

any labels. I will say that the importance of what we are doing should not have a label of Republicans or Democrats, but clearly, the label should be that Congress has not acted.

We simply have not done the job. I am not sure if this has anything to do with big government or little government. I would say that it has a lot to do with congressional abdication of their responsibilities and agencies not doing their jobs and regulations not being strong enough, and that is, of course, the problem of corporate non-responsibility.

It is urgent that this Congress acts now. I happen to represent Enron Corporation who is now at this point trying to rebuild itself and remake itself, and I have always said that I wish them well, because I want a strong business doing the business that it was designed to do and providing jobs for the 18th Congressional District. At the same time, we cannot ignore the fact that we have a circumstance where there is a crumbling of investor integrity and investor confidence in our system.

Whether it is Enron that fired 4,000 employees 24 hours after they filed for bankruptcy, while 2 days before they gave \$105 million in retention bonuses to past leadership of that particular corporation, and I recognize that trials and investigations are still going on and that is appropriate, but we do know the facts. That almost 5,000 employees were laid off with no savings, minimal severance pay, left to their own devices and much of that was without any device. Pensioners losing their life savings. A constituent of mine, a small investor, a grandmother, said I lost \$150,000, a lot of money for someone who may be new to the marketplace.

WorldCom, and I hold up a certificate of stock ownership, maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is not exactly a certificate of stock ownership, but it reflects that WorldCom sold just a few weeks ago for \$64 per share and just recently it sold for 7 cents a share, and it was disenrolled or D-enrolled on the NASDAQ stock exchange.

It is time now, Mr. Speaker, for much action to occur, and this week I will be looking forward to introducing the Omnibus Restoration and Reform Act of 2002, dealing with trying to get the focus of not only the Congress but of the American people on one legislative initiative that includes any number of fixes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will pass 25 bills dealing with corporate reform. I would hope that this omnibus bill will just signal that the Congress needs to move. It needs to move because insider trading is still going on.

Pharmaceuticals, oil companies, communications companies, we already know that the communications industry has lost more than 165,000 jobs, second only, I understand, to the auto industry.

What has to be done? I agree with the leader of the other body and the leader

of this body that we must have an investor bill of rights, and I join them in their announcement today and applaud them for their leadership.

I agree with the announcements being made in Wall Street today that we need a stronger SEC.

□ 1730

But after we do all of this, we must have follow-through. The Investor Bill of Rights must have the opportunity to pass, and the bill, or any bills that the President is talking of, must be able to pass.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say in closing that we need an omnibus corporate reform restoration act to restore the faith of those who invest in our capitalistic system, oversight of the board of directors, and to make criminal the actions of those CEOs who would do criminal acts at the head of their companies.

I hope we will act soon. Congress needs to act soon and the President needs to sign a bill to strengthen our corporate structure.

#### PRESIDENT'S PLAN ON CURBING CORPORATE GREED

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier today President Bush gave a major speech on the administration's plan to curb executive greed and corporate misgovernance in our country. This plan could be a tough sell, considering the President's own record as a businessman and his record of regulating industry.

Shortly after taking office, President Bush made clear how he felt about any kind of government regulation. His first budget proposal contained the elimination of 57 staff positions at the Securities and Exchange Commission, the agency charged with reviewing his corporate financial problems of the 1980s and reviewing all corporate financial reports today. His Treasury Secretary moved immediately to shut down intergovernmental efforts undertaken by the previous administration to monitor offshore tax havens at the heart of the financial maneuvering that led to Enron's collapse.

This President let chemical companies write legislation that dealt with arsenic in the drinking water, let insurance companies write legislation about the privatization of Medicare, let the drug companies write legislation that had to do with prescription drug coverage, let Wall Street write legislation to privatize Social Security, and let the banks write legislation relating to bankruptcy. This laissez-faire antigovernment attitude of the Bush administration also created a permissive environment clearly making companies like Enron, WorldCom, Adelphia, and others believe they could

mislead investors with impunity as long as President Bush was in office.

