

the premise of the other side, the fundamental flaws in the belief that by government spending, we are going to get out of this problem.

Now, we recognize there is spending we need to do right now, in intelligence gathering, in defense, in homeland security. It is critical. It is increases. We all voted for it and we are going to keep voting for it. But that is all the more reason to be cautious on the other areas that have nothing to do with the threat to our Nation, with the attack that we suffered.

We need to be cautious there and rein in the excessive tendencies, so we can at some point in the near future get back to balancing this budget, get back to retiring some debt. But, most of all, in the meantime, we have got to get this economy going. We have too many people out of work, and that is our obligation.

Our responsibility is to create an environment where folks can get back to work, where our economy can flourish, where businesses can hire new workers. We started that process. In the House we passed a bill that will move us in that direction. The President supports our bill. The President, in fact, called for doing more than we did in the House. I wish we had. But at least we moved in that direction, significantly. And, yet, in the other chamber, we have not a bill on the Senate floor, we have no meaningful progress. It is really a disgrace.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I think that last point is the most important. We need to do a stimulus package, and the inability of the other body to even consider in debate a package is very disappointing. We do not help the workers that are unemployed today. We do not put in place a package of stimulus items that will help ensure that this is a short downturn and not a very deep downturn. And the third thing, I think, is that it is difficult to factor in, but it will send a psychological message that we are ready to move on, and that we are about focusing on domestic issues, as well as waging a war on the other side of the world; that we have not forgotten about the issues at home.

So, these three items coming out of the House and moving forward, I think, speaks well for our ability. It may not be a perfect bill, but it is a whole lot better than doing absolutely nothing and not even being willing to bring a bill to the floor for debate.

If our bill is not perfect, let the other body develop its own version and move forward and bring it to conference, so that by Christmas this President, this country and the American people will have a stimulus package. That is the way the process is supposed to work. But the sheer inaction as our economy struggles is totally unacceptable.

I thank my colleague for inviting me here.

Mr. TOOMEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much for participating in the discussion tonight and everything he added to that.

Mr. SHADEGG. If I could just briefly as we summarize here kind of reiterate an important point in this debate, because too often things get politicized and we miss the issue, some people have pointed out that we have already agreed in the House bill there needs to be an extension of unemployment benefits and health care benefits. We need to take care of people who have already lost their jobs.

But the other debate that goes on is a rejection of any kind of tax relief. I think it is important for the listening audience to remember that under both Democrat and Republican presidents, President Kennedy, a Democrat in the sixties, President Reagan, a Republican in the eighties, when we cut taxes, when they had become excessive and we cut taxes, we stimulated the economy, and, as President Kennedy, a Democrat, said, a rising tide lifts all boats. It put all Americans back to work. It stimulated the economy for all Americans.

Every time I hear this phrase that tax cuts are just for the rich or tax cuts for the rich, it enrages me, because the reality is the way to stimulate this economy is to give all Americans some tax relief. That is what we were proposing to do, that is what will stimulate the economy, and that ought to be a part of the package and will benefit every single American, not just one sector, as President Kennedy said.

Mr. TOOMEY. Well, the gentleman is exactly right. I would just conclude with one other thought. You know, many of the fundamentals for our economy are actually quite hopeful. There is reason to believe that we could come out of this and we could have a return to some real prosperity relatively soon if you look at some of those fundamentals.

Inflation is extremely low, our dollar is strong, and it is very clear that all around the world people have enormous confidence in the dollar. Our productivity levels are at an all time high. Never before have American workers been so enormously productive. Our national debt as a percentage of our GDP has declined dramatically, from 50 percent of our economic output around 1995 down to about a third today. It has also declined in absolute dollar terms.

So these fundamentals are strong. If we lower this tax burden now, resist the urge for wasteful, excessive and inappropriate spending, and lower the tax burden that is acting as a barrier between people who could get this economy moving again, we will do that exactly, and the folks who are out of work today can get back to work.

We have done our part in the House. We have taken an important and enormous step forward. I am urging my colleagues in the Senate to do likewise. It is long past time. It has been over 11 weeks since the terrible attack that ac-

celerated the decline in our economy. It is overdue to have the kind of economic stimulus that we all need.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The Chair will remind all Members that it is improper in debate to characterize Senate action or inaction.

FAST TRACK PROFITEERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I will be joined today by several Members. I am so far joined by my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who in his several years in Congress has been a leader on trade issues and fighting for American jobs and American workers and raising labor standards and environmental standards, both in this country and throughout the developing world and in other nations around the world.

Before we talk about fast track, and that is what this special order is about, as some of us just could not resist listening to the last speakers who, already in the space of 11 months of a Republican administration with a Republican House of Representatives and formerly a Republican Senate, have already, through their huge tax cuts for the rich, have already brought on to our government a deficit. We had several years of positive, good budget situations. We are now already spending back into deficit because of these huge tax cuts for the rich.

Second, we are already in a recession. We have had a Republican President since January 20th. There are 1 million fewer jobs, industrial, manufacturing jobs in this country than there were a year ago. And when we talk like this, talk about tax cuts for the rich, my Republican friends love to say we are engaging in class warfare. But the fact is that every day in this chamber as Republicans try to cut spending on unemployment compensation, on health care, on Medicare cuts, on cuts that people in this country that need help would benefit from, that they make those cuts, at the same time they cut taxes on the rich, they commit class warfare in this society; when they are hurting working people and hurting the poor and helping their wealthiest contributors and wealthiest friends, whether they are the drug companies, or whether they are some of the wealthiest people like Rupert Murdoch and others that they seem to care so much about. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, they so often commit class warfare every day in this body. All we do is point out they are doing it, and they just seem to bristle from it.

Mr. Speaker, on the evening of September 11, several gas stations in my

district and around Northeast Ohio and other places around this country raised their prices to \$4, \$5, \$6 a gallon. Many of us in this body simply called that as it was, war profiteering, that people would take advantage of the events of September 11 to put a little more money in their pocket.

