

those soldiers were not there, Saddam Hussein would control not only Kuwait but also Saudi Arabia, also the Emirates, and he would control 70 percent of the world's oil reserves. But even a withdrawal of American soldiers from the Arabian peninsula would not be enough. It would just whet the appetite of Osama bin Laden, who will not rest until every Arab leader who is even moderately pro-American is displaced and killed, including the entire Saudi royal family.

But even that would not placate bin Laden, who would demand not what Arafat is demanding with regard to Palestinian-Israeli relations but the total destruction of 5 million Israelis. But even that would only whet his appetite. Bin Laden will not rest until every girl in every part of the world is kicked out of school, until the concept of female illiteracy is enshrined worldwide. I do not think that appeasement of bin Laden is possible. But even if it were, if you can change American foreign policy in the Mideast by an act of great terror, then what about those who disagree with our policy in Colombia or Kosovo, Macedonia, Sumatra, Sri Lanka or Taiwan? If we establish the policy that terrorists can change our foreign policy, then every terrorist will try to control the only superpower by an act of super terror.

We must stand by our friends in the Middle East and show that we cannot be controlled by terrorists.

□ 2340

ASSISTING AIRLINES AND AIRLINE EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many times the legislative process proceeds as the American people watch, and there is sometimes much confusion. There is no obligation for any of us to take the added time that this House sometimes does not allow to be able to discuss a very important subject.

Because I come from an area that is heavily impacted, as I would imagine most of my colleagues, by the legislation that we have just passed, I believe it is important to discuss extensively in the brief time that I have, or at least broadly, the legislation that dealt with the Air Transportation System Stabilization Act that was debated today.

For the first time it appeared, since the heinous acts of September 11, 2001, that many Americans might say they were back to business as usual. There was a divided debate, I consider it a healthy debate, on the approach that we should take for something that all of us agreed with, that is, to provide assistance to the airline industry pursuant to the Federal actions that were

taken after the September 11, 2001, heinous terrorist actions.

We, the United States Government, grounded the airlines of America. Certainly we have the responsibility to compensate them for Federal actions that resulted in large losses of revenue. At the same time, let me say to the American people that that grounding also took into account the safety of Americans, to be able to protect them and to turn to the tragedies that occurred and to prepare ourselves for what should happen next.

I have no quarrel with the fact that we acted, and I certainly realize that we impacted those airlines as we did so. So this Air Transportation System Stabilization Act has merit from the perspective of giving direct aid to the airlines based upon accounted-for losses during that time.

But my question becomes, because no legislation is perfect, why there is such a disparate representation of those losses? The Democratic staff of the Joint Economic Council says that during that time frame, the airports or airlines lost \$360 million to \$1 billion. The aid that we have given them, direct aid, is \$5 billion. I would hope that helps to restore them, but I also hope that that may increase their generosity.

Why do I say that? Because the difficulty I have with the legislation today is that the broad concept of employees who may be laid off now or perspective, or for those employees who really want to have jobs, as opposed to unemployment insurance, what guarantee do we have that this airline industry will be sensitive, that they will pull their bootstraps, tighten their belt and work hard to reinvest in their airlines and build the airlines and build employment?

Loan guarantees in this legislation were \$10 billion. I would hope that as those particular support systems are in place, that we will find the airlines being able to sufficiently rebuild, that the laid off or furloughed employees will return.

There are hundreds of letters that I received, probably many from Continental Airline employees, all believing that this package was going to save their jobs. I pray to God that it will, because I want them to work and to have the ability to have a livelihood. But I am sure that many of them are not aware that this package does not carry with it any protections for workers.

That is why I supported the Hastings amendment that provided unemployment benefits, extended them from 26 to 78 weeks, a year-and-a-half, provided 26 weeks of unemployment insurance benefits for workers who would otherwise not qualify, possibly the skycaps or contract workers who are now suffering. What about our cab drivers, who cannot even afford to pay their daily rental fee? This Hastings amendment also extended job training benefits from 26 to 78 weeks so that we could re-

train individuals and also provided them with health care.

In addition, this bill could have been an omnibus bill and included the federalization of security. It did not. To my traveling public, I say to you, get on the airlines. But I also say that we have the responsibility to work over a period of time to direct our attention towards security.

Then we also have the opportunity and the responsibility to ensure that we do not act in fear, we do not act recklessly; that we provide an overall bill that does two things, to keep the airlines strong, and, as well, keep the working people of America strong.

I would hope that this coming week we will make good on the promise of the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and as well our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT). We will pass real worker assistance so the hundreds who have written me will have written me not only to support the airline industry, but as well to support the working people of America. I believe that this is crucial. I believe that we must do that, and that is the reason that I made the votes that I did, not voting for the martial law, wanting to extend the time of debate, but supporting the legislation and as well the motion to recommit to protect the American workers.

ASKING FOR COMMON SENSE AND REASON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, our Armed Forces are poised to conduct military strikes in foreign lands. My own State of Georgia is contributing significantly to our overseas forces with troops being committed from the 116th Bomber Wing, the 117th Air Control Squadron, the 293rd MP Company from Fort Stewart in Augusta, and the 224th Joint Communications Support Squad, Brunswick, Georgia. And I have no doubt that men of the elite 75th Ranger Battalion from Fort Benning are currently or soon will be deploying overseas.

Our Nation suffered a terrible injury last week with the attacks in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania. Many thousands of our innocent civilians were unjustly taken from their families and loved ones, and we as a Nation must now respond. But just how we should do that, both internationally and domestically, is now giving rise to considerable debate.

