

strategic consequences for America's ultimate victory.

South Carolina is especially proud of native son First Lieutenant William G. Farrow of Darlington. Lieutenant Darrow was one of eight members of Doolittle's Raiders who were captured by the Japanese. He endured 6 months of brutal torture and deprivation before being executed at age 25. Lieutenant Farrow's ultimate sacrifice will never be forgotten, and his influence continues with his authorship as a student at the University of South Carolina of "An American Creed for Victory."

As we honor Doolittle's Raiders for their courageous sacrifices for our Nation during World War II, it is my hope that Lieutenant Farrow's patriotic words will inspire all generations of Americans to serve their country with pride and honor.

The document referred to is as follows:

**Farrow's Creed**

After Raider Lieutenant William Farrow's execution on October 15, 1942, his mother found this list in a trunk belonging to him. President Franklin D. Roosevelt touted the list as an example to the Nation. It was printed in newspapers and church bulletins coast to coast.

**MY FUTURE (LATER CALLED "AN AMERICAN'S CREED FOR VICTORY").**

First, what are my weaknesses?

- (1) Lack of thoroughness and application.
- (2) Lack of curiosity.
- (3) Softness in driving myself.
- (4) Lack of constant diligence.
- (5) Lack of seriousness of purpose—sober thought.
- (6) Scatter-brained dashing here and there and not getting anything done—spur-of-the-moment stuff.
- (7) Letting situations confuse the truth in my mind.
- (8) Lack of self-confidence.
- (9) Letting people influence my decisions too much. I must weigh my decisions—then act.
- (10) Too much frivolity—not enough serious thought.

(1) Lack of clear-cut, decisive thinking.

Second, what must I do to develop myself?

- (1) Stay in glowing health—take a good, fast one-hour workout each day.
- (2) Search out current, past and future topics on aviation.
- (3) Work hard on each day's lessons—shoot for an "A."
- (4) Stay close to God—do His will and commandments. He is my friend and protector. Believe in Him—trust in His ways—not in my own confused understanding of the universe.
- (5) Do not waste energy or time in fruitless pursuits—learn to act from honest fundamental motives—simplicity in life leads to the fullest living. Order my life—in order, there is achievement, in aimlessness, there is retrogression.
- (6) Fear nothing—be it insanity, sickness, failure—always be upright—look the world in the eye.
- (7) Keep my mind always clean—allow no evil thoughts to destroy me. My mind is my very own, to think and use just as I do my arms. It was given to me by the Creator to use as I see fit, but to think wrong is to do wrong!
- (8) Concentrate! Choose the task to be done, and do it to the best of my ability.
- (9) Fear not for the future—build on each day as though the future for me is a cer-

tainty. If I die tomorrow, that is too bad, but I will have done today's work!

(10) Never be discouraged over anything! Turn failure into success.

□ 1745

**SPECIAL ORDERS**

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

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

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

**SUPREME COURT RULING  
THREATENS OUR CHILDREN**

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

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, 20 years ago, the Supreme Court recognized the compelling State and national interest in protecting American children, declaring that child pornography is barred from first amendment protection. Since that time, Congress has worked consistently to protect against the exploitation of our children, a charge that has become increasingly difficult in the computer age.

Yesterday, the court struck down Congress's attempt at a legislative crackdown against computer-age child pornography, calling it a threat to free speech. Justice Kennedy's broad language sends a disturbing message. The high court in our land apparently places a higher premium on the expression of pedophiles than on ensuring the psychological, emotional, and mental health of our country's children and society as a whole.

Child pornography is a highly organized, multi-million dollar industry in this country, involving the exploitation of thousands of children and youth in the production and distribution of pornographic materials. In 1996, Congress addressed the mushroom effect of high-tech kiddie porn by passing the Child Pornography Prevention Act. The law broadened the scope of the definition of child pornography to include computer-generated issues. Computers are increasingly being used to alter innocent pictures of children to create visuals of those children engaging in sexual conduct. This type of child pornography invades the child's privacy and reputational interests. Images that are created showing a child's face on a body engaging in sexually explicit conduct can haunt the minor for years.

As articulated by the court's dissenters, The Child Pornography Pre-

vention Act prohibition of virtual child pornography was tailored narrowly enough to pass constitutional muster. It is clear that the Act merely extends existing prohibitions on child pornography to a class of computer-generated pictures that may be easily mistaken for actual photographs of real children. Yesterday, the court turned its back on its long-standing recognition of the government's compelling interest in protecting American children. That interest is promoted by Congress's efforts to ban virtual child pornography. Such images whet the appetites of child molesters who may use the images to seduce young children.

Anger to children who are seduced and molested with the aid of child sex pictures is just as great when the child pornographer or child molester uses visuals of child sexual activity produced wholly or in part by electronic or computer means, as when molesters use images of actual children engaging in sexually explicit conduct.

Despite the Supreme Court's decision, Congress is not required to, nor will it wait, on harm to our children before legislating against it. I echo Attorney General John Ashcroft's disappointment in the ruling and that child pornographers and pedophiles can find little refuge in the court's decision. Ensuring enforceability of our American child pornography laws is indeed a compelling one, and the Child Pornography Prevention Act is an important tool in fighting child sexual abuse.

We will continue to fight to ban expression which is used by sex abusers to act in deviance with children and which desensitizes the offenders themselves to the pathology of sexual abuse and exploitation of children. The First Amendment does not protect the panderer.

