

before they make up their mind about how they are going to vote on whatever rule is attached to the Defense Appropriations bill, I urge every Member to simply review line-by-line what it is that is being proposed. If they do, I think that you will find that the vast majority of members of both parties would recognize the substantive value of what it is we are trying to do. It just seems to me that that is our job.

I also want to point out again, lest anyone think we are trying to "bust the budget," each and every add-on to the homeland security package, each and every item in that bill contains as part of that item the following language: "Provided further that such amounts shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress."

What that language means, Madam Speaker, is that if this money were to be provided, not a dime could be spent unless the President later agreed that each and every one of those items represented an emergency that needed to be funded. If, in the judgment of the President after reviewing our arguments, he decided that spending could wait for another day, that is the way it would be. He would maintain total control over the expenditures.

But we believe it is crucial to provide this, because we have talked to the FBI, the CIA, the National Security Agency, to many other agencies of government, and we are convinced that this is necessary for the good of the country.

We have stimulus packages floating around here being promoted by both parties. I will not comment on what I think of them. But the fact is that if we want to stimulate the economy, the number one requirement is to restore public confidence in our ability to travel and people's ability to go into public places without fear, and that is what we attempt to do. That could do more to restore economic confidence than virtually anything else this body will do.

So I urge each and every Member to review this. And I repeat, we are perfectly willing at any time to grant unanimous consent for that Defense bill to come up today or tomorrow, provided only that we have an opportunity to vote on these three amendments. Surely that is not too much to ask.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 74

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in*

*Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "December 7, 2001"; and by striking the date specified in section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof "December 1, 2001".*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI) laid before the House the following communication from Ronald J. Norra, Pharmacist/Security Officer of the Office of Attending Physician:

OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,  
U.S. CAPITOL.

Washington, DC, November 15, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for production of documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

RONALD J. NORRA,  
Pharmacist/Security Officer.

UNITED STATES ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN BIENNIAL REVISION: 2002-2006—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 4108(a)), I transmit herewith the seventh biennial revision (2002-2006) to the United States Arctic Research Plan.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 15, 2001.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks)

□ 1715

CONGRATULATIONS TO MEL AND SUG HANCOCK ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us who are fortunate enough to serve in this House consider it a great privilege to do so, and we are very grateful to our constituents for giving us this privilege. I think most of us feel that the best part, the most gratifying part of our job is that we are able to help many people, and we receive many very kind thank you notes and letters. But certainly a close second is that we are each able to make some very close friendships with other Members from around the country, people we probably never would have met if we had never been able to serve in this House.

I consider myself very lucky to have become friends with former Congressman Mel Hancock of Missouri. Mel came to Congress just a short time after I did, and this was only because I was sworn in the day after the 1988 election, and he came in in January. I rise today to pay tribute to Mel because he and his wonderful wife, Sug, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary in Springfield, Missouri, this Sunday.

Mel was one of the best examples of a citizen legislator that I have ever known. He was as honest as it is possible to be. He was a straight shooter. He always told the truth. If he could not support a bill, he told the people who were for it that he could not support it. He was one man who was never swayed by any special interests. He was and is a patriotic man who loves this country. His life has been the American dream come true. He did not have everything handed to him on a silver platter. He lived and worked for a while, for about a year and a half, in my hometown of Knoxville as a representative of International Harvester; and he and Sug had a son born there in 1954. I guess I am glad that he left, though, because both of us could not have been elected to Congress if he had stayed there.

Mel started a bank security business and built that small business up from nothing to become one of the most successful small businesses in the State of Missouri. Probably from his small business background he became a staunch conservative, very much opposed to Federal rules and regulations and red tape, and absolutely horrified by waste and high taxes. He believed that the

people of Missouri knew better how to spend their own money than Federal bureaucrats could spend it for them. He believed in a government of, by, and for the people, rather than one of, by, and for the bureaucrats. He led the fight in Missouri for the Hancock amendment to limit taxes because he knew it is not possible to ever satisfy government's appetite for money or land.

He did not win every race or every election, but Sug stood by him through thick and thin, the losses as well as the victories. He won his seat in Congress running on the slogan of "Give 'Em Mel," and he did just that in his 8 years of service here. He served from 1989 to 1997 and always won overwhelming re-elections. He could have been easily re-elected in 1996; but he had committed to an 8-year term limit, and he was a man of his word. In fact, probably about the only issue that Mel and I ever disagreed on was that of term limits. Mel started something called the Hancock Poll for those of us who had come to Congress with him, always rating us compared to his votes, and some of us always thought it was a great honor if we came out very close to Mel in the Hancock Poll.

Shortly after the first election in 1988, Mel went with other freshmen to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard; but because he found that there is not really true academic freedom in this country on our college campuses, and particularly in a place like Harvard, Mel got fed up and walked out on Harvard after just a short time there.