Unfortunately, over the last 8 or 9 weeks, something not much different has occurred on Capitol Hill. Many of us have called it political profiteering. First, Congress passed a bailout bill that gave the airlines \$15 billion in cash and loan guarantees. No sacrifices were required of airline executives, few restrictions were placed on companies that received that money; nothing was provided for airline security; no assistance was given to the 140,000 industry workers who were laid off as a result of the September 11 attacks.

Then, in the name of stimulating the economy, this chamber passed new tax cuts and accelerated others for the richest people and the largest corporations in this country. IBM will get a check from the Federal Government under the Republican plan for \$1.4 billion. Ford will get a check from the Federal Government for \$1 billion. GM will get a check for \$900 million. United and American Airlines, as if they did not do all right with the airline bailout bill, will get several hundred million dollars more from the Republican tax cut for the rich, while they are ignoring unemployed workers.

But now the political profiteering has reached new heights. In the past few months, Mr. Speaker, the Bush Administration's Trade Representative, Bob Zoellick, sought to link the trade negotiation authority known as fast track to our Nation's anti-terrorism efforts. He went further by claiming that people like the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) and me and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and many of the others that will be joining us tonight, that because we oppose fast track, we are indifferent to terrorism, and maybe a little bit less than patriotic.

According to Mr. Zoellick, free trade is the way to combat terrorism around the world, and, if you do not support free trade, if you do not want to do it Mr. Bush's way and Mr. Zoellick's way, if you do not support free trade and do it their way, then you do not really support American values.

Earlier today, Republican leadership took a similar route until support of fast track. They stated that trade is directly related to our battle against the enemies of the United States and the values we hold dear; that fast track is essential to our war effort.

In Qatar are, where the World Trade Organization ministerial was recently held, a place chosen by the leaders, the trade ministers, the administration, the people who support free trade, in Qatar, the people do not have freedom of speech, they do not have freedom of assembly, they do not have freedom to

publicly worship anything in any other religion but Islam, they do not have freedom of association, they do not have free elections. Yet the World Trade Organization ignored these abuses of personal freedom in selecting Qatar as the host of the ministerial.

Qatar's human rights record is not in line with American values by any measurement, but it is familiar territory for many of America's corporate trading partners.

Supporters of fast track say interaction with the developing world spreads democracy. But as we engage developing countries in trade and investment, democratic countries are losing grounds to dictatorships and authoritarian governments.

Democratic India is less desirable for investors from the West than totalitarian China. Democratic Taiwan is losing out to autocratic oligarchic Indonesia. In 1989, 57 percent of developing country exports, of poor country exports to the United States, came from democracies. Since then, that number has fallen 22 percent. Today, 65 percent of developing countries exports come from authoritarian countries.

The fact is, Western investors want to go to places like China and Indonesia, which are dictatorships, by and large, because they have pliable workforce, because they have authoritarian governments, because they have a docile workforce that cannot organize and bargain collectively, and they are very predictable for Western business.

They do not want to go to India, they do not want to go to Taiwan, they do not want to go to South Korea, and, all too often, they do not want to stay in this country, because these countries have strong environmental laws, strong worker safety laws, labor unions that can organize and bargain collectively, and free elections.

Instead, Western corporations, as they lobby this body, as the corporate jets pull into National Airport and Dulles and BWI, and they fan the halls of Congress going to office after office after office, begging us for fast track, begging us last year, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) and I worked hard against PNTR for China, these companies want to invest in countries that have nonexistent environmental standards, that have below poverty wages, that have no worker benefits, that have no opportunities to bargain collectively.

Understand that. Western investors do not like to go to democracies where workers can organize, do not like to go to democracies where they have good environmental laws and worker safety laws. They like to go to China. They like to go to Indonesia.

□ 1815

They like to invest in Burma. Countries where workers cannot talk back, countries where workers cannot vote in elections, countries where workers do not have any kinds of rights. That is the way they like it. That is why they want fast track.

Our trade agreements, Mr. Speaker, go to great lengths to protect investors and property rights. These agreements do not include the same protection for workers or the environment. So in other words, fast track provides protections for property rights, protections for investors, but no protections for the environment, no protections for workers.

The call for an absolute trade negotiation authority in the name of patriotism must be recognized for what it is. When Mr. Zoellick says he has to have trade negotiating authority, trade promotion authority to combat terrorism and to fight this war, recognize it is pure and simple political profiteering.

We have all watched with pride the indomitable spirit of so many Americans in response to the events of September 11. The right response to defend the jobs of these Americans and especially the values of these Americans is a "no" vote on trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of another issue in the last 5 years that I have debated on this floor, and we have had some hot issues, that I feel more viscerally about, and I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree with me, he has been here longer than I have, than the subject of trade. We who oppose fast track do not oppose trade. It is a given. And simply put, what we have asked for on every issue since 1997 when there obviously were not enough votes to bring it to this floor at 3 o'clock in the morning one day in the fall, what we simply asked is that every trade agreement be a reciprocal trade agreement. What is good for one side is good for the other. But what does that mean?

To my friends who want to give away the store, I recommend that they read the Constitution of the United States. Many times, people stand on the floor of this great House and talk about what the Constitution says. We talk and refer to the Constitution on guns, we talk about the Constitution in terms of who has war powers. Well, the folks back in the eighth district in New Jersey sent me to uphold this Constitution, not just some parts of it. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes and duties imposed and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare, et cetera; to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, et cetera.

I did not come here, I say to the gentleman from Ohio, to surrender my responsibilities and obligations under the Constitution, because if it is trade today, what will it be tomorrow?

We need to protect that responsibility as defined in article I, section 8. There is no consistent administration

policy on trade besides lower tariffs and cutting quotas. There is no structure; there is no plan. It deals with Vietnam, it deals with the Andean countries, the WTO, Pakistan, our newly found friends, all of which do not take into account the wishes of the American worker. Cost-benefit analyses just are not there.

