

consistent with all governing rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and statutes.

(o) Log.

The Director of Security and Registry for the Committee shall maintain a written record identifying the particular classified document or material provided to such other committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee), the reasons agreed upon by the Committee for approving such transmission, and the name of the committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee) receiving such document or material.

(p) Miscellaneous Requirements.

(1) Staff Director's Additional Authority. The staff director is further empowered to provide for such additional measures, which he or she deems necessary, to protect such classified information authorized by the Committee to be provided to such other committee or Member (not a Member of the Committee).

(2) Notice to Originating Agency. In the event that the Committee authorizes the disclosure of classified information provided to the Committee by an agency of the executive branch to a Member (not a Member of the Committee) or to another committee, the Chairman may notify the providing agency of the Committee's action prior to the transmission of such classified information.

15. LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

(a) Generally.

The Chief Clerk, under the direction of the staff director, shall maintain a printed calendar that lists:

(1) the legislative measures introduced and referred to the Committee;

(2) the status of such measures; and

(3) such other matters that the Committee may require.

(b) Revisions to the Calendar.

The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes.

(c) Availability.

A copy of each such revision shall be furnished to each Member, upon request.

(d) Consultation with Appropriate Government Entities.

Unless otherwise directed by the committee, legislative measures referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chief Clerk to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

16. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

(a) Authority.

The Chairman may authorize Members and Committee Staff to travel on Committee business.

(b) Requests.

(1) Member Requests. Members requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request directly to the Chairman.

(2) Committee Staff Requests. Committee Staff requesting authorization for such travel shall state the purpose and length of the trip, and shall submit such request through their supervisors to the staff director and the Chairman.

(c) Notification to Members.

(1) Generally. Members shall be notified of all foreign travel of Committee Staff not accompanying a Member.

(2) Content. All Members are to be advised, prior to the commencement of such travel, of its length, nature, and purpose.

(d) Trip Reports.

(1) Generally. A full report of all issues discussed during any Committee travel shall be submitted to the Chief Clerk of the Committee within a reasonable period of time following the completion of such trip.

(2) Availability of Reports. Such report shall be:

(A) available for the review of any Member or Committee Staff; and

(B) considered executive session material for purposes of these rules.

(e) Limitations on Travel.

(1) Generally. The Chairman is not authorized to permit travel on Committee business of Committee Staff who have not satisfied the requirements of subsection (d) of this rule.

(2) Exception. The Chairman may authorize Committee Staff to travel on Committee business, notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (d) and (e) of this rule—

(A) at the specific request of a Member of the Committee; or

(B) in the event there are circumstances beyond the control of the Committee Staff hindering compliance with such requirements.

(f) Definitions.

For purposes of this rule the term "reasonable period of time" means:

(1) no later than 60 days after returning from a foreign trip; and

(2) no later than 30 days after returning from a domestic trip.

(C) DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

(a) Generally.

The Committee shall immediately consider whether disciplinary action shall be taken in the case of any member of the Committee Staff alleged to have failed to conform to any Rule of the House of Representatives or to these rules.

(b) Exception.

In the event the House of Representatives is:

(1) in the recess period in excess of 3 days; or

(2) has adjourned *sine die*;

the Chairman of the full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may take such immediate disciplinary actions deemed necessary.

(c) Available Actions.

Such disciplinary action may include immediate dismissal from the Committee Staff.

(d) Notice to Members.

All Members shall be notified as soon as practicable, either by facsimile transmission or regular mail, of any disciplinary action taken by the Chairman pursuant to subsection (b).

(e) Reconsideration of Chairman's Actions.

A majority of the Members of the full Committee may vote to overturn the decision of the Chairman to take disciplinary action pursuant to subsection (b).

18. BROADCASTING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, a majority of the Committee may permit that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions and in accordance with the spirit of the purposes enumerated in the Rules of the House.

19. COMMITTEE RECORDS TRANSFERRED TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(a) Generally.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Notice of withholding.

The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the full Committee for a determination of the question of public availability on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

20. CHANGES IN RULES

(a) Generally.

These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by vote of the full Committee.

(b) Notice of Proposed Changes.

A notice, in writing, of the proposed change shall be given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to any meeting at which action on the proposed rule change is to be taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for five minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) is recognized for five minutes.

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

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

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

LOW VOTER TURNOUT AMONG THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the untold and unspoken-about crises facing this country is that in many respects we are losing our democratic traditions. As you know, France recently had an election, and 80 percent of the people voted in that election. We are going to have an election in November, and the estimate is that 35, 36 percent of the American people are going to vote in our election. And, in fact, we end up having by far the lowest voter turnout of any industrialized and major nation on earth.

What makes the situation even scarier is that as low as the voter turnout in general is, it is especially low among young people, people 25 years of age or younger. And the estimates are that about 80 percent of those people do not vote. And what sociologists tell us that as these people get older, they are less likely to vote, which means the voter turnout will go down and down and down. And it is not just voter turnout, Mr. Speaker, it is that poll after poll shows that millions of Americans do not know how government functions, do not know anything about the major issues facing our country, and I think that this is a very scary situation.

With these concerns in mind, Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 2002, I held a town meeting geared toward young people, high school students. I wanted these high school students to understand

that as citizens of the United States of America, they have the right to ask their Member of Congress questions and they have the right to voice their opinions about some of the most important issues facing our State and our country. And I am proud to tell you that we had about 14 different schools and youth organizations participate in that process.

I think the American people would have been extremely proud to have heard the intelligent comments and analysis and questions that these young people asked. I am very grateful that the University of Vermont allowed us to use their facilities. I am very grateful that we had many faculty members at high schools throughout the State helping us in this project.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do now is provide for the RECORD some of the very excellent testimony that we heard on that occasion.

IS NATO NECESSARY?

(On behalf of Hailey Davis)

HAILEY DAVIS: America is a great nation. It is a great nation with great abilities. Fighting distant wars just happens to be one of them. When it comes to equipment and technology needed to fight its wars, America has it all. The United States has become so independent and self-sufficient militarily and intellectually speaking, that it can put up a great fight alone. So the question arises: Do we need NATO anymore?

The fact that the United States is so much more technologically advanced than any of its NATO allies brings about an answer of: No. Frankly, we don't. We have increasingly lost every and any need for the NATO alliance, due not only to our technology but to the unilateralism of the Bush administration. He and his team tend to dislike fighting with aid from allies who might get in the way or limit America's room for military exercises.

