

The President has requested a \$48 billion funding increase in Fiscal Year 2003 for the Department of Defense. \$10 billion of this increase is a so called reserve fund unallocated to any specific programs. Mr. Speaker, I say that the emperor has no clothes because the Armed Forces have testified that they are facing critical shortfalls NOW that could be filled with funds from this \$10 billion reserve. In this bill, I ask the Congress to take advantage of the flexibility offered by the House Budget Resolution to meet these shortfalls. Section 201 of that resolution requires chairman of the Budget Committee to increase funding to the Department of Defense to prosecute the war on terrorism if the Committees on Armed Services or Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution providing that funding. My bill would do just that.

The armed services have shown that additional funding is necessary through lists of their urgent unfunded priorities and through testimony to the Congress. Let me explain how the \$10 billion should be used to meet these needs.

Fully one-half of the \$10 billion would be used for procurement for all four services. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I have not included funding for specific programs; that detail is appropriately provided through deliberation in the Armed Services Committee. Yet \$3.4 billion would be allocated for the Navy—hopefully to begin to address the shortfalls in shipbuilding that have been continually cited by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the combatant commanders who rely on maritime capabilities. These procurement shortfalls mean not only that the emperor is without clothes now, he'll remain naked for a long time to come.

Beyond procurement, this bill would provide close to \$2 billion for research and development throughout the services. Money must be spent now to ensure that our military has what it needs to continue the war on terrorism into the future.

This bill would also restore military construction levels to where they were in Fiscal Year 2002. Construction funding ensures the health of our military bases and the quality of life of all those who serve. We cannot expect to win this global war without effective support facilities for our warfighters and their families.

This bill would also fund operations and maintenance requirements for special operations forces who have proved so critical in the current war. It funds Army depot maintenance as well in order to keep our war effort moving efficiently.

Finally, this bill would put significant additional resources toward our most critical military asset—the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who defend our nation every day. First, it matches the pay raises of 4.6 percent Congress approved for them last year and provides targeted pay increases for experienced service members we need to retain for this war. Second, it provides greatly needed end-strength increases for the services in the active duty, the reserves, and the National Guard components. The service chiefs have told us they need more people to fight this war—we should give them what they need. Getting enough quality people to service is the best way to ensure that the emperor gets his new clothes.

Mr. Speaker, this reserve funds is designated to meet the needs of the global war

on terrorism. We know what those needs are and we should act quickly to fulfill them. That's how we get the emperor some new clothes. And that's the best way of ensuring the continued success of the war on terrorism and the long-term health of our military. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

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

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF GLENNA HAYES AND JOHN THOMAS RIDDLE

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

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and contributions of Glenna Hayes, a true American hero.

Ms. Hayes received her B.A. degree from Spelman College in 1940 and married her college sweetheart, Joseph Hayes, in 1943. A year later she received her R.N. and Public Health Nursing degrees. Her husband and she moved to Los Angeles in 1945, and Ms. Hayes quickly devoted herself to the children of Los Angeles.

In 1950 she became involved in organizing an auxiliary to the Children's Home Society of California, a statewide organization placing children for adoption. During a time of great segregation, the CHS was responsible for finding families for children from all ethnic backgrounds. In an effort to honor this commitment, Ms. Hayes was instrumental in helping to create the Lullaby Guild in 1950, which was organized with 27 interracial members.

The Lullaby Guild played a pivotal role in identifying homes for many African American children who faced the dim prospect of not being adopted. Members of the Lullaby Guild actively sought and identified families that were willing to adopt and then assisted them through the adoption process. The Guild also transported babies from their foster homes to CHS clinics for monthly medical checkups.

Ms. Hayes was elected treasurer of the Council Auxiliaries in 1963 for two terms, and elected president in 1965. In 1968 she became a school nurse in charge of employee health for the Los Angeles Unified School District. Throughout her life, she continued to volunteer her time to causes that helped protect the children and the health of the wonderful people of Los Angeles.