Congress cannot allow this administration to craft trade laws without our input under the Constitution. The only reason for fast track is that they want to add things they know that the Congress and the American people do not want. We are patriotic Americans. We are loyal to the President. We are loyal to the commander in chief. To question the loyalty of Members of this Congress for being opposed to fast track, to me is shameful.

We are the people's House. We are directly elected by the people. We hear from those out of work, and we must respond to their needs. Americans want us to keep our voice. We must keep our voice. This job belongs to us. The only way our leverage will be felt is to oppose fast track.

Despite overwhelming evidence, the current trade policies have resulted in massive trade deficits. No one on any side of the argument denies that. Job losses. Just take a look at what NAFTA did to jobs in this country. In my State of New Jersey, we have lost 84,749 jobs. That is according to the Department of Labor. This is not anything that was made up. That is not an illusion. Under two free trade administrations we have lost that many jobs. Imports have risen between 1994 and 2000 by 80.5 percent, and exports went up 60 percent. We have a huge trade deficit.

An example of the impact our Nation sees under these disastrous trade laws as we surrender our rights one after the other, just look at the VF Corporation, the well-known jeans producer. They are cutting 13,000 jobs worldwide. They are closing plants in the United States and, according to their own release, to cut costs, they will increase offshore manufacturing from 75 to 85 percent. They are certainly glad we do not require labor standards for our trading partners. In fact, as the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, it is quite interesting to see what our trade ambassador had to say about that.

Apparently the trade ambassador, who appeared in the WTO meeting at Doha, says that labor rights should not make it into the negotiations on trade. Have we lost our way? Are we not a country of free individuals? Labor and environment are not just social issues. They are issues that bind humanity. They are issues that we feel are no less important than any other.

Two weeks ago, 410 House Members voted to ask the United States Trade Representative to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws and should ensure that United States exports are not subject to the abusive use of trade laws by

other countries. Not even this important antidumping mandate was needed at the Doha conference.

I want to conclude at this point, Mr. Speaker. Recently Secretary Powell, who all of us in this Chamber have the greatest amount of respect for, he stated some very powerful words I am about to quote. He said, "Fast track is going to be viewed internationally as a test of the President's leadership at a time when there is all sorts of events going on." A better test is his ability to do what is right for working Americans. The real test of leadership is to make bipartisan policy to help our unemployed brothers and sisters. Do not let this scare tactic fool anyone. The President can show leadership by working with the Congress, not taking them out of the equation, not usurping article I, section 8, as if we did not exist.

Mr. Speaker, I said the same thing on the floor last session when Bill Clinton was the President. This is a bipartisan attack on our very rights as Members of the United States Congress. I do not accept it. I am prepared to fight day in and day out to make sure we begin the process of protecting jobs in the United States of America. This Constitution either is meaningful or we will selectively decide what we will adhere to, and then we will become less of a democracy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much for his very well thought-out remarks.

We are joined also by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), an old friend, who first established his trade predictions during the first fight against NAFTA when we almost defeated that trade agreement which has been shown to be dangerous to this country. We also have a new member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), an iron worker himself who understands trade from all aspects; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) from the other end of the State. They will be joining the discussion in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one comment before yielding to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) mentioned current trade policies and what happened in Doha and the steel industry. When we see that this Congress voted 410 to 4, as he said, to tell them, to instruct President Bush's trade representative in Qatar not to mess with U.S. dumping laws, he immediately put it on the table for negotiations. It is not difficult to understand why LTV, where many people in my district work, and the rest of the American steel industry, is in trouble when we pass these kinds of trade policies, and the President has not moved fast enough on section 201 of the 1974 Trade Act. The President has refused to support and this Congress has not passed 808, the Steel Revitalization Act, which is absolutely necessary to save this industry, and now these same

free traders are pushing more of the same, as if our trade policy has worked. It has not worked. Our trade deficit is almost \$370 billion. So the President's answer and Trade Representative Zoellick's answer is let us do more of it. That simply makes no sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my colleagues for appearing here with us tonight. I especially appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) on this issue and the compassion of the gentleman for the working men and women throughout our district in Ohio, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) has always been an expert on these issues.

To just pick up a little bit on what the gentleman had said on these trade initiatives and the WTO rules on antidumping, basically what it says is Congress instructed the Trade Representative, when you go to Doha next week not to give up on antidumping laws. We need them. We have other countries illegally dump their product in this country like they are doing right now with steel. It was very, very specific. But if we go to the text of the agreement that was in Doha this past week and go to paragraph 28, and I am quoting now, they are going to clarify and improve WTO antidumping and subsidy rules, an agreement not to use antidumping measures on the same issue once the case has been rejected. The total disregard for Congress's instructions on this issue, even after over 400 Members of Congress said do not give this up, do not give this up.

So we can see while they are saying, we need the authority to negotiate, give us your authority, Congress, because only you can approve it, but give up the authority under fast track, and we will do the best agreement possible and all you have to do is come back here and say yes or no; we cannot amend under fast track. We just give them instructions: over 400 Democrats and Republicans say do not give this up, and they gave it up.

□ 1830

So now they want to come with a fast track legislation. If you just take a look a little bit at what is going on and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is correct. We were here and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) was here in 1993, 1994; and a lot of us thought NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, would be a horrendous thing for this country.

I am talking a little bit about my own northern Michigan district. We have lost manufacturing jobs, agriculture jobs, timber, steel. We are here with a letter. They say even if you lose your job because of foreign imports, we have this trade adjustment assistance. It will help you out, extend your unemployment and do all these things.

