appeal in U.S. courts.

I strenuously object to any proposal that would subjugate the health and safety of American citizens to the profit goals of international corporations. I strongly believe that the U.S. should not be allowed to undermine the health, safety, and environment laws of other countries either. I have opposed efforts by U.S. trade negotiators who have acted on behalf of special interest groups to challenge foreign laws, such as those designed to protect food supplies curb smoking, and increase access to life-saving HIV/AIDS medication in developing countries.

For example, U.S. trade negotiators, acting on behalf of the pharmaceutical companies, have tried to use international trade law to challenge governments in sub-Saharan Africa that are struggling to provide affordable medicines to people suffering from the AIDS epidemic. In southern Africa as many as 1 in 4 are suffering from AIDS, more than twelve million children have been orphaned by the disease, and the overall rate of infection is eight times higher than the rest of the world. Yet, the Thomas bill completely ignores this crisis and would allow the trade challenges to continue.

Furthermore, the Thomas bill would direct the President to challenges prescription drug pricing systems that have been implemented in Canada, Europe, and other countries to keep prescription drug prices from spiraling out of control. In fact, it may even jeopardize efforts here in the United States to provide affordable Medicare prescription drug benefits to seniors.

And in addition to possibly putting our public health and safety in jeopardy, the bills shows complete indifference toward labor rights. Meekly suggesting that countries should enforce their own labor laws, the bill only promotes the perpetuation of weak labor laws that often allow the exploitation of child and slave labor, and discriminatory treatment and harassment of labor activists in violation of the five core standards of the International Labor Organization (ILO).

If we want to work toward a progressive world trading system, we should be working for a world economy that lives up to higher standards instead of sinking to lower ones.

We should be expanding and updating our negotiating agenda to reflect the dramatic changes that have taken place in just the last few years since the previous Fast Track expired in 1994. There are now new items on the table at the WTO regarding intellectual property, antitrust law, investment rules, electronic commerce, product/food labeling, and technology transfer. The United States has set new precedents by including environmental and labor standards in the trade agreement with Jordan and trade expansion measures with countries in the Caribbean and Africa. We should not be prevented from pursuing these provisions in future trade agreements.

We should be insisting on more Congressional influence and oversight over the trade agenda. Unfortunately, the Thomas bill would minimize our role and stifle any meaningful opportunity for Congress to revoke fast track if the President violates or ignores key negotiating objectives.