

United States Army Corps of Engineers, is retiring from duty bringing to a close his admirable 29-year military career.

Colonel DeLony, a 1973 graduate of Texas A&M, spent much of his career in the elite Airborne forces including command of the 101st Airborne Division's Engineer Battalion and as the Brigade Operations Officer of the 20th Airborne Engineer Brigade during the Gulf War. For his service, Colonel DeLony has been awarded a number of decorations including the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal (Five Awards), Army Commendation Medal (Two Awards), National Defense Service Medal (Two Awards), Saudi Arabia Liberation Medal and the Kuwait Liberation Medal. He has also earned the Senior Parachutist Badge, Air Assault Badge, and the coveted Ranger Tab.

In his most recent assignment, Colonel DeLony served as the Commander of the Wilmington District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In this position, Colonel DeLony battled different foes, from mosquitoes in the Cape Fear River to Hurricane Debby as it threatened the Southeast coast. He has distinguished himself in this assignment, providing able leadership as his command carried out its essential mission of enhancing the military and economic capabilities of South-Central Virginia and North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Representative of the citizens of Virginia's 4th District to congratulate Colonel DeLony on his magnificent career and to thank him for his long service to America. Colonel, we wish you and your wife Jennifer every happiness as you begin this new assignment and thank you both for your dedication to service and duty.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO HILDA VAUGHAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2002

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Hilda Vaughan, an exceptional individual who has selflessly devoted her time and energy to the betterment of this nation. I applaud her outstanding character, and her desire to support and educate her community. Hilda demonstrates impressive qualities worthy of such praise, and today we honor her retirement as a salute to a job well done.

Hilda was born in Lynchburg, Virginia, and spent her adolescent years thirsting for knowledge. After graduating from Rustburg High School in Rustburg Virginia, she obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree from Lynchburg College, and married her beloved husband, Ted Vaughan. Hilda moved to Silt, Colorado, and served her community well, by holding a number of clerical, secretarial, and accounting positions. Additionally, Hilda achieved her EMT-B certification and assisted the Grand Valley Fire Protection District. Hilda's attention to detail, together with her unwavering determination, led her to become and perform as an outstanding substitute teacher and librarian for 23 years. As a student teacher in Lynchburg, she educated herself to become a mentor as well as a teacher. Her first substitute teaching position was in the RE-2 School District, in

Rifle, Colorado. Through her experiences in different geographic areas and districts, Hilda expanded her vast knowledge and wisdom, and became an excellent asset to every school district she served. Today we admire a woman who selflessly donated her time and efforts to upholding the structure of her community.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I honor such an outstanding individual before this body of Congress and this nation. Hilda contributed so much, and she was so thoughtful, words will never express our appreciation to her. Hilda, thank you for your hard work in our country, and I anticipate great future achievements from you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2002

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my flight from Los Angeles was delayed in departing and I unavoidably missed two roll-call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 208, H.R. 4800 to make the adoption tax credit permanent, "Yea".

On rollcall No. 207, to make permanent the tax exemption for payments to Holocaust survivors, "Yea".

EXPLAINING SEPTEMBER 11TH TO FUTURE 4TH GRADERS

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2002

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following letter to you and all of our colleagues. Nicole Bansen read this letter at the Lindenhurst Memorial Day Ceremony on May 27, 2002. An elementary school student from Long Island, Nicole directed the letter to future 4th graders so that they might better understand September 11 based on her own experience. Like Nicole, I believe that we must help preserve the memory of that tragic day by sharing our stories with future generations.

DEAR FUTURE FOURTH GRADER: September 11, 2001 was a tragic day. I'm writing this letter to tell you what really happened. I was in school when it happened. That was the day that jet planes hit the Twin Towers, and soon both collapsed. Tower One was hit first. Within the next hour, Tower Two was also hit. Time seemed to freeze. Everyone just stopped what they were doing to see what happened in disbelief. It was like a nightmare coming true!

When I found out what had happened, my heart felt like it was shattered, just like the Twin Towers. After school, my brother and Mom told me to watch the news. I turned on the television and saw both planes crashing into the Twin Towers. A friend of our family's worked on the 72nd floor of Tower One. I was afraid that he might be killed, like so many others. He made it out of the building in minutes before it collapsed!

I was affected by this tragedy in a sad way because I will not see the Twin Towers anymore, and so many innocent people died. In

the future, people should never forget this day, and always remember all the people who died. I believe parents should tell their children the truth about what happened when they are old enough to understand, so they aren't frightened. Your friends and you will learn about this day in your Social Studies class in school, if your parents didn't already tell you about it.