I have a letter right here, November 27, to the Honorable Elaine Chow, Secretary of Labor. It was sent to her because we have been waiting since June 9 for a decision, June 9, almost 6 months. One hundred workers from the Besser Company in Alpena, Michigan are at the end of their state unemployment. The State has cut back unemployment. In Michigan we are down to \$300 a week now. That is what they have to live on. That is \$1,200 a month to try to support their family. That is true unemployment, and we are running out.

Everyone agrees they lost their job because of the flood of imports in the lumber company, in the lumber industry; therefore, they should get trade adjustment. It was a no-brainer case, and here we are still waiting, still waiting for a decision on trade adjustment. We have this letter here. We will make some more phone calls tomorrow. Hopefully, we can move this along.

It was NAFTA, TAA. That was one of the big selling points. Do not worry if you should lose your job. We will take care of it. I think the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) was correct on Congress giving up its right underneath the Constitution to approve, amend any agreement before us. Under Fast Track we cannot. That is a good reason not to vote for it.

Let us talk a little bit about steel because I know that has been a big issue lately. I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and all of us have been working hard on the steel caucus to try to come to grips with the steel industry since the last 3 or 4 years has just been plagued with this flood of imports on the hot road end, on cold steel, on rod, on wire. You name it, they have been doing it.

As we sat there yesterday in a meeting with Secretary Evans and we will give the Bush administration some credit. Secretary Evans and his assistants have come up and met with us often. They have investigated. The ITC, International Trade Commission, says they are dumping illegally in our country. We must do something and we will.

But if we take a look at it, and I said, I have been hearing this since 1998. I am sort of frustrated. You have 232, 232 trade orders out there; 131 relate to steel. Sixty percent of the trade orders issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce said stop. You are doing this illegally, 131 times; and we have no relief.

What about putting countervailing duties on imports coming in? We have 45 countervailing duties in this country; 28 are related to steel. So we are slapping duties on it. We have 131 trade violations, and we are still losing every 9 days a steel mill or an iron ore mine, like I just lost up in northern Michigan just before Thanksgiving, LTV. They are restructuring their situation. They are 25 percent owner in the mines in

northern Michigan. There is only eight iron ore mines left in the United States; two are in my district. LTV is a 25 percent owners in the Empire mine. They are also a big customer of those iron ore pellets. You need iron ore to make steel.

They announced just before Thanksgiving 770 miners will lose their job by the end of the month; 120 salary workers are gone. That is 890 jobs in my little community of Palmer, Michigan, up in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

We know they will have trouble getting their TA benefits if Besser is any idea. You go back to them and I say we have 131 orders out there saying you cannot dump steel, but they are still doing it. We have 28 countervailing duties that they cannot do this. They are still doing it.

What is our relief? We are finally going to have a 201. I have testified before the ITC, and I know all of you have too, on that, and saying, look, we need strict, drastic measures. You have all these duties. You have all these trade orders. It is time to put in quotas. It is time to put in tariffs and you have to act now. The President will get that 201 remedy situation or remedy order on or about December 10. He then has 60 days to make up his mind. We urge him to move quickly. Every 9 days we lose a steel mill. Every 9 days another mine goes out. There is going to be nothing left.

I believe we have 27 steel mills right now in bankruptcy. Banks are not lending them money. They cannot keep their mills going. They are shutting them down. And then we just take a look at NAFTA and what has happened after NAFTA. I have been just talking about steel.

In the State of Michigan we have lost over 152,000 jobs. And there is a list here, Table III. They talk about agriculture, mining, construction. Let us just go to manufacturing. Lumber and woods products. I have the mines and I have timber. In lumber and wood products we lost 118,000 jobs since 1994 under NAFTA. Paper and allied products, again paper industry big in my district, we lost over 33,000 jobs since 1994.

Stone, clay, glass, concrete products. We make concrete up in my district. Great limestone mining, 84,000 jobs. Primary metal products, 23,000. Blast furnaces, basic steel products, over 107,000 jobs in the last 6 years.

Motor vehicles and equipment, probably what Michigan is known most for, over 200,000 jobs. The administration comes to us and tells us, give us Fast Track Authority. We will negotiate. We will make sure our trade laws are enforced. That is what we heard in NAFTA. Here are the end result.

We have all of these trade laws, 131 violations on our books; and we cannot get any relief. Where do we go with this?

We must monitor the authority we give any U.S. Trade Representative and ensure that certain special interests

such as brand name pharmaceuticals that we have not even talked about yet tonight, they will not gain further concessions at the expense of American workers and the American consumers. No matter what it is, pharmaceuticals, manufacturing, mining, construction, agriculture, forestry, fishing, we have lost. And once again they tell us, trust us. We will take care of it. The last opportunity we had for trust was Doha last week. We said, no more anti-dumping. Do not give in to that. Over 400 of 435 Members said, do not do it. They did it.

How can we now turn and say let us support Fast Track Authority when a trade representative who we said not to do it just did it to us?

American people, Members of Congress, we have to wake up. We are not protectionists. We are not isolationists. We believe in trade, but it is has to be fair. When you have 131 orders on the books, that is not fair. When our mines are shutting down, our steel mills are shutting down and our hands are tied and we cannot do anything, is that fair? I say not. And I say bringing forth a proposal such as Fast Track Authority for this President to continue trade negotiations is just unconscionable, especially in these economic times. We are in a recession.

We are in a recession. And you can blame September 11. It was well before September 11. But just take a look at what happened. And I believe the state of mind we are in right now and the state of our economy is due to these trade laws, is due to the layoffs in the steel industry, in the mining industry, the lumber industry, the furniture industry. You name it.

I certainly want to join my colleagues here tonight and I look forward to hearing their comments. I will stay in case there are other comments that maybe we can go back and forth on some of these issues.