Will the NATO nations ever fight together again? I'm quoting New York Times journalist Thomas L. Friedman here when I say that "to fight a modern war today you need four key issues: Many large transport aircraft to deploy troops to far-flung battlefields; precision-guided bombs and missiles that can hit enemy targets with a high degree of certitude, hence lowering number of civilian casualties; a large amount of special teams that can operate at night with the proper equipment; and secure and cryptic communications, so that ground and air troops can be connected in a high-tech war without the enemy listening in."

Now, America has all four of these Assets. No other nation does. Although Britain comes close, with Germany, France and Italy right behind it, the United States stands alone in its military stature. The fact that the European defense industries are not nearly as sophisticated as America's today, constitutes primarily for their dependence on the NATO alliance. Adding to this is the idea Europeans don't really feel threatened by the U.S.'s enemies, such as Bush's Axis of Evil, which includes Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, and therefore don't have much interest in spending a lot on defense. So if the Europeans really want NATO to last, perhaps they should invest more in military technology so that they can potentially fight a war alone, much like the U.S. can.

If the NATO alliance deals with countries helping each other fight wars, and America

doesn't need this help, then I ask you to consider the question: Is NATO really necessary for the United States?

CHANGE OF LEADERSHIP IN MIDDLE EAST

(On behalf of Timothy Plante)

TIMOTHY PLANTE: Okay. The current aggression in Israel and its occupied territories represent a clash between two people, the Palestinians and the Israelis, and the leadership of these two states or people represent a clash of values, and the leaders of the two people—that would be Arafat and Sharon—are both very radical in their views, and they are opposing. In order to come to an agreement and to peace, something has to change, and that is what I'm going to deal with.

Ariel Sharon epitomizes the political views of his Likud party. This party's motto is: Don't give an inch. Negotiations with the Palestinians will never happen as long as Ariel Sharon is in power. He has no intention to negotiate for peace. Sharon has actually used violence as a campaign to get into his position.

One thing that he did during the run for the election of prime minister was that he went to the Temple Mount, and he basically did it to provoke violence from the Palestinians, to make Ehud Barak look like he didn't have control over the situation in Israel. As soon as we went up there, he—although he didn't do anything, he just went up there and looked around, he did that because he knew it would tick off the Palestinians. And they started a campaign of violence in retaliation, and this made Barak look bad, and therefore Ariel Sharon came into power.

In order for Arafat to continue his campaign against the Palestinians, he has now started to be extremely aggressive against the Palestinians. The Palestinians have many martyrs, as they call them, which have been—they have been killed by the Israeli army as collateral damage, and these are women and children and men, and these people didn't intend any violence to the Israelis, but they died because the Israelis were being aggressors.

And then the Palestinians take these martyrs, and they say: Look what happens to us. We want to retaliate. So they retaliate with suicide bombers, and then Ariel Sharon wants to retaliate against the suicide bombers, and this creates a cycle of violence and destruction.

I believe the only way to end this cycle is through our allies the Israelis. Not many people know the U.S. gives, as Tim said earlier, the .1 percent—or whatever the number was, one-third of that money goes directly to the Israelis. So one-third of our foreign aid goes to the Israelis, and of that figure, \$2.04 billion is in military aid, and \$720 million is in economic aid. This is obviously showing that we are as belligerent as Sharon is, and as the Israeli Likud party is.

The only way to stop the aggression is by us altering the funding that we give to the Israeli people. If we tell Sharon that he needs to stop being violent and belligerent, he needs to stop invading these territories and stop killing people, and have his army stop doing all the negative things he is doing, he might laugh. But if we say, We are funding your country, and threaten to take away the funding, he won't have an army anymore. He will have nothing to attack with. So if we play hardball with Sharon, we will be able to influence him into bringing along peace.

Now, on the other side is Yasar Arafat. And this guy is a waffle. He picks one side that is the most popular, to stay in power. He has been in power for a very long time. He started out as a terrorist or as a freedom

fighter, he did terrorist acts, and he gained popularity. And he has changed his views on the position several times. But he does this to stay in power.

And the popular thing right now is to go against the Israelis and the Americans. So what Yasar Arafat says to the American press in English is not what he says to his own people in his language. It is completely different, and he is sending mixed messages to the world. He and his people are using the international media as a way of showing their side of the story, to gain sympathy in the international field, and this is creating problems for Israel, making them look bad, and this is creating problems for America, which has been referred to as "the big Satan."

To recap, if we force the Israelis to come to a peace agreement with the Palestinians by either giving up the occupied territories or coming to some sort of agreement, a ceasefire, the Palestinian people will find peace, they won't have as many martyrs. This will be a good thing. Because Yasar Arafat goes on popular opinion, and as popular opinion will turn towards peace instead of violence, that will bring an end to the problem in Israel.

BETTERING EDUCATION

(On behalf of Elizabeth Christolini)

ELIZABETH CHRISTOLINI: Middle East conflict. Just as I wish that someday there will be peace between the Israelis and Arabs, I wish also that there were peace in the workings of the education system within the United States. The question, then, which I propose, perhaps foolishly, is how to go about achieving this peace.

By traveling 45 minutes twice a day, five days a week to a parochial high school in Burlington. I am going to school not so much for the religious faith but rather because my parents and I felt that my local high school was not a place from which I could create a solid future.

Our assessment of both schools was done much in the same way that one's college choices may be established, by research concerning a wide variety of things, the most important of which was teacher accountability or lack thereof, the lack of accountability—by that, I mean the disregard on behalf of a teacher for his or her student, or where a student is passed through a grade despite the fact that he or she has not truly completed work satisfactorily enough to be granted admission to the next grade.

While the school I currently attend is a far cry from perfect, I feel that I have learned more than I would have had I attended my local high school. As pleased as I am to say that my education has done something to me and will enable me to do more in the future, I, at the same time, find myself thinking of the students who do attend my local high school, who are, as I am, nearly finished with their high school careers, and who may be wishing their own education had been better or different.

My belief is that, if education is to work as it ought to, there should be no need for private and public schools. There should, instead, be the same form of education available in each and every institution. In saying this, I do not mean for the creation of a flat-out equality where what is right for one is right for all, but, rather, the kind of education that I received in my high school should be given to all of the students; and vice versa, those classes and options which are not available today in my school should be maintained.

Such a sharing could be done through the creation of a new institution where a public school is interconnected or combined, whether a private or parochial school, while still

retaining the government funds, as well as the right of separation of church and state. In essence, such an institution would provide students everywhere for a better and cheaper education, thus enabling more families to have the funds needed to pay for cost of college tuition.