**OPPOSING THE ADMINISTRATION'S  
PROPOSED WORK REQUIREMENTS  
UNDER TANF REAUTHORIZATION**

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

Ms. WATSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the President and Republican leadership proposals for TANF reauthorization. On February 26, the administration announced an agenda for welfare reform to strengthen families and help more recipients work towards independence and self reliance. In keeping with the principles outlined by President Bush, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced H.R. 4090, the Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act of 2002 on April 9. On that same day, the gentleman from California

(Mr. McKEON), chairman of the Subcommittee on 21st Century competitiveness of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, introduced H.R. 4092, the Working Towards Independence Act.

Let it be known, Madam Speaker, none of these proposals will strengthen families, move families towards self reliance and independence, or reduce poverty. To the contrary, the proposed changes to welfare will erode the successes of the past and severely limit the States' flexibility.

The Republican bills, while largely similar in most respects, promote increased work requirements, introduce an acceleration in the number of families in specified work activities, and devote \$300 million a year to marriage and family formation. The problem with these proposals is that States are expected to make sweeping changes to their programs and move more welfare recipients into work with the current level of funding. Flat level funding will erode the States' ability to provide services such as child care, transportation, vocational training, skills, and barrier assessments, all of the important ingredients of work promotion, poverty reduction, and self-sufficiency.

Recent analyses have indicated that these proposals will cost the States \$15 billion over the next 5 years. Any plan must avoid imposing unfunded costs upon the States that could lead them, shift resources away from low-income working families in order to finance new requirements.

Furthermore, 41 governors from the States, both Republican and Democratic, have voiced their concerns about the fundamental changes proposed in these bills. A new 40-hour work requirement would be an enormous burden on the States, and the new rules would be far too rigid. These proposals decrease State flexibility, one of the champion successes of the past legislation that enabled States to move families off of welfare.

In addition to these concerns, the 40-hour work week is counterproductive and makes no sense, given the rules and limited flexibility. If TANF participants work off their benefits in a work fair or community service job, and if their job is valued or paid at State minimum wage rates, these individuals would earn their benefit in fewer hours than the required 24 hours.

Let me give my colleagues an example. In California, my constituents would work off their benefits in just 19.3 hours in a work fair or community service job. These individuals would then face noncompliance and sanctions. This is true in 26 other States as well. If, on the other hand, a welfare recipient finds an unsubsidized job at a minimum wage, they would earn too much money to qualify for the benefits and would move into a class of the working poor. The proposals really do not add up.

In addition to this dilemma, the proposals do not account for the large

number of families needing child care or transportation in order to work. By demanding increased work requirements and an acceleration in the number of families in specified work activities, the demands for child care and transportation will only increase. Flat level funding will not suffice.

The need, in closing, for child care has increased by 21 percent over the past few years.

Madam Speaker, we need to relook at these proposals, for they simply do not add up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD STAND WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our friend and ally, Israel, for celebrating the 54th Independence Day for the State of Israel. It is important at this time that we stand with our friend and ally, Israel.

There is a famous story that Davy Crockett told. It is in the book "Three Roads to the Alamo." Davy Crockett got into an argument and then there was a brawl afterwards. One of his friends did not help him out and Davy Crockett got kind of beaten up in the brawl. He asked his friend afterwards, how come you did not help me? His friend said, well, it was really controversial and it was kind of a difficult decision, and I was not sure if I wanted to back you up. He said, hey, you do not need friends when everybody is in agreement with you. You do not need friends when everybody thinks what you are doing is wonderful. You need friends when you are in a fight and there is a question over the principles.

We are not the government of Israel. It is a difficult time for Israel. They made some decisions to go after terrorists that were attacking their right to exist, just like we have gone after terrorists that are attacking our right to exist. Whether or not I would have done the completely same methods that Israel has used, I do not know. I think so, but I am not the leader of Israel. Ariel Sharon is the Prime Minister of Israel and the leader of Israel,

and I believe it is important that we stand with them.

One of the debates when I have been in the Middle East is whether or not Israel has displaced the Palestinians. Any student of history, even somebody who has not focused on history, realizes that there has been a conflict, basically, an eternal conflict over who was where. But when the Jews were dispersed around the world and others moved in does not mean that when the Nation of Israel was created in 1948, that suddenly the people who were displaced at that point had any more of a legitimate claim, even in a secular way, than the people who were moved out and dispersed before that.

It is important that we recognize that that is an independent state of Israel. When we met with Dr. Arakat and the Palestinians in Jericho, Dr. Arakat was promoting that they needed a contiguous state, a Palestinian state. Part of the argument that I had was why should we trust you when you still have it in your Constitution that Israel does not have the right to exist. Conflict erupted, verbal conflict in the meeting, because he said that that was not politically possible. But why should Israel trust the words of the Palestinian Authority if they do not grant their right to exist?

Part of the problem is, as we have seen multiple times there, when we pushed and western powers pushed Israel to back off the Golan Heights, people can look right down on Israeli citizens and shoot down on them that the reason that they cannot have a contiguous state is that there is not much water in that area.

□ 1800

The reason they cannot have a contiguous state is there is not much water in that area. They have water pipes going through. If those things are controlled by people committed to their destruction, they cannot exist as a state.

Furthermore, we have a longtime moral and secular argument about whose capital Jerusalem is. It is a shrine to many nations. We have some conflicts that are not easily reconciled. Israel, unless they have the flexibility to take out the terrorists, will not exist as an independent state. So we can commemorate the independence of Israel, but unless they can make sure they have a water supply that comes, unless they make sure people are not shooting down on them from the heights, people who can hide in terrorist camps, they cannot exist and have an independent state.

Furthermore, we have a lot of whining about how Israel treats the Palestinians. It is tough. Quite frankly, I might handle some of these things slightly differently. But we know this for a fact, Palestinians can become citizens in Israel. They can vote in Israel, in the Israeli elections. They can own property in Israel.

But when we go to the Arab countries around Israel, they treat the Palestinians like dirt. They cannot own land.