Even after the Enron scandal was revealed last year, the President proposed a zero-growth budget for the SEC. He supported publicly and aggressively weak pension and accounting reform bills in the House, even though thousands of employees in this country, turning into tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of employees, are losing their retirements to fraud and mismanagement by the President's friends at Enron and other corporations.

He refused to support legislation that would close the loopholes that allow American companies to go offshore to avoid U.S. taxes. He has declined to support reauthorization for the Superfund tax, requiring corporate polluters to pay for cleanup of the messes they make. Instead, he has chosen to have taxpayers pay to clean that up. To make matters worse, the President's advocated turning Medicare and Social Security over to the private sector.

As evidence of this bias in his political contributions from the insurance industry, the President recently endorsed a Medicare prescription drug plan that would be administered by the health insurance industry. This plan undercuts seniors' purchasing power and enables the drug industry to sustain its outrageous drug prices by permitting the continued abuse and manipulation of drug patent laws.

Why? It just might have had something to do with our committee 2 weeks ago considering the prescription drug bill. The committee chair decided to quit at 5 p.m. so all the Republican members in the committee could troop off to a fund-raiser, a Republican fund-raiser headlined by George Bush, where the chairman of the fund-raiser was the CEO of a prescription drug company in England. That chairman and that company contributed \$250,000 to House and Senate Republicans and to President Bush. Other prescription drug companies contributed \$50,000, \$100,000, and \$250,000, while Congress was considering a prescription drug bill.

No surprise that the next day, when our friends returned to our hearing, that on issue after issue after issue the Republicans voted down the line for drug company interests against seniors' interests.

The President and his administration have a long way to go to convince the American people they are serious about cleaning up corporate abuses in large American business or even enforcing current law.

So as the country considers the President's plan for reversing the current trend of corporate greed and misdeeds, I hope my colleagues will understand that I view his conversion from a proponent of laissez-faire economics in letting corporations run roughshod over government regulations and roughshod over the public, his conversion from that to chief regulator and enforcer of these laws with a healthy degree of skepticism.

A famous civil rights leader years ago said, "Don't tell me what you believe. Tell me what you do, and I will tell you what you believe."

#### CRISIS ON WALL STREET

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today President Bush went to Wall Street, and he went to Wall Street because he believes that Wall Street is now in trouble. It is in trouble with investors, it is in trouble with the American people, it is in trouble with the international capital communities; and therefore, the President went to Wall Street.

The President today recognized that we have a crisis and a scandal in the financial markets in the United States; that, rightfully, professional investors, amateur investors, and people who really do not even know how to invest but have a stake in Wall Street through their pension plans have lost their confidence and are starting to think that somebody ought to go to jail.

This did not happen today, it did not happen yesterday, it did not happen last week when the President made up his mind he was going to Wall Street. This has been a crisis for the average American for more than a year. This has been a crisis since Enron and Tyco and many other companies started to falter as their fraudulent bookkeeping schemes started to come to light.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans have had their pensions evaporate as companies disguised their financial health and then immediately declared bankruptcy. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who thought they might be able to retire in the next couple of years now recognize that they are going to have to work the rest of their lives if they are going to get by. This was a crisis for tens of thousands of employees whose jobs evaporated overnight because of the greed of the corporate executives who, while they told employees they could not provide additional health care dollars, they could not provide extra compensation, they could not give to their pensions, were taking hundreds of millions of dollars off the top of the corporation.

This has been a disaster for millions of shareholders across this country and in the rest of the world as they lost value in their portfolios, some of it for their retirement, some of it for their children, some of it for their families, because of the deception, the greed, the dishonesty that was rampant on Wall Street these last couple of years. Yet it took almost 18 months for George Bush to ask what was going on. It took almost 18 months for George Bush to deliver a major speech on this crisis.