Within the shared schools, advanced placement, honors, remedial and other classes which catered towards a person's strengths and weaknesses would not only be available, but, as well, each would hold to a strictly followed set of prerequisites such as tests, shared recommendation for prior classes, on which admission to such a class could be based, allowing for the classes to be taught at a level specified to students who truly meet this level.

Payment of teachers would be increased, in conjunction with the more demanding set of stipulations on which these teachers would be hired. Rather than giving the position to a person simply for the fact that he or she showed up for the interview and had achieved a minimal degree, a teacher's performance in achieving this degree, as well as to their overall talent and work ethic, would be considered.

With the hiring of these qualified as well as motivated people—and I know there are some out there, as I have had the privilege to work with a few of them—there would not be the need for the constant testing as is proposed by President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act, where each child from the third to eighth grade would be tested every year in areas of math, science and English. If a teacher does his or her job not just adeptly, but, as well, enthusiastically, it stands to reason that, in combination with up-to-date facilities, the testing of students each year to ensure the continued progression of the student body would not be needed. It would be an accurate assumption to say that both teaching and learning are occurring at or above the standard level.

This new institution should be formed through the right kind of slow but effective change. The place at which to start these changes is in our current schools, public and parochial as well as private. Reform should be made to encompass a strict non-tolerance rule concerning drugs and alcohol. This action should include suggestions toward rehabilitation centers as well as the intervention programs. The following of this rule will alleviate the various student behavioral problems, and leave within each school only those truly willing to learn.

From this point, the reevaluation and decisions concerning positions held and ability of each teacher should be tested in a manner similar to the no-tolerance rule for students, whereas those teachers who do not wish to, should not, and, consequently, would not be teaching. Lastly, evaluation for the remaining teachers as well as students should be made concerning classes. A decision should be informed not only by those classes which are had and not needed, but as well as by those needed and not had.

With these changes put into effect, it is my belief that the creation of a quality high school education for each and every student in each and every institution would be on its way.

MULTINATIONAL IMPACT

(On behalf of Rebecca Lee Marquis)

REBECCA LEE MARQUIS: I would like to speak today on the subject of fast food and how it is permeating our society, promoting an unhealthy way of life, costing a tremendous amount of money in healthcare, and the immoral way in which it targets young children around the world in its advertising. Ray Crock, the founder of McDonald's, said, "A

child who loves our television commercials and brings her grandparents to a McDonald's gives us two more customers."

We are a nation of instant gratification. We live in a time when everyone moves at a fast pace. The act of eating, whether it is breakfast, lunch or dinner, is no longer a social time for families. Our society used to be much more aware of what it was eating and where the food came from. As we become more isolated from food production, we become ignorant of how it is grown, processed and marketed.

Many people today consider themselves too busy to take the time to think about and prepare healthy meals. For breakfast, lunch or dinner, we quickly pull into variously shaped but strategically located buildings and emerge with breakfast sandwiches, hamburgers, fish sandwiches, fried chicken, tacos, pizza, fries, shakes, soda, and all the promotional gadgets that accompany this food. Seesaws, slides, and rainbow-colored balls are attractive, but when it gets down to brass tacks, a brand new article on fast food notes, the key to attracting kids is toys, toys, toys.

But what do we get for this trade-off of time for convenience? We get overly priced, highly processed, high-calorie, high-fat, low-nutritional food. We get food with manufactured flavors that will taste exactly the same from Boston to San Francisco to Tokyo. These types of eating habits have led us to our national problem of obesity, which translates into countless related health problems, costing millions of dollars in healthcare.

The original Ronald McDonald was a man by the name of Willard Scott. He was later deemed too overweight; McDonald's wanted someone thinner to sell it burgers, shakes and fries. These facts are well-known, and, as adults, we have the ability to make informed decisions. What is appalling is that we allow these massive corporations to direct huge national advertising campaigns at our youth.

Three billion dollars a year is spent on just television advertising. That number does not include the countless other ways that advertisements are ingrained into our minds. These corporations bribe our school systems with cash payments so that they can market products to captive audiences. Instead of schools being places of exploration and learning, they risk becoming warehouses for corporations to sell products and brainwash future consumers.

We allow the same corporations to develop movies and cartoons that are nothing more than continuous advertisements. The corporation's goal is to hook its customers at younger ages so that they can create consumers for life. The chains often distribute numerous versions of a toy, encouraging repeat visits by small children.

What can we do to counter these less-than-admirable situations? We can begin to slow down and take time to learn where our food comes from and how it is processed. We can become better educated about nutrition and try to buy only foods that are grown, processed and marketed responsibly. We can learn to grow small gardens, to become better acquainted with our own health. We can lobby our government leaders to outlaw the marketing in schools and the marketing to young children. We need to stop being passive consumers or we risk becoming captive consumers.

U.S. AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

(On behalf of Tim Fitzgerald)

TIM FITZGERALD: Foreign aid, began by the United States starting in 1941 and continued after the Second World War. This plan

for rebuilding war-torn nations became known as the Marshall Plan. About \$12 billion dollars was distributed under this plan, and it was responsible for helping the nations of Europe regain some financial stability.

Longer-reaching reconstruction was funded by the World Bank. Later, aid was given to strengthen countries' militaries, and less humanitarian aid was provided. In the late 1990s, less than one percent of the gross national product of the United States of America was used for foreign aid.

A simple analogy can be used to understand this percentage. Imagine a man who possesses 100 ears of corn, each with 100 kernels. Now, the man has many neighbors who are starving to death on a yearly basis, but the man gives away only a total of twelve kernels of corn in 1998. Not only is the percent minuscule, but part of this amount never reaches these people due to the corruption in their governments.

This may seem ridiculous, but it is what is happening with U.S. foreign aid. Instead of giving military aid to nations, it would be much more conducive to provide food and supplies to developing nations. Especially those in sub-Saharan Africa, with the AIDS epidemic continuing to plague this part of the world, this minuscule amount of financial support being given seems ludicrous.

Even with President Bush's promise of \$5 billion extra in foreign aid, there are problems. Distribution of funds and aid is a major problem. Giving aid directly to the unstable regimes which govern the poorer states is not a good policy. Work of this kind should be done directly with the population. This would be more efficient for governments that are unable to distribute aid and prevent corrupt ones from stealing it.

An important part of foreign aid is healthcare. Many African nations are unable to take care of giving children basic inoculations, let alone the staggering number of individuals living with HIV AIDS. In some places, about 35 percent of the adult population has contracted the disease. Education is also needed to help these developing nations.

But the key to healthcare is efficiency. Private healthcare organizations are leading the way with this. Vaccines often go bad while on route to those who need them, so a new type of indicator was developed to tell those containers that still retain potency from those that are past their prime. This development helps to waste as little as possible of supplies that are often in short supply anyway.