I hope this terrorist act never happens again. Hopefully you will never know the "evil" word, terrorism. But, if something like this does happen again, I am sure that everyone will be very sad. I am so glad to be an American, because of our freedom and people staying united through difficult times.

Sincerely,

NICOLE BANSEN.

FARM SECURITY ACT

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2002

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the attached article appearing in *The Weekly Standard* on May 27, 2002 regarding the recently passed and signed Farm Security Act conference report be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the *Weekly Standard*, May 27, 2002]

THE PIGS RETURN TO THE TROUGH

FARM SUBSIDIES ARE BACK, BIGGER THAN EVER

(By Fred Barnes)

The White House veto of the farm bill was bold and defiant, reflecting the strength and confidence of the president. The bill not only costs too much and imposes too many government controls, he said, but it's also filled with "so much that would be detrimental to farmers," their future would be put in jeopardy. "It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country," the president said, causing large surpluses. "Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people." Too bad this veto message didn't come from President Bush last week when he instead signed the bloated new farm bill. No, those words were President Eisenhower's as he vetoed the Agricultural Act of 1956.

At the last moment, Bush considered a veto. His aides checked with congressional Republicans to find out if the bill's price tag might be as much as \$20 billion more than advertised. It's costly, but not that costly, the White House was told. And even if it were, it was too late for a veto, the president having signaled repeatedly that he'd sign the measure. So, with misgivings, Bush went along. Three times, he called the bill "generous," and he conceded "it's not a perfect bill." His weak explanation for signing it was: "There's no such thing as a perfect bill."

There's a lot more wrong with the bill Bush signed than a few imperfections. First, there's the money. Depending on whose projections you use, it will raise farm spending by \$73 billion to \$82 billion over 10 years. The bill's total cost is pegged at \$457.8 billion, including \$251.9 billion for food stamps. What's worse is the attitude of Congress and the White House toward the increased spending that the bill reveals. A war is on and there's again a huge deficit, yet Washington is back to its old ways, gorging on spending. The era in which big government was over is over.

The bill not only increases spending for most existing crop subsidy programs, it

brings back old ones that had been killed and even creates new ones. Remember the mohair subsidy, which became famous because one of its recipients was newsmen Sam Donaldson of ABC? It was eliminated in the Freedom to Farm Act of 1996, which was supposed to wean farmers off subsidies altogether, but didn't. Well, the mohair subsidy is back, along with the previously killed wool subsidy, thanks to the chairman (Larry Combest) and ranking Democratic member (Charles Stenholm) of the House Agricultural Committee, both from Texas. And thanks to the efforts of Democratic senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota, the honey subsidy has also risen from the dead.

Is it crucial to America for these products to be federally subsidized? Of course not. Yet what's alarming is how easily these subsidies were revived. The standard wasn't whether they are necessary. Obviously they aren't. It was whether the subsidies could be slipped into the farm bill, one way or another, while everyone is distracted by the war on terrorism. This is the old way of doing business in Washington: Feather your own nest—that is, your district or state—with as much of the taxpayers' money as you can get your hands on. This practice, dormant for a spell, is now back in full flower.

Republicans are almost as guilty as Democrats. For instance, they used the farm bill to present a gift to Ben Gilman, former chairman of the House International Relations Committee, who's retiring. Onion growers in his upstate New York district have been clamoring for federal aid for years, and so has Gilman. The farm bill provides a subsidy. Gilman was duly appreciative. "This measure enables us to finally deliver the needed \$10 million in federal assistance to our Orange County onion farmers, who have suffered year after year," he said. Gilman is a capable congressman and a nice man. But should the farm bill be a vehicle for gifts?

The onion program is not the only new one. Conrad was the key player in bringing about a subsidy for "pulse" crops—you know, chickpeas, lentils, and dry peas. A subsidy for those is designed to encourage farmers to rotate their crops. Crop rotation is a good agricultural practice. But hasn't it been done for eons without a subsidy from Washington? Must farmers really be prodded at taxpayers' expense?

To no one's shock, the farm bill is blatantly political. As Richard E. Cohen and Corine Hegland noted in the National Journal, Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle made sure Democratic senators up for reelection this year were helped. Max Cleland of Georgia got a bigger-than-ever peanut subsidy. Tim Johnson of South Dakota wanted something called "country-of-origin" labeling on products—and got it. Tom Harkin, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, got a big, fat farm bill to brag about back in Iowa.