Glenna Hayes was a remarkable member of the community and an American devoted to helping better the lives of children and families. Now let

us all celebrate Glenna Hayes's life and spirit of volunteerism and racial equality.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to present a celebration for the life of John Thomas Riddle, a sculptor, painter, printmaker, and educator.

□ 1500

John Riddle was born in Los Angeles in 1933, educated in the public schools, and graduated from Los Angeles City College. John taught art at Los Angeles High School and Beverly Hills High School before moving to Atlanta, Georgia, where he taught at Spelman College and received many awards, as well as public arts commissions.

He was eventually appointed to the post of administrative assistant for the city of Atlanta. In 1984, he was commissioned by the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority to create four wall sculptures for the Tenth Street Midtown Station.

In 1999, John joined the California African American Museum as its curator. John Riddle's early artworks have been described as figurative. However, the Watts civil disturbance of 1965 changed his views on the purpose and the worth of art. He began to search for ways in which he could artistically expose the harsh realities of living and working in South Central Los Angeles.

John's works are now found in the collections of the Oakland Museum, the California African American Museum, the High Museum of Art in Atlanta, the Schomburg Center in New York City, and the Harriet Tubman Museum in Macon, Georgia.

His works have been collected by numerous celebrities, including Sidney Poitier, Bill Cosby, Roberta Flack, and Jasmine Guy. In 1971, he was one of the subjects of the NBC Emmy Award-winning television presentation entitled "Renaissance in Black: Two Artists' Lives."

John came from a highly distinguished family. His father, John Riddle, Senior, was an architect and former USC fullback who held many school records during the first half of the 20th century. His mother, Helen Louise Wheeler, was believed to be the first African American woman to have graduated from USC's School of Law.

But most importantly, John was a family man, and has been described by his oldest son, Anthony Riddle, as a great father, a great artist, and a good man. He is survived by his wife of nearly 50 years, my classmate, Carmen Garrett Riddle; four daughters; two sons; and 12 grandchildren.

We pay a great deal of attention and celebration to his life.

THE UNITED STATES MUST AVOID ISOLATIONISM AND HYPOCRISY WITH REGARD TO ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I just want to call attention to the fact that I have submitted into the RECORD paraphernalia about today's National Day of Silence.

I also, before I begin, want to comment on some of the things that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), mentioned, who seems to advocate a foreign policy for the United States of isolationism. I had thought that we were way beyond that. He sounds like the people pre-1941 and pre-Pearl Harbor who were talking about isolationism, and as a result, the United States entered the war rather late, and we suffered through Pearl Harbor.

After September 11, I would hardly think that anybody who is serious would advocate isolationism. We do not live in a vacuum. Today's world is closer than ever before, and I think as leaders of the free world we have a responsibility, and that responsibility means that we are engaged.

I think that his comment about somehow the United States supports Israel because of domestic political pressure is absolutely ridiculous. The United States supports Israel because the U.S. and Israel have shared values, common values: democracy. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East, and that has a major effect on support for Israel in this country from Christian clergy and all clergy and average citizens alike, because we share democratic values.

I want to talk a little bit about the fight against terrorism and what is happening in the Middle East. The fight against terrorism I believe has to be consistent. If we go halfway around the world, rightfully so, to Afghanistan to root out terrorist cells, I believe that we have no business criticizing Israel for attempting to do the same thing in her own backyard. We need to be consistent.

We went after the Taliban in Afghanistan, and again, rightfully so, because they were harboring terrorists. We went after them because they were harboring al-Qaeda. Well, in the Middle East, Yasser Arafat is not only harboring terrorists, he is the terrorist. He is akin to Osama bin Laden. Three-quarters of the terrorist attacks by the suicide bombers carried out in Israel in the past several months have been from groups directly under Yasser Arafat's control: the al-Aqsa Brigade, 4/17, Tanzime. They are all part of Fatah, the umbrella group that Yasser Arafat controls.

So I would like to ask the question: If we do not negotiate with terrorists, why should we force the Israelis to do the same? President Bush put it quite right when he said: You are either with us or you are with the terrorists.