Education is an important part of foreign aid, which is often ignored. This includes people from all sections of society—men, women, children, and all ethnicities. An example of this is the amount of children being born in sub-Saharan Africa. Traditionally, families in Africa has many children, as a sign of prestige and help with work. If these families were informed how having more children is both a strain on family and country, they might have less children, thus freeing more aid and bettering the chances for survival of their child. With resources being strained less, there might be a better chance for the development of a strong body of workers who would in turn improve the economy, and ultimately the government.

Foreign aid is an important part of foreign policy and must be utilized in order to truly secure the United States of America. States in poverty are often unstable and this can translate into a hatred of the United States. For example, the average income of an individual in certain states could be under \$500. That is not to say it is the only factor involved, in certain situations. Far from it. But perhaps, if the standard of living was increased, there would be less of a sense of unrest.

Aid must, however, be reformed in two main ways. First, more must be spent by the United States on foreign aid in general. Secondly, distribution must be looked at. It is not helpful to send aid to a foreign country which does not have the means to distribute it or withholds it for some other reason. A \$5 billion increase will help, but so will increasing efficiency so that money goes further.

So, Congressman Sanders, I would ask you that, when and if legislation on foreign aid reform comes up, you work for and vote for foreign aid reform.

ARAB-ISRAEL CONFLICT

(On behalf of Pierson Booher)

PIERSON BOOHER: The increasing violence in the Middle East led many people to question our nation's policy in the region. Since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, the United States has had fluctuating relations with Middle Eastern countries.

It took heavy convincing by President Jimmy Carter to persuade Anwar Sadat to recognize Israel and form good relations with the country and Prime Minister Menachem Begin. The Camp David accords of 1979 stirred up the Arab world, eventually resulting in the assassination of Sadat in 1981.

The Middle East is not a liberal region, but rather a land of Islamic extremists ready to defend their faith to block the spread of westernization. Back in time before the Gulf War, before Lebanon, before the Six Day War, and even before the creation of Israel, the world has been saturated with the Middle East, not because of their culture or the beauty of the land, but rather because of a prosperous natural product that floods the region: Oil.

Our nation's dependency on oil has led us to base our relations in the region solely on the influence of oil in regards to a particular problem. President Bush has attempted to find alternative sources of oil by improving regions with Russian President Vladimir Putin, and pushing for drilling in the Alaskan wildlife refuge.

The increasing numbers of suicide bombings in Israel has led many to question the definition of the word "terrorism." Terrorism can be defined as an act of violence done to a group of persons. Although there are many similarities between President Bush's terrorists and Ariel Sharon's terrorists, Bush has shifted his stance.

He recently sent envoy Anthony Zinney back to the region to help ease tensions and push for peace. Bush also sent Secretary of State Colin Powell to Israel last Thursday to bid an end to the conflict. Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon recently declared war on Yasar Arafat and the PLO. Unwilling to resume peace talks until Arafat helps put an end to terrorism existing in Israel. In response Arab leaders have said that ending occupation will lead to the end of terrorism.

President Bush's war on terrorism came as a result of the September 11th tragedies, while Sharon's war on terrorism stems from the suicide bombings that have taken place for a few years, the bombings being a result of the 35-year occupation of Palestinian territories. Diplomats have said that the Arab world is looking to the United States to draw red lines for Israel, for it to withdraw its forces from Palestinian territories. In response, columnist Friedman has said, if Arab leaders have only the moral courage to draw lines around Israel's behavior, but no moral courage to decry the utterly corrupt and inept Palestinian leadership for the depravity of suicide bombers in the name of Islam, then we're going nowhere.

Sharon probably wishes he had dealt with Arafat in Beirut when he had the chance. But he did not do anything more than allow

the PLO to regroup and regain momentum. In order for the United States to have an impact on the current Arab-Israeli conflict, the country must begin working from the bottom up. We have from the Iran Contra issue that there are other anti-Israeli countries supplying Palestinian militant groups with weapons.

Unlike the Israel army, the U.S. must seek to cut off the suppliers, such as Iran. In doing so, the U.S. will destroy the lifelines of the militant groups in the region, most notably Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Al Aqsa Brigade and another group. After the militant group's suicide bombings, all that is left is the heart of the people. Yes, no one will be able to destroy the foundation of the Palestinian struggle (inaudible) nationalism. But the destruction of those who facilitate the cause would be a decisive and crushing blow.

At a meeting with British Prime Minister Tony Blair over the weekend, the President said that Iraq would be a better place without Saddam Hussein. The same can be said about Palestine and Israel with regards to Yasar Arafat. One could also say the same about the world with regard to Osama bin Laden. But what President Bush needs to understand is that there could very well be an even more persuasive, powerful Napoleonic man looming in the background waiting for his moment to take over in a coupless revolution.

If Hussein refuses to meet the demands of the U.N. weapons inspectors, there could very well be a U.S. return to Iraq and a more dangerous successor. The United States needs to understand that our nation has become too reliant on the Middle East oil. We live in a country that is enormously dependent on a natural resource that is found in a hostile region. The U.S. must reduce their dependence on the region's oil and look elsewhere, something Bush has already begun to do.

Because of our new relations with Russia and the access of oil that is in circulation, gas prices have fallen 7.1 cents since last year, to an average of \$1.32 per gallon. A decrease in dependency on the Middle East oil reserves will help give the country more confidence and less to lose.

In the past we have based many of our diplomatic relations and war strategies around the impact it would have on our ability to obtain oil. Along with the exporting of oil, Russia could serve as a possible coalition member down the road. As a result of this retraction, the United States gives itself more leeway in the Arab world and begins to lose the title of taker.

There may never be a conclusion to the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians. The fighting has gone for so long, there does not seem to be an end in sight. The second Intifada has proven many wrong when they said that the Palestinians had no chance against the might of the Israeli defense forces.

The disciplined Israeli army is scared to work in the occupied territories, fearful that they will be killed by a suicidal Palestinian. The Massad, Israel's renowned intelligence bureau, and arguably the best in the world, has failed in providing pivotal information.

The United States' success in the Middle East begins with the successful defense of the Israeli policy of withdrawal of dependency on the region's oil. But our diplomacy in the region has been suspect in the past. We cannot handle relations in Iran. We give foreign aid to Turkey, who turns around and uses the money to oppress the Kurds. And we have angered many of the Muslims who live in the world.

The United States needs to sit down and decide exactly what stance it wants to take in the region, and deal with the problems

that result from their decision. The question now is, Can the United States step up to the plate and prove that we are the most powerful country in the world?

