

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.

The bill also does nothing to increase transparency of the trade negotiations, deliberations, and rulings veiled in secrecy. It fails to advocate the publication of negotiating texts, or address the critical need for changes to dispute settlement mechanisms that are not even open to the submission of amicus brief by non-governmental entities that have an interest in the deliberations.

The Democratic substitute offered by Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN, which the Republican leadership unfairly blocked him from offering, seriously looks at ways to address all of these matters. It would take advantage of the scarce opportunity fast track offers for Congress to shape the future of a world trade system with leadership from the United States on issues important to workers and the environment.

The bill calls for specific rules to ensure that it would not be a trade violation for a country to enforce a Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA), such as the treaty prohibiting trade in endangered species. It would also make progress on the issue of investor provisions by clarifying that investors protection rules cannot be used to undermine legitimate health, safety, and environmental laws.

In addition, the Rangel-Levin bill would explicitly clarify the right of WTO members to adopt measures necessary to respond to national emergencies like the HIV/AIDS epidemic by increasing access to essential medicines, and set at least some limitations on challenges to prescription drug price containment.

Moreover, the bill would provide a much stronger role for Congress by providing a structural biennial review of ongoing negotiations, and a process for the House to bring a resolution rescinding trade promotion authority to the floor for a vote if it is supported by at least one-third of the House.

At a time when we have the chance to move a progressive U.S. trade agenda forward, I regret that the Republican leadership squandered the opportunity to work with Democrats to achieve legislation that enjoyed strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the Thomas bill and in support of the Rangel-Levin alternative.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TUBEROUS SCLEROSIS

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 2001

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this resolution to raise awareness of and strengthen the fight against tuberous sclerosis.

This genetic disease often goes undetected, preventing those struggling with the disease from obtaining needed care. Afflicting vital organs, tuberous sclerosis causes tumor growth and seizures and can lead to learning disabilities and behavioral problems.

The nearly one million people worldwide known to have tuberous sclerosis need help, and it is our responsibility as public leaders to assist them by strengthening efforts to identify and treat this disease. The cause of the mutations that cause tuberous sclerosis are not understood, but increased research and

attention to this disease will increase our chances of finding a cure.

By passing this resolution, we are demonstrating to the American people that we know tuberous sclerosis is a problem and that we are determined to solve it. And we are telling health care providers and researchers that we recognize their efforts and will stand behind them in seeking an effective treatment for this disease. I am proud to support these efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 2001

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 482, H.R. 2944, the District of Columbia FY2002 Appropriations Conference Report. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF FLAKE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 2001

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote on rollcall vote No. 482. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

BIPARTISAN TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 6, 2001

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I have thought long and hard about this important vote on trade promotion authority. Frankly, people in South Dakota have different views about the issue of trade and its impact on our rural economy. Many of the livestock producers where I come from in Western South Dakota have been hurt by unfair trade practices. I have listened to their stories and am more convinced than ever that if South Dakota agriculture is to fully realize the benefits of trade, it must be fair trade. To get fair trade, we must have a seat at the table.

In recent years, the United States has fallen behind. Our competitors in Europe and around the world are negotiating trade agreements that will give them advantages over the United States in their trade with other countries.

There are 130 regional trade agreements currently in force today. The United States is a party to just two. Every day it gets more and more difficult for our products to be exported overseas.

Fair trade requires tough negotiations, sound agreements, and strong enforcement. I believe President Bush will negotiate fair agreements with other countries to open up markets overseas for U.S. goods. I also believe he will enforce these agreements by imposing real consequences on countries that

violate trade agreements with the United States.

I vote for this legislation today out of a belief that President Bush will do the right thing for American agriculture. That means according agriculture the high priority it deserves at the trading table. And as I indicated earlier, that also means tough negotiations, sound agreements and strong enforcement. Only then will we see fair trade and only then will we realize the promise of greater trading opportunities for South Dakota farmers, ranchers and small businesses.

I will be watching to make sure that agriculture gets a fair shake. I will be watching, and if agriculture is not treated fairly, the Administration will be hearing from me early and often.

I am pleased that this legislation strengthens the role of Congress by requiring the U.S. Trade Representative to consult with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees during the negotiations, and prior to any agreement involving agriculture. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I look forward to that new voice.

Mr. Speaker, South Dakota has broad interests. I've listened to agricultural producers and business interests from across the state tell me how they feel about trade and South Dakota's ability to keep up. I've heard again and again that if agreements are fair and enforced that we can compete and win in the world marketplace. I will fight to make that happen.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BOB MILEY

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 10, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this year the House will say farewell to one of our most loyal and dedicated employees, namely, the Superintendent of Buildings, Bob Miley.

I have known Bob for several years and worked very closely with him in 1997-98 during my tenure as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch. The person who responded to my questions about the many problems related to this House complex was Bob Miley. If ever a person knew first hand what needed to be accomplished in a priority manner it was Bob. He planned and executed his assignment with skill and expertise.

When you work your way up through the system as Bob did, starting from being a temporary elevator operator in 1962, and rising to the position of building superintendent some 25 years later, it clearly indicates your skills are recognized by everyone.

The work of caring for the House takes dedication and devotion on a daily basis. One doesn't simply start at nine and expect to leave at six. The problems related to work follow you 24 hours a day and 365 days a year. This vast facility is always changing and the unexpected occurs regularly.

Bob Miley has a difficult job. His patience and understanding is in large part the reason for his successful reign. He has earned respect from the members and his colleagues who work so closely with him on a daily basis.

I hope every member of this House will recognize the contribution Bob Miley has made