What about President Bush? He could have kept the farm bill from becoming egregiously larded. Citing new economic circumstances, he could have called for a little belt-tightening. It was back in spring 2001 when Congress authorized the \$73 billion increase in farm spending. At the time, the budget surplus was \$5 trillion and no annual deficits were in sight. The economic slump changed things. By late 2001, the surplus had shrunk dramatically and deficits were foreseen. True, the White House complained about House and Senate farm bills as they were being drafted, saying they cost too much and didn't meet the White House's free-market standards. But Bush could have insisted Congress trim the \$73 billion hike and not add programs.

Against a good bit of evidence, Bush and his aides assert the Freedom to Farm bill

with its market-oriented approach has not been reversed by the new farm bill. At last week's signing ceremony, Bush said supplemental farm bills won't have to be enacted every year, as was the case after 1996. The new bill, he said, "is generous enough to eliminate the need for supplemental support later this year and in the future." We'll see. The question is whether farmers and their allies in Washington have merely been whetted. The answer, more likely than not, is whetted.

HOLOCAUST RESTITUTION TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Holocaust Restitution Tax Fairness Act of 2002 to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001. This bill which allows the continued exemption of Holocaust related payments from federal income tax is an important and symbolic gesture on behalf of eligible individuals who were persecuted on the basis of religion, physical and mental disability, sexual orientation by Nazi Germany.

A reparation fund established by Germany makes approximately 60,000 payments to individuals living in the United States. Payments also come from countries and industries that benefited from slave labor or property confiscation during the Nazi era.

Payments to Holocaust survivors should not be subject to U.S. income tax. The Exclusion From Federal Income Tax For Restitution Received by Victims of the Nazi Regime was enacted as a thoughtful way to bring closure to a painful period in history.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation on behalf of victims of the Nazi regime.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 2002

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I come today to address the critical issue of American seaport security. I am acutely aware of the dangerous possibilities for terrorist acts against our seaports since I represent the third largest and the busiest seaport on the East Coast of the United States—the Port of New York/New Jersey, which creates over 229,000 jobs and generates more than \$25 billion in commerce.

As we are all sadly aware, a terrorist's intent is not only to kill innocent people and destroy valuable property, but also to destroy our livelihoods and our way of life. Any terrorist action against our strategic seaports would have disastrous effects nationally and internationally. Any attempt on our part to grapple with the complex issues and details of developing and implementing a maritime security system must take into consideration the fact that we will

need international cooperation and equal security capabilities.

We need to ensure the safety of cargo originating overseas, which then must pass through the global chain of custody, before it reaches our domestic ports. To fully understand the scope of dealing with maritime security, simply imagine that every single container bound for entry into the United States or simply passing through the United States is a potential weapon of mass destruction. Every ship could be a delivery system of doom and every port a potential target. Now realize that the equivalent of six million containers entered the United States last year aboard 7,500 commercial vessels making 51,000 port calls.

H.R. 3983, the Maritime Transportation Anti-Terrorism Act of 2002, as amended, is an important step in ensuring the safety of cargo originating overseas. Together with the manager's amendment adding the Coast Guard reauthorization bill and the Custom's reauthorization act passed by the House shortly before the Memorial Day Work Period, the Congress is finally taking a comprehensive approach to port security.

Perhaps most critical to a timely global implementation of a port security system is the fact that H.R. 3983 incorporates the need to work effectively with foreign governments in order to ensure national security. This bill calls for the Department of Transportation to identify foreign ports that pose a security risk to the United States. If the Department finds a foreign port's security measures to be inadequate, it will make recommendations to improve these security measures. But if the foreign port fails to take corrective actions within 90 days, the Department can prescribe additional security conditions for ships and cargo entering the United States from these ports.

The bill also requires development of a cargo identification, tracking, and screening system, as well as performance standards to enhance the physical security of shipping containers. Also important is H.R. 3983's inclusion of a deadline (June 30, 2003) for the deployment of this cargo security system. We all know that such a time schedule is crucial to the protection of our people, seaports and national and international commerce. There is no time to waste on this endeavor. We must start and complete this strategy against terrorism before we are subject to another attack. Implementing preventive measures will greatly reduce the degree of vulnerability of our ports.

Finally, it codifies an emergency Coast Guard rule put in place immediately after the attacks of September 11th. Under this rule, shipping companies must electronically transmit passenger and crew manifests to the Department of Transportation prior to the vessel entering the United States.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3983 is vague or does not address many issues important to port security and I hope that my colleagues will address these issues in conference. For example, the bill creates a single, national transportation security card to be issued to port workers, merchant mariners, and truck drivers who work in "secure" areas based on the successful completion of a background check. Background checks and a single security card are something we have been doing at the Port of New York-New Jersey for many years. However, it remains to be seen how this single, national transportation security card is going to work in an actual seaport setting and I urge