ALTERNATE ENERGY VEHICLES

(On behalf of Jack Fleisher and Elden Kelly)

JACK FLEISHER: We are going to be talking about alternative energy vehicles today.

Motor vehicle transportation is invaluable to people across the globe. In Vermont alone, fossil fuel comprises 65 percent of total petroleum energy use. In today's industrial society, the lifestyles of most humans depend on automotive transportation.

Unfortunately, the operation of such vehicles requires the combustion of fossil fuels that release greenhouse gases as carbon dioxide. Acting essentially as a heat-trapping gas when released into the atmosphere, carbon dioxide could potentially contribute to a rise in the global temperature. The global warming is a serious environmental concern that will significantly impact the entire world's ecology. That is why we must begin to act now by taking advantage of currently available alternative energy vehicles in Vermont as a step toward a mode of transportation that is at once environmentally sound as well as readily accessible.

ELDEN KELLY: I am going to discuss three types of alternative energy vehicles, that being electric, hybrid, and biodiesel.

First, we will direct your attention to electric vehicles. For a motor vehicle that runs on gasoline, approximately 85 cents of every dollar are consumed by smoke and heat alone, which leaves only 15 cents out of every dollar to be used in actual operation. But for the electric car, with the efficiency of a battery, 55 cents are used at the actual driving wheels.

Batteries are only getting more efficient for electric vehicles. Lithium batteries have increased the mileage capacity from 120 miles from each charge to over 300 miles. An electric car can be 97 percent cleaner than a car that runs on fossil fuels if the pollution of the electric power plants are eliminated. Electric cars will meet this efficiency standard as Vermont moved towards utilizing more alternative energy sources, such as wind and geothermal power, which Dean has mentioned as possible litigation. Over 90 percent of the daily trips made in the U.S. are under 50 miles. This is well within the range of most electric vehicles, that are about 40 to 60 miles.

JACK FLEISHER: A second type of alternative energy transportation are hybrid vehicles, which is a combination of electricity and gasoline. There are primarily two hydrocarbons available in the U.S., the Honda Insight and Toyota Prius. The power source of the Insight is called a parallel hybrid system. The car possesses a fuel tank that supplies gasoline to an engine, as well as batteries that supplies power to an electrical energy motor. Both the engine and the motor can activate the transmission at the same time, setting the wheels in motion.

As opposed to an electric vehicle, these two hybrid models never have to recharge from an external electrical power source. Instead, a set of batteries harnesses the energy dispelled from the engine, as well as the energy released from braking. The Insight, on the other hand is capable of fuel efficiency at 70 miles per gallon. The Toyota Prius is slightly different. It is comprised of a series hybrid system. In this case, a gasoline engine is used to power a generator that supplies energy to the battery's electric motor.

The Prius is equipped with a gear box that allows the vehicle to run solely on the electric motor, the gas engine, or both simultaneously. Both hybrid cars exceed the fuel efficiency of all vehicles that run solely on

gasoline, and cut greenhouse-gas emissions in half.

ELDEN KELLY: Next, we'll discuss biodiesel.

This ingenious concept springs from the fact that the oils used in modern day petroleum come from the same plants that are still around today, such as soy and palm oil. The essential oils that, after much time, produce petroleum are available immediately from nearly any vegetable substance. The oils obtained can only be used as a fuel source for diesel vehicles, due to a fundamental difference between the operation of a diesel- and gasoline-powered engines.

A diesel system uses high heat and pressure for combustion, which a gasoline-powered engine cannot provide. Biodiesel requires conditions of high heat and pressure in order to burn effectively. Fortunately, in order to use biodiesel, no modification is necessary for the working diesel engine.

The production of biodiesel is incredibly simple compared to the complex process of refining petroleum. Biodiesel is composed of only a simple mixture of vegetable oil, lye and methanol. The triglycerides present in the acids of the vegetable oil are combined with sodium and potassium hydroxide of the lye and methanol, which produces the compound methyloxide. The triglycerides react with methyloxides resulting in the formation of methyl esters, which is burnable by biodiesel, and also a by-product, glycerin.

Using biodiesel in vehicles is probably the single most inexpensive manner of operating a fuel-burning vehicle, in that its sources, vegetable oils, can be reused. Used soybean oil, for example, from a fast-food restaurant that is throwing away millions of gallons daily can be recycled in the engine of the car burning clear of greenhouse-gas emissions.

The little carbon dioxide that is released from the combustion of biodiesel is reduced by the plants in respiration. So the very sources of biodiesel plants have what help to reduce these minor emissions. A plant by-product in this way completes the natural role that plants already play in a cycle of conservation. Unlike petroleum fuel, biodiesel originates from the renewable sources that ensure a supply of energy for vehicles in the future.

Moreover, the oils used in biodiesel are available right now for usage in vehicles. 3.5 billion gallons of vegetable oil are used in the U.S. every day, and already, biodiesel companies are receiving soybean oil free, because of the current surplus of soybean oil. Excitingly, this wasted resource can be utilized in the vehicles that are now unreasonably inefficient.

No longer will we have to worry about the dwindling supply of petroleum resources, taking advantage of the more easily produced and more readily available biodiesel.

JACK FLEISHER: In conclusion, we must assert that alternative energy vehicles are not merely a scientist's gadget or a new gimmick. As responsible human beings, we must look towards ways in which we can better our actions, in order to make the world a better place for future generations. One of the ways in which we can do that is by reducing our reliance on fossil fuels, which, when consumed, result in various hazardous effects.

In recent months, concern over reliance on Middle East oil has spread because of the attacks of September 11th. Many speculated that money generated from Middle Eastern oil sales to the United States has financed terrorist operations such as the attack on the World Trade Center. Unfortunately, many politicians have responded to this concern which a renewed fervor for drilling domestically, such as in Alaska.

However, we wish to refocus this issue in terms of alternative energy vehicles, which would rid our dependence on oil altogether, ensuring that gas money doesn't end up in Al Qaeda's pockets, and that the Earth is a cleaner, cooler place for years to come.

This takes us to our next area of concern, the rise in global temperature on Earth. Throughout history, major shifts in temperature—

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: I will ask you to try to tighten it up.

ELDEN KELLY: All right.

Lastly, we will close with possible ways to institute alternative energy vehicles in Vermont. To place emphasis on improved efficiency of such vehicles, tax incentives to be supplied for owners of biodiesel, electric and hybrid vehicles.

An active public campaign needs to be launched, with the goal in mind and educate motorists of the environmental impact of cars that run on fossil fuel, and to make them aware of the attainability of these greatly affordable, available and simple vehicles that do not impact the environment negatively.