The President did not deliver the speech when it was just the American family that was in trouble. He did not

deliver the speech when it was just the workers at Enron or ImClone or Dynegy that were in trouble. When we in California tried to tell him that they were manipulating the energy market, that they were gouging our consumers, that they were gouging the State, that it was all manipulation, they told us there was nothing to talk about, that they were comfortable that the market would work it all out. There was no market. It was manipulation. It was greed. It was dishonesty. It was fraud.

The same was true when he appointed Harvey Pitt as the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who said that the previous chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Mr. Levitt, had been too hard on American corporations; when he tried to get honesty and transparency in their accounting processes, the industry came to Congress and got them to stall out. So Mr. Pitt said he is coming to be kinder and gentler to these corporations.

That is not what we need. We need a watchdog. We do not need a lapdog. But Mr. Pitt was appointed to be a lapdog. I do not think Mr. Bush can retrain him fast enough to take care of the American investor, the American worker, and the American shareholder. Every week now we get a new revelation. And the interesting thing is that many of the things these corporations were doing may not be against the law.

Merck was taking money that went to the pharmacists and saying it was their revenue. They never saw the money; it never came to them. And they are saying this is generally accepted within accounting principles. Generally accepted to what? To misstate revenues, to misstate earnings? I do not think so. But apparently it is.

That is why we need what Senator SARBANES is presenting to the Senate right now, a strong, independent review board, and not some industry control board that the President has been for, or that Mr. Pitt has been for, controlled by industry, making up the rules for industry for the good of the industry and not for the American people.

An investor today in the American stock market, whom are they to believe? Are they to read the 10K statements? They apparently have been misleading. Are they to read the page that is signed off by the accountant? They have been lying to the public. Are they going to go talk to the attorneys? They have been misleading the public and the boards of directors and others.

Mr. President, we are glad that you finally recognized this is a crisis, but for millions of Americans who have lost their pensions, lost their jobs, and lost their savings, this was a crisis a long time ago.

#### INTRODUCTION OF MILITARY TRIBUNALS ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing the Military Tribunals Act of 2002 to provide congressional authorization for tribunals to try unlawful combatants against the United States in the war on terrorism.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution provides that it is the Congress that has the power to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court to define and punish offenses against the law of nations.

Up until now, there has been no congressional authorization for military tribunals. The formation of these tribunals, thus far, has been performed solely by executive order of the President with clarifying regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense.

Some would argue, not implausibly, that despite the clear language of article I, section 8, congressional authorization is not necessary; that as President and commander in chief, he has the authority, all the authority he needs, to regulate the affairs of the military, and this power extends to the adjudication of unlawful combatants. Ultimately, if the Congress fails to act, any adjudications of the military tribunals will be challenged in court on the basis that the tribunals, having been improperly constituted, the sentences cannot stand.

Through this bill, we can remove any legal cloud that would overhang these prosecutions. For one thing the Supreme Court has made abundantly clear is that the power of the executive when it acts in concert with the Congress is at its greatest ebb. But there is another reason, an even more compelling reason, for Congress to act, and that is the separation of powers.

No single branch should have the authority on its own to establish jurisdiction for a tribunal, to determine the charges, to determine indeed what defendants should be brought before that tribunal, to determine process, and to serve as judge, jury and potential executioner. As a former prosecutor, I would not have wanted such unbridled authority, nor do I believe it is appropriate here.

The Military Tribunals Act of 2002 establishes the jurisdiction of these new courts over noncitizens, non-U.S. residents, unlawful combatants, al-Qaeda members, and those working in concert with them to attack the United States. It preserves the right of habeas corpus, and appeal, and the basic rights of due process. It also protects the confidentiality of sources of information and classified information. And it also protects ordinary citizens from being exposed to the dangers of trying these suspects.

Perhaps most important, in the context of a war without clear end, against an enemy without uniform or nation, the bill requires the President to report to Congress on who is detained for how long and on what basis.