I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). He has been a stalwart in helping out here. And between WTO and GATT and NAFTA and NTR or whatever you want to call them. The bottom line is the American people, our hard-working men and women in the districts we represent, are not protected with these countervailing tariffs, with these steel orders, with trade adjustment. When it comes right down to it there is nothing there for the American worker. We should not give up our right as Members of Congress to modify and demand tough enforcement issues, especially since last week when we told us not to do it and they sold us out at Doha.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for his 9 years of leadership against bad trade issue and for fair trade and better working conditions and environmental safeguards for Americans and for people around the world.

One thing that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) said that was particularly important, and I will then

yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), we should think about this. When he said, we in this Congress on behalf of American people, 410 votes in support for said to our negotiators in Qatar said that we wanted to stand strong on our steel anti-dumping laws. And we demanded that on behalf of the American people. Those demands were totally ignored by the administration.

The administration now says, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) said this, the administration said, give us Fast Track. You can count on us to protect American workers with Fast Track. You can count on us to be fair. You can count on us to protect the environment and workers and all that around the world.

Well, the fact is can we count on them to do that when we saw already the kind of betrayal from our trade negotiators. Not to mention that this President does not seem very concerned domestically about environmental laws, does not seem concerned domestically about food safety, does not seem concerned domestically about labor standards.

This is the same President that tried for 10 months tried to weaken arsenic laws, and tried to allow the mining and chemical companies to allow more arsenic in the drinking water, and we are going to trust them to protect the environment all over the world and in this country? I do not think so. And that is really the reason, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) said, that Fast Track is really a betrayal of our values.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who already in his couple of months in Congress, he came here in early October, I believe, late September, and he has already jumped in the trade fight because he knows that is important to the people of Massachusetts and the people of our country.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and all others, including the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), for the great work they have done.

I am new to this debate. I am new. I have watched the work done by all of the Members here, both in this debate and in previous debates over NAFTA. I commend you for living up to your constitutional obligation to represent the people of your districts.

As I said, I am new to this debate; but I am not new to this issue. In my own life prior to the privilege of my office now, I was an iron worker for 18 years; and over that 18 years I worked at the Quincy shipyard just outside of Boston. And I saw that job go away with thousands of others from that shipyard because of foreign competition and the fact that the American shipyards were paying their workers well. And companies could go offshore to exploit low-wage labor.

I also worked at the General Motors plant out in Framingham, which is closed now and they are making those cars down in Mexico now.

I worked in Michigan in some of the auto industry plants there as well, and I understand those plants have closed and many of them have been relocated in Mexico. I also worked in a couple of the steel mills in Indiana and in Chicago, the Inland Steel and the U.S. Steel plants which I now understand are closed. There is a pattern developing here; and at this rate I am afraid that at some point there will be my counterpart in Mexico City taking my congressional responsibility as well.

The point made by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) needs to be emphasized. And that is that the United States Constitution says that Congress shall, not may, not might, it shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations; and it shall have the power to make all necessary laws proper for carrying out those powers.

This fast track mechanism, and this is just a procedural rule, would obligate us to abdicate our responsibilities on behalf of our constituents. Basically, what we would do we would give up those rights and those responsibilities to the very people who sent us here. I need to join the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others who have said that I can say also that my constituents did not send me here to give away their rights and responsibilities, to walk away from a job just because it is complex. It is difficult. It is hard. We knew that that was the job we were taking when we ran for office.

This bill is counterintuitive. It flies in the face of our responsibility both under the Constitution and as a moral obligation to the people who we represent.

Another part of this fast track framework that is poorly designed is the fact that while the obligation under the Constitution is given to us as Members, also many of the other responsibilities and procedures that are set up around the Congress guarantee an open and honest debate around trade matters. The Constitution requires that we publish a journal of the actions taken here in the Congress.

If you look at Fast Track, Fast Track allows these negotiations to be done in secret, if they are given to the U.S. Trade Representative.

□ 1845

These are secret negotiations and they are done in a back room, without the direct representatives of the people being in those negotiations.

It just is an unseemly process that we initiate by supporting a Fast Track-type procedure, and we do not need to look far to see examples of the flaws of that process. We can look directly at NAFTA. We have evidence now to see how this Fast Track procedure plays out.

We see it in the fact that there are no enforceable labor standards in NAFTA nor in the bill before us to expand NAFTA to 34 other countries. There are no firm mandatory or enforceable labor standards in this bill. There are no firm and mandatory and enforceable environmental standards in this bill. Those have been left out.

There is language in here, very fluffy language, that raises the issue of labor standards, raises the issue of environmental standards, but does not allow us in negotiations on these trade matters to require other countries to respect their workers and to respect the environment in those countries.

We can look at what NAFTA has done for Maquiladora, the workers there. Although there was the great promise of the raising the buying power of the average Mexican worker, we still find in Maquiladora that the autoworkers in the Maquiladora are making an average of 67 cents an hour.

I do not have any U.S. autoworkers in Massachusetts anymore. Those jobs are all gone over the border. The U.S. autoworkers today, those left in Michigan and other places across the country, should not be made to compete with workers making 60 cents an hour, living in substandard conditions, with no working conditions, with no right, no voice in their workplace. This bill is completely absent any enforceable standard.

The American worker should not be required to compete with 67-cents-an-hour workers or slave labor or child labor in these other countries. Yet that is exactly what this bill allows. That is exactly what Fast Track and the ministerial directive that came out of Doha, that is just exactly what is allowed here.

The American public should not be faced with the risk of trucks coming over the Mexican border without the safety requirements and the regulatory obligations of the trucks that we have in this country that are registered in any of the 50 States, and we should not allow produce, food products, to come into this country that do not meet the regulatory standards that we have set up in this country.

We have seen examples of that. I know that in Michigan just recently, we had an incident where 200 people were affected by eating strawberries that had been contaminated with the hepatitis A virus and that were allowed into the country because they did not have to undergo the FDA process and the sanitation process that products here in the United States are required to go under. We should also realize that of the 4.4 million trucks a year that come in from Mexico into the United States, we have the ability right now to inspect 2 percent, about 88,000 trucks out of 4.4 million. We do not have the ability to check the licenses, the qualifications of those drivers, the safety mechanisms on those trucks, and there is just a complete lack of accountability. That is the bottom line.