Already, alternative energy vehicles are in promotion across the U.S. The organization E-Vermont has been testing the viability of the vehicles in colder climates, and finding great success. There was concern that the vehicles would have difficulty remaining heated, since there is no direct heat source, but space heaters have been installed to solve the problem. Right here in UVM, a bus runs on biodiesel. Isn't that a testament already to the real practicality of alternative energy?

To continue our vision as concerned citizens, we wish that the government of Vermont realizes the potential of alternative-energy vehicles by making a conscious decision to make energy efficiency a top priority in transportation, and in doing so, to help the realization of alternative-energy vehicles come to fruition.

RANDOM DRUG TESTING OF STUDENTS

(On behalf of Lindy Stetson)

LINDY STETSON: I am here to discuss random drug testing throughout high schools for students participating in extracurricular activities. This is an action being taken throughout the United States.

Even though most students prefer that it wasn't an option for school authorities, I believe this is a good idea, because, as a varsity sports participant and a band member of my high school, I think that overall performance is important in athletics and in music. Everyone should be on top of their game, so to speak, which can't happen if someone on the team is using drugs throughout the game or during the season.

But I think that, if random drug testing is going to be an option, it is important about what happens once the athlete or student who participates in extracurricular activities has tested positive. I think that, at my school, we have a school policy that addresses this issue, saying, if caught using drugs or alcohol, the student is dismissed from the team for 14 calendar days, and must go through counseling.

I think this is a good start, but there needs to be a stronger form of punishment, because if a student uses drugs, then there is obviously something wrong, and they need help, which should be more than counseling. Not only has the participant harmed himself or herself, they also could cause damage to the rest of the team.

For example, look at the recent events that have happened in this winter sports season, especially at Middlebury High School, where four varsity members were caught

using alcohol during the season. They were then forced to miss ten days of the basketball season. This incident not only affected the four athletes as individuals, but it forced the team to forfeit four games, because these players were very important players on the team. But what surprised me even more was that these four athletes were still allowed to practice, but could not participate in the games.

Even though many complain random drug testing violates civil rights, I believe that you have signed a contract stating that you will not use alcohol or other drugs while participating in a sport event. I mean, look at the Olympics. Many medals have been stripped from athletes because of using drugs to enhance their performance. They have volunteered to participate in the Olympics and have been selected by their country to represent them there. And it is the same in high school athletics. You have been chosen to show your high school your ability, and other high schools throughout the state.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(On behalf of Vanessa Hinton and Thomas Lawson)

VANESSA HINTON: In the events of September 11th, we, the citizens of America, have helped expose an unsafety in America. In order to prevent any event related to terrorism, the American government has passed the Patriot's Act that allows them to take anyone into custody without reliable evidence to back up their reasons.

This is dangerous for those who criticize the government, giving the government officials the right to arrest anyone at will. The U.S. is abusing domestic liberties by detaining people suspected of terrorism and police surveillance of those who oppose government policies. The military is also holding private hearings of suspected persons without releasing information. The government is violating human rights by doing this, and are becoming terrorists themselves.

No war has been declared. So why are going to such extreme measures as this? There has been a significant increase of law enforcement to monitor technology and the Internet. Government files have been released to lower-ranking law enforcement, but not the public. They have also been given the right to tap phone lines without probable cause. How can we trust a government who doesn't give us reasons or evidence as to why they are going to such extreme measures?

THOMAS LAWSON: For example, Siem Al Aran (phonetic) a Muslim professor at the University of South Florida, was fired for reasons officials said was because of his speeches presented to a class on Muslim views. The superintendent of the school said that they felt at threat if Siem stayed, and wished they had fired him sooner. Does this not go against the First Amendment of the Constitution, freedom of speech?

Another example takes place on an American flight from Baltimore to Dallas, Wendel Shattner (phonetic) was told to leave the plane for more checks because of his dark skin and the fact that he was a federal agent carrying a gun. He had previously filled out the proper form stating that he was a federal agent, and, indeed, had a weapon. Yet Shattner got off the plane, and a flight attendant found a book labeled The Crusade through Arab Eyes. This was enough evidence to take him back to headquarters, where he was further questioned.

Maybe in order for our rights not to be violated, we should, in turn, question our leaders. If we turn our heads, we are just as guilty as the condemned.

Thank you.

NATIONAL CIVIL UNIONS

(On behalf of Chastity Norris and Kim Lunna)

CHASTITY NORRIS: We are here today to talk about civil unions. We believe that there should be a national one. I know that when Vermont passed civil unions, there were a lot of people who put up signs saying "Take Back Vermont." People didn't feel it was right for homosexuals to have the same tax benefits and marriage benefits. No matter what you call it, marriage, holy union, commitment ceremony, it's about the love between two people, no matter whether heterosexual or homosexual.

KIM LUNNA: Of course, civil union marriages have the same consequences as a heterosexual marriage. Parties to a civil union shall be responsible for the support of one another to the same degree and in the same manner as married people. The law of domestic relations, including separation and divorce, child custody, and support, and property division and maintenance, the rights of parties to a civil union with respect to a child of whom either becomes the natural parent during the term of a civil union shall be the same as those of a married couple.

CHASTITY NORRIS: From the Internet, we got summaries of talks about civil unions in other states. In November of 1998, the constitutional amendment added to Alaska's state constitution, to be valid or recognized, a marriage must exist between a man and a woman. In 1996, Arizona declared that marriage between persons of the same sex is void or prohibited, and that same-sex marriage from other states are not valid.

KIM LUNNA: According to the Declaration of Independence, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that cannot be taken away, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. How can someone pursue happiness if they are not allowed to live their lives the same way as everyone else and show their commitment forever through marriage? We don't think that everyone is being treated equal.

CHASTITY NORRIS: Ed Flanagan is the only openly gay state auditor. His sexual orientation was not a problem five years ago, but now it is. "It is an issue in every race in Vermont," said Flanagan, a Democrat. This is about quality and fairness, and nothing more.

When people think of civil unions, they often only think of gays and lesbians. They don't think of the benefits that come from marriage, benefits such as estate, medical insurance, social security and retirement. The decision of the marriage should be up to those in the relationship, not outside people.

A solution we had was to suggest a constitutional amendment to force each state to vote on whether they believed in civil unions or not.

Thank you.

AFFORDABLE CHILDCARE

(On behalf of Amy Downs and Anissa Martin)

AMY DOWNS: We are here to make a presentation on affordable child care for everybody. We are just here to make sure that both single moms and struggling couples, whether if they're married or single, receive proper child care assistance, and for it to be a safe and educational environment.