In his service here in this Congress, he became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and he was a leader on the Committee on Ways and Means on all the major issues that that very powerful committee acts on. He was a pilot, and he was very much interested in aviation issues; and during my 6 years as Chairman of the sub-committee aviation, he always had good suggestions and comments to make in regard to the very important aviation issues facing this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mel Hancock was and is a true-blue American who believes in free enterprise, private property and individual freedom, the things that made this country great. He voted that way here in the House. Mel Hancock helped make this Nation great, and our country is a better place today because of men and women like Mel and Sug Hancock. Mel Hancock is one of the finest men I have ever known, and I know that all of my colleagues who served here with him and got to know Mel join me in wishing him and Sug a wonderful and a happy 50th wedding anniversary this coming Sunday.

---

#### VISIONS FOR A NEW AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I led a bipartisan delegation to Europe that met with the exiled King of Afghanistan in Rome, and I want to say up front one of the most common questions we had was, is United States policy tilted towards the King, or is it tilted towards the Northern Alliance? And one thing we continually made clear and we need to continually make clear is that many of us here in Congress supported the Northern Alliance and wanted additional funding to go to them, and many of us in Congress support the exiled King. We support both, and we believe there should be a coalition government.

In fact, today's papers, in The New York Times, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times, all are running stories suggesting that the Northern Alliance is suddenly wanting to go it alone, now that after months of not moving or actually retreating, were able to advance with American bombs, all of a sudden they want to go exclusive. Our policy needs to be balanced.

I would like to share a few comments of our exchange with the King and then some thoughts on the direction of where we may head. Clearly, the King is 87. He is of strong mind and will, but he has been in exile for years. His role would be more of a coordinator and peacemaker, not necessarily a dominant leader. After all, he is 87, not 57. His heart hurts for his people and country. He expressed sorrow because of the terrorism that brought the bombing. He stated that that bombing was a necessary evil. He stressed the need for meetings with the Northern Alliance as soon as possible. We pushed him hard in part on that point, and clearly they need to get to those meetings. Unfortunately, one of the dangers here is if one group gets in a dominant position, particularly if they are in the minority population, a dominant governing position over the others, we will not have peace in Afghanistan; we will descend into further chaos.

We stressed Afghan solutions. But that does not mean just warlords who could not have advanced without our bombs; it means a real coalition. Our goal is to hunt down terrorists and to bring them to justice and to hold those who harbor terrorists accountable; but our goal is not to be nation-building beyond a point. We want an Afghan solution, but if they want our long-term support, they need to have a balanced solution.

We also aggressively oppose the distribution of heroin and the violation of human rights, which some of our so-called new-found friends have done as well, not just the Taliban. Financial assistance and trade policies of the United States are impacted by a government's abuse of human rights and death peddling through drug dealing and drug trafficking of heroin.

There is an Afghan solution that meets these goals, but it needs to include the people of the north as well as the majority Pashtuns of the south.

Americans today only see an Afghanistan that is riven by tribal factions, funded by heroin, chaos and constant war, terrorists and terrorist sympathizers. But the former King has shown that a different Afghan did exist, a coalition government, a move from monarchy to democracy, rights for women, and an economy not dependent upon heroin. It can happen in Afghanistan, and it did for many years.

In that sense, the country is currently missing all of this for many years, and the exiled king would give them a vision of hope. It is not a question of his returning as a King, but as a symbol of a functional Afghanistan which many people in the United States and the world do not see. As our delegation told him, if we do not see, if the Afghan that he represented that did not harbor terrorists, that respected human rights and, in fact, does not distribute heroin, then the American people will help rebuild their economic devastation that the Taliban has caused. But we are not going to help rebuild if, in fact, it is replaced with another government. It does not mean that an enemy of an enemy is just that, an enemy of an enemy is a temporary ally, but to be a friend, where they get the financial assistance, the trade and help in rebuilding their country, we want to see a decent government.

Afghanistan has been subject to being a political football for centuries, particularly between Russia and England, but all the way back to Timur-i-Leng, for centuries and centuries. The book "Tournament of Champions," a book about this battle for Central Asia, reads, in many ways, like the current New York Times: "Back and forth through the passes, through the mountain hideouts, hiding out in the snow, fighting mountain wars, tribal factions dominated by the bordering nations."

What we do see in the reign of the former King is a move to democracy, that it can be different. A country torn by war with tribal and religious differences that was poor before being wrecked by the Taliban is not suddenly going to be paradise on Earth. Romanticism by Americans is not in order.

But we do know that it can be a better Afghanistan. We do know that if there is a coalition government that respects the rights of the Afghan people, that does not deal in heroin, that is committed to rebuilding their economy, that is oriented towards peace, not harboring terrorists, it can be different. But if it does not, it not only will not be a paradise, it will continue to be close to an earthly version of hell.

---

#### HONOR THE FALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take up