This Fast Track bill takes away the accountability. We are unable to oversee or guarantee that the American workers and the American public are being protected, and we need to do whatever we can to recapture the power and the accountability on behalf of the American people.

I think the easiest way to do that would be to defeat this Fast Track proposal.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) points out something very important about democratic values. At the beginning of this Special Order we talked about political profiteering that some people, the President, the White House and the Bush administration, have said that we need to have Fast Track to wage this war against terrorism. Yet as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) so deftly pointed out, much about trade negotiations and much, not just writing these trade agreements, but actually some of the appeals in front of the tribunals and the three-judge panels at the World Trade Organization and the NAFTA tribunals and all are conducted in secret.

We talk about American values. How can we talk about American values and then turn over our sovereignty on issues of public health and issues of water, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) in his district, which borders three of the Great Lakes, how can we turn over those decisions on environment, on food safety, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) said; on constitutional issues, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) said.

We are turning those issues over to panels who are people we do not elect, who are making decisions in secret, and then often do not have to publish their findings. And that runs exactly counter to our government, to our way of life, to our values, and to our beliefs as Americans.

I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), who many years ago during the NAFTA debate used to join the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who could not be here tonight, used to join us on these Fast Track issues. I would add that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who is a candidate for Governor of Michigan, will be leaving this body at the end of 2002 and has been the real leader on trade issues. He said he could not be here tonight, but he is in there fighting against these bad trade agreements on behalf of Michigan workers and on behalf of all of us.

So I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), from the other end of Ohio, from southern Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we do represent common areas of our Nation, areas where there has been strong manufacturing in the

past and where people are now losing their jobs and where there is great distress. Sometimes I wonder how long the American people are going to be willing to put up with us as they watch what is happening. It seems that the decisions that we make in this Chamber so often favor other countries and other peoples rather than our own country and our own people.

It really bothers me that we would make decisions in this Chamber that would put the American worker at a disadvantage to workers elsewhere in this world. That really troubles me, and I am wondering how long the American people are going to put up with it.

Now, we are going to be facing a decision rather soon and the pressure is building here in Washington, D.C., the lobbying is taking place, the administration is sending people up here to try to twist arms and to convince people that they need to support this Fast Track authority. And we are going to be making a decision, and it is my hope that as the American people observe what is happening, that they will let their voices be heard.

And how can they do that? Well, the old-fashioned way. They can call their representatives. They can send e-mails. They can send letters. They may arrive 2 or 3 weeks late, given the current circumstances. They can call their Representatives and their Senators and ask for a personal meeting in their offices, in their States, in their districts, because unless the American people express themselves, I am afraid this will be pushed through this House and through this Congress, and that once again the American people will be placed at a great disadvantage.

I am the son of a steelworker. I grew up in a family of nine kids. My dad had a fifth-grade education, but he worked in a steel mill and he was able to support us. That steel mill is closed today. There is not a single man or woman or family that is being supported by that steel mill, because it does not exist.

Even today as we met in our Steel Caucus, we heard the fact that if something is not done, over the next 12 months the American steel industry will be decimated, will cease to be a major industry in this country. Yet we are on the verge of being forced to take a position that will extend this, what I would call obscene trade policy that we currently have in place.

When are we going to stop and say what is best for the American worker, the American family? When are we going to do that? When are we going to have an administration that is willing to put Americans first when it comes to these kinds of issues?

We go to a union hall and it is very common in my district when I go to a union hall to have union members stand and pledge allegiance to the flag. We are urging American school children across this Nation to be loyal to our Nation and to express that loyalty by pledging allegiance to the flag.

Sometimes I think we should request that these corporate board members who belong to these multinational organizations, who have no particular loyalty to a country or a set of democratic principles or a political philosophy, maybe they should be asked to pledge allegiance to the flag as well.

I am just really getting increasingly concerned about the fact that over the years, in an incremental manner, we are more and more giving up the power that we have within this Chamber to protect our constituents, to make sure that when we cast a vote, when we make a decision, it is in the best interests of the people of southern Ohio or northern Ohio or the upper peninsula of Michigan. We cannot give up this authority. We ought not to. I believe it is a violation of our constitutional responsibilities and our oath of office to just relinquish this responsibility to an administration. And I am not just being critical of this administration because, quite frankly, I think we were critical of the past administration when it came to trade policies and the willingness to stand up for the American worker.

We have got a responsibility as elected representatives to do the right thing, but I am afraid we will not do the right thing if the American people do not make their voices heard. It is my hope that in the next few hours and days, that the American people will call and write and request visits with their Congresspersons and their Senators so that we can stop this and we can once again start reasserting ourselves as the legitimate spokespersons for the people who send us here to represent them.

I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for his attention on this issue for many, many years, and he is very knowledgeable about it, as is my Congress friend from the great State of Michigan. I live in a district where the steel mill is already gone. Some of my colleagues live in districts where there is still hope to maintain the jobs, and we will not be able to do it if this Fast Track legislation passes.

We will see more and more jobs going to other countries where those functions are performed by people who earn little more than slave labor salaries, where children are abused, where the environment is raped, where there are no protections in terms of worker rights. How can we do that and say that we are representing the United States of America? I do view this as a patriotic issue and one that calls upon me to oppose this effort to take away and to strip from us our legitimate right as representatives of the people to stand up for them.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for this time and for giving me a chance to express myself.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to reemphasize something the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) said. As this debate winds down into next week when the Republican leadership has said it will be scheduled for a

floor vote, we have seen the kind of strong-arm lobbying from the President, from the President personally, from administration officials, Cabinet members, up and down the administration, throughout the administration, promises, all kinds of promises, everything from highway projects to support of legislation, to jobs, to all kinds of things that some of these people promise.