As a person who doesn't have any kids, as opposed Anissa here, I see that some families need assistance, including those who are not on welfare and that have people working making eight dollars an hour, and that's like \$800 to \$900 a month they are just bringing in. That doesn't count the bills they have to

pay or the food to buy for their families, and other necessities to support their kids.

People are having kids at a younger age, and in order to get proper assistance they would basically have to be on welfare to be able to afford it. And if they're not on welfare, they will have to wait just a pay off their day care bills. It is not worth it to some, and they just end up falling back on welfare, and basically the whole point of the system is to get people off of welfare. That is why it is only like a five-year agreement now.

And you can't really do that if you have kids to look out for all the time. Basically, in the long run, it isn't worth dealing with the system. It doesn't help you out. It is just a waste of time, and they don't have the time, when they have kids, to worry about just it. They would rather just stay home and collect welfare, and do nothing and get everything paid for.

ANISSA MARTIN: Before I go on, kids need to stop having kids. Thank you.

Child care cost about \$468 a month in a licensed day care with no assistance. Because people are having babies at a younger age, they drop out of school and take care of them. Now, when they decide to go back to school, they are going to need help. Most get assistance, if they are single moms, to help to meet their needs. Most get assistance if they are single moms, but when you have one person that works and one person that wants to go back to school, like me, you don't get as much assistance as others would.

The system says to you, it's too much. When you are only making \$8 an hour, that is not enough. We want to make sure that there is more assistance available for those who want to work and go back to school, as well as those single moms that are out there, who are struggling to get off welfare.

And it is real hard. Me and my fiancé, I volunteered from New York to move down here to better my life, and when I went down to welfare, they did not help me. They said, well, it was a voluntary move. And I had to struggle on my own to go to school, finish my education and for my fiancé to find a good-paying job in order for us to survive. It is just me and him; I don't have no family or no one. I expected for the welfare to help me out, which they didn't. I had to do it on my own. And I am only receiving food stamps up to this day. But now we figured out, forget them, we are going to have to do it on our own. It would be really helpful if they do help me, which I am not receiving help.

TAXATION OF MINORS

(On behalf of Keith Blow, Jessica Oakes, Jessica Davis, Shirlaine Miller, and Ruhin Yuridulla)

KEITH BLOW: We are here to raise the issue of tax withdrawal from minors' paychecks. We feel it is unnecessary to withdraw federal and state taxes from people under the age of 18. We, as working teens, believe there is no need for our money to be taken away from us before we are adults.

JESSICA OAKES: In today's society of high-priced items, it is difficult for us to balance schoolwork and personal possessions such as a car, school, gas, insurance, et cetera. We work hard for the little money we earn. The reality is that we only get minimum wage, and then should be able to keep the little amount of money that we do earn. We feel we should be able to keep this money to save up for higher education, motor transportation and our personal expenses.

JESSICA DAVIS: My friend works as a cashier receiving only 5.50 per hour. This is not even minimum wage. Juggling schoolwork and a social life, he is also trying to

pay off a truck. It is taking him longer to make payments because of his small paycheck, not to mention the taxes being taken away from it. If the government took out less or no taxes from his paycheck until he was 18, he would be able to pay the truck off more efficiently and have more time to concentrate on other important issues, without worrying about not having enough money to pay for the truck.

SHIRLAINE MILLER: At this age, we are not old enough to vote, fight in the military, drink, or sign a legal document for ourselves. Therefore, the law still considers us children. With the government taking money out of our paychecks, they are taking money away from their children. If we aren't even allowed to vote, and if we have no say in what the government does, why should we pay taxes towards that?

RUHIN YURIDULLA: Thank you, Congressman Sanders. I am not a U.S. citizen, but as far as my experience is concerned, living in the other countries far from the United States, this thing of income taxes from a minor's check seems very unfair to me. Because if they did not take taxes out of our paychecks, it is likely they can get it from the food that we eat, from the utilities that we use, and from all the things we use in daily life.

So those taxes can be taken out and they can go to the government, but unlikely if they take that check, I mean, money from out of the paychecks of minors. That is like nothing, because minors have to save some money for their future. I mean, they are going to go to college, or they have to build their own lives. I think it should be, I mean, a law should be passed on this, in order to regard it as not to be taking money out of minors' paychecks.

Thanks.

KEITH BLOW: So in conclusion, we feel the government should not take out any taxes from people's paychecks that are under the age of 18. It is unfair how the government still considers us children if we are not 18, but it is hypocritical of them when they take the taxes away from us, because we can't even vote, so why should they take taxes away from us if we can't have a say in what they do with it.

JESSICA DAVIS: Taxation without representation, pretty much.

INVESTING IN CHILDREN

(On behalf of Megan Sullivan and Alex McKenzie)

MEGAN SULLIVAN: Representative Sanders, Mr. Gutman, and fellow students. Good afternoon.

My name is Megan Sullivan. I come before you now as a representative of a group of students at Harwood Union High School, in a class called Other Voices. This is a course that focuses on the suppressed and forgotten voices of past and present. We read part of a book by Jonathan Kozol entitled *Savage Inequalities*.

In this book, Mr. Kozol addresses the issues of the lack of responsibility that we as a society show for other peoples' children. Children who are not even given a chance to fail, let alone to succeed, but are put in the situation because of their financial and, many times, racial backgrounds. As a class, we explored the concept of other peoples' children, and the social implications that such a concept holds.

We are here today because we reject that concept. The children of the nation are the responsibility of the nation. We should, as citizens of these United States, provide the same opportunities to succeed in education, regardless of one's ability to pay.

We live in a state that recognizes the right to equitable education regardless of the ability to pay. Vermont's solution to the problem of inequalities between schools in the state was Act 60. Though this is a very controversial issue among Vermonters, and a complicated act, the results cannot be denied: Act 60 is making significant and steady progress in reducing inequalities in student resources.

Prior to Act 60, property-rich towns spent an average of 37 percent more per pupil compared to the poorest towns. In the fiscal year of 2002, the spending gap was less than 13 percent. Bearing in mind how well this has worked in a mere few years in Vermont, we reason that setting up a system much like Act 60 on a national level could have similar effect on a much grander scale.

The right to an equitable education is not one that is promised in the United States Constitution. However, the federal government is putting mandates on schools, ranging from funding of special education to national testing. It is not ethical to make education reform without providing adequate resources. The government does appropriate money towards education, but it is not nearly enough.

