

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

my colleagues to heed the concerns raised by those who actually run and work at our nation's seaports. These concerns include having a set of clear, defined standards; the ability to appeal based on merit, not just technicalities; and the fluidity of port traffic among many levels of security.

Another concern is the inadequate funding to assist ports in addressing the threat of terrorism. H.R. 3983 authorizes \$225 million in grants over the next three years to assist U.S. ports in implementing the Coast Guard-approved maritime antiterrorism plans. Congress appropriated \$93 million in the Defense Supplemental Bill to initiate this program. Unfortunately, the need greatly exceeds the amount provided in this bill.

The question becomes "How do we develop and implement a worldwide maritime security system which ensures the maximum security while causing minimal disruption to domestic and international commerce?" If we are serious about ensuring the safety of our seaports, then we must also ensure that sufficient funding is available for the development and implementation of the necessary technology, as well as for the training and hiring of additional personnel, if needed.

Among the important provisions of the Maritime Transportation Antiterrorism Act of 2002 is the specific placement of the primary responsibility for the development of standards and programs under the newly created Transportation Security Administration headed by the Undersecretary for Transportation Security.

Ladies and gentlemen, we know now that the security of our homeland is a matter that concerns everyone in the country. We have been entrusted with the grave responsibility of developing timely and cost effective solutions to the complex issue of national security.

There are many questions still to be answered and many difficult decisions from our part still to be made. However, there are certain irrefutable facts that must guide us in making those decisions:

Our seaport security systems are currently neither comprehensive enough nor strong enough to deter a terrorist act.

Developing and implementing an effective seaport security system will require the cooperation and coordination with local, state and Federal government, port authorities, terminal operators, shippers and ocean carriers, and everyone involved in maritime transportation activities including labor.

In order to protect our national seaports, we must ensure that all ships and cargo bound for an American port have been inspected and cleared for entry. Thus, we must enlist the cooperation of foreign governments and make sure that these governments also have comparable security capabilities.

The development and implementation of a global maritime security system will require a substantial financial commitment, regardless of what cost-cutting measures may be taken.

The time for developing such a security system is now. Any legislative bill that passes the House must have a timetable or deadline for deployment.

We have an onerous responsibility upon our shoulders and we will have to make some very difficult decisions in the near future regarding the overall security of our beloved homeland. However, we should not despair. For over seven months we have seen how

united our country has been in our determination to confront terrorism and our refusal to allow a terrorist attack to change our American way of life. We have demonstrated our courage, patriotism, strength of spirit and dogged determination in the face of the most catastrophic attack on our Homeland.

We will need these same traits as we work together to protect our people and our country.

STATEMENT ON PIPELINE SAFETY, H.R. 3609 TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MARKUP

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 2002

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the health and safety of our citizens is a central part of a livable community. We in Congress have a special responsibility to ensure that the federal government is doing all it can to make our communities safe. Sadly, in the area of pipeline safety we have fallen short. Between 1986–1999, 23 fatalities, 113 injuries, and \$68 million in property damage resulted from 411 pipeline accidents. In the Pacific Northwest, two ten-year-old boys were killed in a 1999 pipeline explosion in Bellingham, Washington.

The bill before us today is a much-needed attempt to improve the federal government's role in pipeline safety, guarantee compliance from pipeline operators, and promote a more environmentally sound operation of natural gas and hazardous liquid pipeline systems. Four areas in particular I would like to see improved are integrity management, environmental review, whistleblower protection and the public's right to know.

Of these priorities, one that is of great importance to the families who live in communities with pipelines is the right to know the locations of these pipelines. Citizens have the right to know if a pipeline crosses near a school, hospital or important community landmark. These are not state secrets and the community's access to this information does not impair our nation's security. Many pipeline maps are already in the public realm and are posted on various public interest group web sites. Increasing public access to this information can only make our communities safer as the public will be more knowledgeable of where spills or leaks could occur.

While I support efforts to improve pipeline safety, I am concerned with any approach that would limit community awareness of the potential hazards of pipeline facilities. The public and the pipeline industry recognize the need to increase safety through appropriate federal supervision and protection. We must not fall short on our federal responsibility.

2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2002

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, throughout the history of this great nation, all of our political parties—whether they were Federalist or Antifederalist, Democrat or Republican—have worked from a shared belief that each generation of Americans has a basic and continuing obligation to provide a better future for the next generation. Simply put, this is the promise of America. It reflects both the strength of our democratic system as well as its fragility. It is fragile in the sense that this promise to the next generation is only as good and as reliable as our willingness to honor that promise during times of great challenge. After all, it is easy to make promises when there is no cost to their fulfillment.

I find it troubling that the Republican leadership has chosen in recent months to forget the next generation and break that basic promise and to wander from that common ground that we once shared. I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who said that a politician thinks about the next election, while a statesman thinks about the next generation. Only a few years ago, a former leader of the Republican Party warned this body, "If we don't get our house in order, the financial burden of the baby boom retirees will be crushing for the next generation." Sadly, that message seems to have gotten lost. What I see now from the leadership on the other side of the aisle, raiding the Social Security trust fund, returning us to deficit spending, and in effect handing the bill for this war in Afghanistan and the domestic war against terrorism to our children in the form of a multi-trillion dollar deficit. It seems disingenuous that while the Republican leadership champions nine years of tax cuts for individuals making over \$250,000 a year, they also refuse to ask those same people to help pay for this war and the costs of protecting our country from terrorism.

Think about it . . .

We are without question the wealthiest generation of any civilization that has ever walked this earth. We have acquired in this generation, our generation, greater wealth, greater scientific progress, greater luxury—a higher living standard, and done it faster, than any other generation of humans on this planet. We have seen in the past 20 years the average income of the top one percent of earners in this country increase by a staggering \$414,000 per year. We have seen the number of millionaires in our society increase by 400 percent over the past 10 years. The rate of home ownership is unsurpassed and has never been higher in this country.