We have also seen strong-arm lobbying from America's largest corporations. Every time there is a trade vote here, people at National Airport used to tell me they saw more corporate jets at that airport than anytime during the year, as corporate executives know that these trade agreements mean they can move more jobs overseas, make more money as they hire low-wage workers with no environmental laws, with no food safety laws, with no kind of worker safety laws.

□ 1900

Mr. STRICKLAND. I would just like to point out that many of these corporations are in fact multinational in nature. They have no loyalty to this country in particular or to any set of democratic principles or anything else, except the bottom line, and we allow these multinational corporations to influence American domestic economic policy. It is just absolutely wrong.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, one CEO of a major corporation said a couple of years ago, "I wish I could locate my corporate headquarters on an island that is part of no country." He does not mind being an American when he comes to this institution for subsidies, for tax cuts personally or corporate tax cuts, but when it comes time to employing American workers or living under the sovereignty of this Nation, he seems a little bit less interested.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and I, a moment ago, and for years, actually, but a moment ago were talking about food safety. And food safety is a particularly important issue. We have legislation with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and some others because we are concerned about country-of-origin labeling; we are concerned about inspections, as more and more fruits and vegetables come into the United States.

Because of budget cuts, and because of increased imports, and because of poor trade laws, only seven-tenths of 1 percent of food coming into this country is inspected at the border, much less than that inspected anywhere else. That means one out of every 140 crates of broccoli, one out of every 140 crates of fruit, one out of every 140 boxes of any kind of food gets inspected at the border. It is a serious problem, and the gentleman from Michigan will tell us more about what all of this means with Fast Track.

Mr. STUPAK. Well, with Fast Track, if we take a look at the proposed legis-

lation, H.R. 3005, the legislation that is going to be proposed, when we get to environmental standards or inspection, it is all voluntary. And when we have voluntary negotiating on objectives, on the environment, on food safety, it usually means nothing will happen. If anything, when we look closely at H.R. 3005, it is a step backwards. We do not have an opportunity to enforce the laws that we have because they are all subject to negotiations. Under H.R. 3005, when it comes to inspections, that is subject to negotiation. Even our laws which prevent adulterated or bad food that does not meet our standards or uses pesticides not allowed in this country, that is subject to negotiation. It is voluntary under these proposals.

The gentleman from Ohio talked about food coming into this country, that seven-tenths of 1 percent is ever inspected. Well, when they do broccoli, they just take a crate and drop it on the ground. If bugs come out, they impound it. If no bugs come out, it goes on. For years, we have asked for sophisticated inspection of food coming into this country. Let us not just drop the crates. Let us do a quick chemical test to see what pesticides are in it that we are consuming. Let us put the country of origin on this food. Let us have inspectors there and be able to impound the food for some time so we can have an opportunity to do a proper inspection.

All that is happening is a quick check, and then we are sending the truck on. By the time they do a sophisticated check, that truck is already hundreds of miles into the United States and has probably dropped its load. They do not know where it is because they do not have the order there in front of them. How do we recall it then? It is consumed.

We had that in Michigan with Guatemalan raspberries and our hot lunch program, and hundreds of kids were ill. Well, it is too late then. And guess what? It was really a U.S. company that imported the food. The U.S. company was supposed to inspect it, but they never did. Tainted water had been used to grow the crops, and that is what we have. We do not even have inspections overseas where this food comes from.

It is amazing. We have worked, as the gentleman said, for a number of years, and we have the bill again this year; but it is frustrating when we see that less than 1 percent is ever inspected. It is wintertime now, and where will most of our fruits and vegetables for our salads come from?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When the gentleman and I started this conversation 3 or 4 years ago, 2 percent of food was inspected. This Congress continues to cut the budget on food inspection.

And understand it is not just the adulterated food coming in. The way the trade law works on food safety, there are certain pesticides in the United States that are banned for use. It is illegal to put them on fields. It is

not illegal to make them. So in many cases, American manufacturers manufacture these pesticides, sell them to Guatemala to spray on the strawberries or on the raspberries. Those products then come back into the United States with pesticide residues, making the farmers sick that apply the pesticides, and then coming across the border.

We do not spend the money at the border to detect either adulterated food, anything from fecal matter to other kinds of contaminants, nor do they detect any kinds of residues from pesticides. And that is one of the reasons that in this country, and it is not all foreign food, but in this country 5,000 people a year die from food-borne illnesses and 300,000 people go to the hospitals with food-borne illnesses.

Not blaming it all on foreign food by a long shot. We should do a better inspection job with domestic food. But foreign food is a part of it, and food coming from abroad is a growing problem because we are importing more. That is why we get vegetables and fruits in the winter, because we are importing them. That is a good thing. It makes Americans healthier. But give Americans the confidence that our food will be safe by passing trade legislation that upgrades food safety standards everywhere, rather than pulling our standards down to the weaker standards of other countries.

We have about 3 minutes, so I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. I want to say quickly that I think the American consumer deserves information. When they go to the grocery store, as a consumer they deserve the right to know where that food has come from.

I was talking with one of my constituents over the weekend; and he said to me, you know, I would pay a little more for a television set that was made in America by American workers if I could find one. It is just unconscionable that we have reached this place.

But in terms of country-of-origin labeling, that is so basic. And if we cannot give this kind of information to the American consumer, then we will have failed them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just give more information to people.

In closing, I thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), who is here on the other side of the aisle, who has always been a strong opponent of bad free trade laws.

I would close by saying, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) said, corporate CEOs, the President, cabinet officials will all be lobbying this institution big time in the next week. I hope that coming out of this Special Order tonight that people will understand better what our trade policy does to our values and our way of

life, and that the American people will rise to the occasion and continue to push Members of Congress to do the right thing next week when we vote down Fast Track Trade Promotion Authority.

THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we have been told on numerous occasions to expect a long and protracted war. This is not necessary if one can identify the target, the enemy, and then stay focused on that target. It is impossible to keep one's eye on a target and hit it if we do not precisely understand it and identify it.

In pursuing any military undertaking, it is the responsibility of Congress to know exactly why it appropriates the funding. Today, unlike any time in our history, the enemy and its location remains vague and pervasive. In the undeclared wars of Vietnam and Korea, the enemy was known and clearly defined, even though our policies were confused and contradictory. Today, our policies relating to the growth of terrorism are also confused and contradictory. However, the precise enemy and its location are not known by anyone.

Until the enemy is defined and understood, it cannot be accurately targeted or vanquished. The terrorists are no more an entity than the Mob or some international criminal gang, such as the Mafia. It is certainly not a country, nor is it the Afghan people. The Taliban is obviously a strong sympathizer of bin Laden and his henchmen, but how much more so than the government of Saudi Arabia or even Pakistan? Probably not much.

Ulterior motives have always played a part in the foreign policies of almost every Nation throughout history. Economic gain and a geographic expansion, or even just the desires for more political power, too often drives the militarism of all nations. Unfortunately, in recent years, we have not been exempt. If expansionism, economic interests, desires for hegemony and influential allies affect our policies, and they in turn incite mob attacks against us, they obviously cannot be ignored. The target will be elusive and ever-enlarging rather than vanquished.

We do know a lot about the terrorists who spilled the blood of nearly 4,000 innocent civilians. There were 19 of them, 15 from Saudi Arabia; and they have paid a high price. They are all dead. So those most responsible for the attack have been permanently taken care of. If one encounters a single suicide bomber who takes his own life along with others, without the help from anyone else, no further punishment is possible. The only question

that can be raised under that circumstance is why did it happen and how can we change the conditions that drove that individual to perform such a heinous act.

The terrorist attacks on New York and Washington are not quite so simple, but they are similar. These attacks required funding, planning, and inspiration from others. But the total number of people directly involved had to be relatively small in order to have kept the plans thoroughly concealed. Twenty accomplices, or even 100 could have done it; but there is no way thousands of people knew and participated in the planning and carried out the attacks.

Moral support expressed by those who find our policies offensive is a different matter and difficult to determine. Those who enjoyed seeing the United States hit are too numerous to count and impossible to identify. To target and wage war against all of them is like declaring war against an idea or sin. The predominant nationality of the terrorists was Saudi Arabian. Yet, for political and economic reasons, even with the lack of cooperation from the Saudi Government, we have ignored that country in placing blame.

The Afghan people did nothing to deserve another war. The Taliban, of course, is closely tied to bin Laden and the al Qaeda, but so are the Pakistanis and the Saudis. Even the United States was a supporter of the Taliban's rise to power. And as recently as August of this year, we talked pipeline politics with them. The recent French publication of bin Laden, "The Forbidden Truth," revealed our most recent effort to secure control over Caspian Sea oil in collaboration with the Taliban.

According to the two authors, the economic conditions demanded by the U.S. were turned down and led to U.S. military threats against the Taliban. It has been known for years that UniCal, a U.S. company, has been anxious to build a pipeline through northern Afghanistan. But it has not been possible due to the weak Afghan central government. We should not be surprised now that many contend that the plan for the U.N. to nation-build in Afghanistan is a logical and important consequence of this desire. The crisis has merely given those interested in this project an excuse to replace the government of Afghanistan.

Since we do not even know if bin Laden is in Afghanistan; and since other countries are equally supportive of him, our concentration on this Taliban target remains suspect by many. Former FBI Deputy Director John O'Neill resigned in July over duplicitous dealings with the Taliban in our oil interests. O'Neill then took a job as head of the World Trade Center's security and, ironically, was killed in the 9-11 attack.

The charges made by these authors in this recent publication deserves close scrutiny and congressional over-

sight investigation and not just for the historical record.

To understand world sentiment on this subject, one might note a comment in the "Hindu," India's national newspaper, not necessarily to agree with the paper's sentiment, but to help us better understand what is being thought about us around the world in contrast to the spin put on the war by our five major TV networks.

This quote comes from an article written by Sitaram Yechury on October 13, 2001: "The world today is being asked to side with the United States in a fight against global terrorism. This is only a cover. The world is being asked today in reality to side with the U.S. as it seeks to strengthen its economic hegemony. This is neither acceptable nor will it be allowed. We must forge together to state that we are neither with the terrorists nor with the United States."

The need to define our target is ever so necessary if we are going to avoid letting this war get out of control. It is important to note that in the same article the author quoted Michael Klare, an expert on Caspian Sea oil reserves, from an interview on Radio Free Europe. He said, "We, the United States, view oil as a security consideration, and we have to protect it by any means necessary, regardless of other considerations, other values."

□ 1915

This, of course, was a clearly stated position of our administration in 1990 as our country was being prepared to fight the Persian Gulf War. Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction only became the issue later on. For various reasons, the enemy with whom we are now at war remains vague and illusive. Those who commit violent terrorist acts should be targeted with a rifle or hemlock, not with vague declarations with some claiming we must root out terrorism in as many as 60 countries.

If we are not precise in identifying our enemy, it is going to be hard to keep our eye on the target. Without this identification, the war will spread and be needlessly prolonged. Why is this definition so crucial? Because without it the special interests and the ill advised will clamor for all kinds of expanded militarism. Planning to expand and fight a never-ending war in 60 countries against worldwide terrorist conflicts with the notion that at most only a few hundred ever knew of the plans to attack the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The pervasive and indefinable enemy, terrorism, cannot be conquered without weapons and U.N. nation-building. Only a sensible pro-American foreign policy will accomplish this. This must occur if we are to avoid a cataclysmic expansion of the current hostilities. It was said that our efforts were to be directed towards the terrorists responsible for the attacks, and overthrowing and instituting new governments were not to be part of the agenda.