We have heard the Bush Administration's call to arms to fight the first war of the 21st century. I understand that our Nation's full military resources are soon to be turned against not just the terrorists responsible for last week's attack, but international terrorism generally. Our intelligence agencies have allegedly identified terror cells in some 60 countries, and that

whether or not Afghanistan actually surrenders Osama bin Laden, the alleged mastermind of last week's attacks, our military intends on fighting a long and bitter worldwide campaign against international terrorism in more than 60 countries, or, as Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld announced this week, we intend to drain the swamp.

I understand a draft bill, which is the first of a far larger package of anti-terrorist legislation, is now circulating Capitol Hill, and I am told it proposes giving law enforcement the power to detain non-U.S. citizens for indefinite periods without charge, giving immigration authorities greater and accelerated powers to deport non-U.S. citizens, and, at the same time, curtailing rights of non-U.S. citizens to judicial review and appeal.

Many of these reforms that the Bush Administration is now proposing are the very same types of state powers that we routinely criticize other nations for possessing in our own State Department's annual Human Rights Report. I am greatly concerned that we are about to engage in an extremely hazardous military campaign of unknown duration with unrealistic objectives and perhaps even ultimately harmful long-term consequences for our Nation.

Already, there is disquiet in the Muslim world that the U.S. is poised to turn its terrorist campaign into a war against Islam. The Bush Administration has already had to change the name of the military mission once when it used term "crusade," and now it has got to change the name again, because it used the term "Infinite Justice," and that is offensive to our Muslim communities.

□ 2350

All of these gaffs feed the growing Muslim fear that this impending U.S. military action could become a broader campaign against them.

Mr. Speaker, I know I do not need to address the impending catastrophe should large sections of the world's 1.2 billion Muslims unify and turn against the United States. It would be ironic indeed if we as a Nation destroyed democracy in the name of saving democracy. But before we grant more powers and massive resources to our law enforcement, military and intelligence community, we should be examining why they did not detect the threat of these and other attacks, especially since we had been told that the attacks last week were sophisticated, involved many people over a considerable period of time, and maybe even involved the assistance of a foreign government.

We should know or should have known that bin Laden was capable of attacking our major cities. Just 7 months ago, during the trial of suspects charged with the embassy bombings in Africa, Federal prosecutors detailed the bin Laden network in open court. Details of bin Laden's business

and financial history, his international terror network, as well as his hatred for America, were all systematically dissected by Federal prosecutors.

Given these revelations, it was clear, or it should have been clear, that our Nation and our citizens were in grave danger. I do not understand how intelligence services have the ability to penetrate, analyze and publicly distribute records of bin Laden's alleged cellular phone traffic in the hours immediately after the bombings. From these conversations, we learned of bin Laden's alleged celebrations with supporters. But in stark contrast, over the same period of months, they were not able to intercept bin Laden's planning or preparations for the attacks.

I am also deeply concerned that recent reports in the press of specific, credible and quite extraordinary warnings of terrorist attacks on our citizens, which were ignored by our government, and some of these warnings directly referred to the use of hijacked aircraft attacking the World Trade Center.

For example, the L.A. Times reported on September 20, 2001, that Mossad, the Israeli intelligence service, had warned the FBI and the CIA that a major terrorist force of some 200 individuals were entering the U.S.

The Advertiser Newspaper from the Murdoch Group reported on Monday, September 17, that a man in the Cayman Islands wrote to U.S. authorities on August 29 and warned them that he had overheard three Afghan men in a bar talking about impending attacks on the United States. The CIA is said to have followed up on the attack, but apparently did not take it any further.

Then it is also reported that a week later, an Iranian in Hamburg, Germany, contacted police and warned them of an impending terrorist attack against the United States using hijacked planes.

Tragically, I am forced to say, this does not appear to be the first time our intelligence services have been caught flatfooted. Earlier this year, Jamal Ahmed al-Fadl, a former aid to Osama bin Laden, while testifying in New York against the four men accused of the U.S. embassy bombings in Africa, said that he told U.S. officials that bin Laden's group was trying to make a war on the United States. Similarly, Prudence Bushnell, the U.S. Ambassador in Nairobi, warned the State Department of the poor security of her embassy in Nairobi. Regrettably, these warnings appear to have been ignored. Not surprisingly, our government now finds itself subject to civil actions by survivors and family representatives of those killed in the U.S. embassy bombings in Africa.

Count up the combined assets of our Nation's law enforcement, military intelligence agencies charged with fighting terrorism over the last 10 to 15 years, and we have budgets worth billions and billions and billions of dollars, space-age technology that most

countries would just dream of having; and despite all of these resources, we sustained three terrible attacks upon our military, our cities, our warships, our embassies.

In my view, the problem is not one of resources, but of a failure of implementation on a scale that should shame us. But what frustrates me most is that no one in a position of leadership in our Nation has yet to seriously ask why our Nation has been attacked in this way. Why have our cities, our embassies and our military forces been systematically targeted by terrorist organizations? Why is it that our Nation and its people are being attacked in these ways? Our politicians and political observers have, for years, been willing to analyze and discuss about the IRA in England, the Shining Path in Peru, the Red Brigade in Italy; but now that it has come home, all of a sudden, we failed to analyze and ask the question, why did it happen.

Secretary of State Colin Powell is absolutely right. We must give diplomacy a chance. We must honestly ask ourselves, what is the root cause of this war being waged on our people and our country? I suspect that we will need to look at altering some of our foreign policy positions. Unless we do this, I fear that a military campaign, unsupported by sound foreign policy strategies, will only cause immeasurable civilian suffering throughout the world and may well actually lead to more terrifying attacks upon our cities and our citizens.

I would ask our President to sidestep those Rambos in the Pentagon who are talking about using nuclear weapons. Now is not the time for us to be talking about using nuclear weapons. We need to free our Secretary of State to do his job, and I know he can do it.

Finally, I pray that common sense and reason will prevail.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. BEREUTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.