The House Minority Report, Education in Crisis, notes that, nationwide, state education cuts already total \$11.3 billion. The educational reforms included aim high by expecting all students to meet challenging standards and holding schools accountable when they fail. But if the federal government is going to hold states accountable for student performance, it must also provide the resources needed to meet new federal goals.

Failing schools cannot be turned around with decreasing funds. Federal funding is needed in schools where other peoples' children have been left behind as second-class citizens. Before we can expect them to succeed on national standardized testing, we need to level the playing field.

Mr. Sanders, as concerned students and current and future voters, we call on you and the U.S. Congress to appropriate a larger portion of the federal budget to education, and to use this funding to bring all our schools up to a collective and equitable higher standard.

ALEX MCKENZIE: Earlier in the day, students from Proctor and Brattleboro high schools spoke of the exploitation of children throughout the world as though these children are partly our responsibility. We agree. Beyond our state, beyond our nation, we seek to extend the principle that children of the world are our responsibility. We call upon our Congress to set an example for all wealthy nations of the world, to address the inequity of the public spending on the children of the world.

The issue of where our nation draws the line on who we are responsible for is one that is argued feverishly all over the world. The Declaration of Independence closes with, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." And today, we make another pledge. These men felt that the people were being oppressed, so they did what they knew they must and fought back. We have come a long way since these people wrote this document, and the words they closed with should have the same meaning, purpose and dedication for everyone, but with a broader worldwide perspective.

In the past fifteen years, the world has grown significantly closer. Communication and trade is but a click of the mouse away. People are traveling more, cultures are mixing, and countries growing. Globalization, like it or not, is real and is here to stay. As our relationships with other countries grow deeper, we're creating a new community, a

global community. The community is profiting a few of the larger industrialized nations, but is failing very many undeveloped countries.

Nearly half of the people in the world live on less than two dollars a day, and a few survive on one dollar or less. Most of the people in Latin America, the Middle East and central Asia are poorer than at the Cold War's close. Africans live no longer and have no higher incomes than they did 40 years ago.

These facts are very disturbing and hard to understand. Understanding is one-dimensional. It is the comprehension of the intellect; it leads to knowledge, which we all hope we have more of now. Realization, on the other hand, is three-dimensional. It is the simultaneous comprehension of the whole body—the head, heart and physical instincts. It comes only from experiences. Life requires more than knowledge, though; life demand right action if knowledge is to come alive.

So in other words, we all know these injustices now, which leads us to the question: What are we going to do about it? If we leave it alone and continue to ignore the suffering, what use is the knowledge I have shared with you? But there are caring people in the world who are disturbed by these facts, people who feel they are part of the global community and feel it is their duty to help the people in the world by pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

What needs to be addressed is how we are going to relieve these people from oppression and suffering. The answer seems to point towards a global developing project for the poor nations of the world. Right now, the World Bank wants rich countries to double their foreign aid. They have linked poverty to terrorism, as well, concluding that the security of rich nations depends on a more just distribution of wealth.

Is it right to live in a community where so many people are hungry and starving in a world with enough food for all? Where so many seek a real education and only get trained in anger and hatred? Where so many are in chains but aren't given the freedom to demand it? These people live as part of our global community, neglected to say the least.

President Bush agrees that poverty and terrorism are linked, but has taken a different approach to aid. While asking for huge increases in the military budget, his administration proposes devoting far smaller amounts to combat poverty and AIDS. A World Health Organization study concluded that, by spending \$27 million more each year to fight infectious diseases like AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, would save 8 million lives a year in the developing world. Washington seems more interested in stamping out terrorism, rather than solving the roots of terrorism. Smart bombs have their place, but smart development assistance can be much more effective.

Many of these issues were brought up in a world leaders meeting on March 17. Development of poor nations seems to be the right way to bring the global community to a stronger, more stable position. The main concern on a lot these richer nations' minds was wealth. Essentially, it all does come down to the issue of wealth. What is wealth if not a means to a greater end? Aren't peoples' lives worth more than building weapons? Wouldn't it be smarter to invest in the children of the world to create a stronger, more stable future for the new generations to come? I guess it all comes down to the question: Would we rather pay now or pay later?

IMPACT OF TOBACCO USE

(On Behalf of Heidi Neil and Martha Mack)

HEIDI NEIL: We are going to start with a couple of facts first.

MARTHA MACK: Five hundred million people alive today will eventually be killed by tobacco. Another four million people died from tobacco-related illnesses in 2000. By the year 2030, ten million people will die each year of tobacco. Smoking-related diseases are responsible for one in ten adult deaths worldwide.

Tobacco will soon become the leading cause of death worldwide, causing more deaths than HIV mortality, automobile accidents, homicide and suicide combined.

HEIDI NEIL: Every day, approximately 80,000 to 100,000 young people around the world become addicted to tobacco. If this trend continues, 250 million children alive today will die from tobacco-related diseases.

We are speaking today on the impact of tobacco on Vermont, the United States, and, most importantly, teenagers. Teenagers are the most important and integral part of big tobacco's manipulation. The companies' advertising plan markets cigarettes directly towards teenage consumers. Millions and millions of dollars are spent annually by tobacco companies to convince teens that smoking is glamorous and hip and cool.

Cigarettes are a very interesting product to market. It's one of the few products which, if used correctly, is actually designed to kill the consumer. As we said before, four million people died in tobacco-related deaths in the year 2000. That is more than 10,000 dying each day. The tobacco companies would go out of business if they didn't pursue additional consumers to replace the customers who are dying each day.

In short, for each person who dies a tobacco-related death, tobacco companies have to replace the person. Why replace that person with another 40-year old who will die in a matter of 40 years or less?

MARTHA MACK: Tobacco companies are much smarter and more cunning than that. They market teenagers. If you start smoking as a teenager, become addicted and smoking for your entire life, big tobacco makes a lot of money off of your life and your health.

There is, however, another very important reason that younger and younger teens are the target group being marketed by the tobacco corporations. Studies have also found that if people do not start smoking cigarettes by the time they reach the age of 20, it is very unlikely they will ever start.

HEIDI NEIL: There are informed and concerned teens out there like us who are desperately trying to bring down tobacco companies, using knowledge as our weapon, to educate the masses. Margaret Mead said, "Never doubt a small group of thoughtful citizens can change the world; indeed it is the only thing that ever has."

We're trying to change the world and asking the help of Vermont legislature. We're looking to the legislature to pass the cigarette tax. While the 67-cent tax helps, we are sure that we here in Vermont can do much better. We are sure that we should do better. For the sake of the teens in Vermont and for the long-term health costs associated with smoking, help us change the world and Vermont.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT UNDER MEDICARE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, just as I finished before the Memorial Day break talking about the need for a