Again, I think we have to be consistent. There is no timetable for our operation in Afghanistan. The President has said we will be there until we finish the job. I do not believe we should pressure Israel into any kind of

artificial timetable until they can finish the job of uprooting terror in their own backyard.

The media would try to portray Israel as somehow the villain and the Palestinians as somehow the victims, but I would say, who has been perpetrating the suicide bombings? There have been 73, and to date, unfortunately, a 74th incident of a suicide bombing in Israel since negotiations broke down 18 or 19 months ago. And believe me, if we allow the suicide bombers to continue to use terrorism as a negotiating tool and we do not eradicate it now, it is only a matter of time before it is going to come to our shores, because if it is effective in the Middle East, it will be effective all around the world. We cannot allow that to happen.

I draw the analogy to the United States and Canada. If there were terrorists, hypothetically, coming down over the Canadian border wreaking havoc in the United States, blowing themselves up and taking innocent civilians with them, and we repeatedly, hypothetically, asked the Canadian government to apprehend these terrorists and the Canadian government refused to do so, would we not feel justified to take matters into our own hands and send our troops over that border to get and capture those terrorists? Of course we would.

Israel has repeatedly, and the United States has repeatedly, called on Yasser Arafat to rein in the terrorists, to rein in terrorism, but he has not done so because he is the terrorist himself and uses terrorism as a negotiating tool.

So, from my way of thinking, Israel is absolutely justified to go in and root out terrorist cells in the Palestinian territories, just the way we are justified in going to Afghanistan to root out terrorist cells.

Ari Fleischer, who is President Bush's press secretary, said today that the President, that Bush does not trust Arafat. If we do not trust Arafat, why is Colin Powell going to meet with him? Why are we elevating this man's status as somehow being a legitimate leader?

Let us remember history: Just 18 or 19 months ago in Camp David, the Israelis were willing to accept a plan which gave Arafat 97 percent of what he was asking for: a Palestinian state with billions of dollars of foreign aid, on 97 percent of the lands. He walked away from it. The Israelis accepted it. Arafat walked away from it and did not offer a counterproposal, but walked away from it and then unleashed the Intifada, with terrorism and suicide bombings.

So I think it is very, very important to have a perspective here and to understand what is really happening. So I think the United States, again, ought to be consistent. We ought to fight terrorism here and around the world, and support those who are fighting terrorism in their own backyard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

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

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is very important to the future of the State of Indiana. For too long, much of Indiana have been out of sync of the rest of the world. Hoosiers have been languishing under a system where as much as three different time zones are randomly followed in our State. This outdated approach has been allowed to exist without regard to geography or to logic.

The result is that we are wasting valuable resources and putting our valuable small businesses and industries at a competitive disadvantage. I want all Hoosiers to have every opportunity and advantage to compete in the global economy. We must put our best efforts towards realizing the great promise of the 21st century.

I am working hard on this issue to help us take a step forward in that pursuit. I am introducing a bill which will finally allow Indiana to spring forward.

The benefits to all of us are clear in Indiana. Daylight saving time will save Indiana families over \$7 million annually in electricity rates alone. It will give a windfall to small and large businesses alike by lifting barriers to competition, improving communication and commerce, and saving millions on improved energy efficiency statewide.

For our communities, this will be one more step in preserving our cherished way of life by perfecting our health and safety. By all of Indiana observing daylight saving time, toxic emissions would be reduced by more than 240 million pounds annually. With more daylight, schoolchildren will not have to travel to and from school in the dark. For families, there will be more time for outdoor leisure and recreation after the work day is over. All of this is by simply changing our clocks just twice a year.

To give one example, Mr. Speaker, of how this issue affects Hoosiers, let me tell Members what I heard from Tom Williams of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis.

He says that there are times when Hoosier borrowers actually pay a higher price to borrow money when Indiana is on Chicago time. This commonly occurs when a loan closing happens at the end of the business day, and the lender wants to use an advance from his bank to fund the loan. If the lender contacts the bank after the market in New York closes, his bank cannot quote a firm price, since it will not