

year-old son when he turns 30, plus interest? How many would dream of going to the local Realtor and saying I want the most expensive house in this country, and I do not care what it costs and bill my 7-year-old grandson?

That is precisely what our Nation has been doing, and yet the Speaker will not give us in the 1,200-plus days that he has been Speaker even one vote on a balanced budget amendment.

□ 1100

It came up in the House about 6 years ago. It passed. We got the two-thirds votes necessary. It went to the other body. It failed by only one vote. So instead of forcing the other body to vote on this again and again and again until we do the right thing for the American people, our Speaker has chosen to run up the debt.

Mr. Speaker, since you have become Speaker, our Nation has increased the national debt by \$511,040,208,939. That is more debt than was incurred in this country from the day George Washington became President to halfway through World War II, on your watch. You are the man. You schedule the floor debate. You decide what we vote on and when we vote on it and you keep deciding we cannot have a vote on a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Speaker, my name is GENE TAYLOR. I represent the citizens of South Mississippi. For every day of the rest of this session, I am going to come to this House floor and tell the American people the truth, that you will not give us a vote on a balanced budget amendment and that you are the guy who is responsible for this debt, and I am personally going to make them aware of it, and I am going to let them decide in November if you have managed this House very well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from references to occupants of the gallery.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, Section 221 of H. Con. Res. 83, and Section 231 of H. Con. Res. 353, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by the Concurrent Resolutions on the Budget for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003.

As reported to the House, H.R. 5093, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations

bill, includes emergency-designated appropriations for wildland firefighting. Those appropriations total \$700,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002. There are no outlays from those appropriations in fiscal year 2002. Outlays flowing from fiscal year 2002 emergency appropriations increase the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2003 outlays. Under the procedures set forth in section 314 of the Budget Act, adjustments may be made for emergency-designated budget authority through fiscal year 2002 and for the outlays flowing from such budget authority in all fiscal years. Outlays from those appropriations total \$400,000,000 in fiscal year 2003.

After making the required adjustments, the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2002 for the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$736,127,000,000 in new budget authority and \$736,420,000,000 in outlays. The 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2003 for the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$748,096,000,000 in new budget authority and \$785,590,000,000 in outlays. The budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2002 become \$1,709,299,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,653,073,000,000 in outlays. The budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2003 become \$1,784,073,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,767,547,000,000 in outlays.

IN OPPOSITION TO INCLUDING TURKEY IN THE QUALIFIED INDUSTRIAL ZONE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 5002, a bill to include Turkey in the Qualified Industrial Zone, allowing duty-free goods from Turkey to enter U.S. markets. This bill is not only an inappropriate and fiscally irresponsible back-door approach to establishing a free trade agreement with Turkey, but also rewards a country that has been illegally blockading Armenia, also a U.S. ally in the war against terror, for the past 9 years. This bill would send the wrong message to countries that are seeking access to our trade markets. It sends the presumably unintended message that violating the Humanitarian Trade Corridor Act will not be punished but instead rewarded for conducting internationally recognized illegal activity.

Since 1993, Armenia has suffered from the coordinated, dual blockades by its neighbors to the west and east. Turkey and Azerbaijan have largely choked off the transportation of goods from Armenia, eliminating a major east-west shipping route in the Caucasus and contributing to the destabilization of the regime.

These illegal blockades are in direct violation of the Humanitarian Corridors Act, passed by both the House and the Senate in 1995. The act states that, and I quote, "recipients of U.S. assistance should not hinder or delay the transport or delivery of United States humanitarian assistance to other countries." Unfortunately there

is also language in this bill that gives the President the authority to waive sanctions if the country that is guilty of prohibiting U.S. assistance to reaching a third country is deemed vital to the United States' national security. Turkey has flagrantly disregarded international trade norms because of this waiver that effectively gives them a free pass to act without fear of consequences. This proposed bill represents seriously flawed trade policy and sends the message that some countries do not have to honor international norms in U.S. law as long as such countries fill a national security need. This bill would not only reflect poorly on the United States' moral authority in trade policy, Mr. Speaker, but also represents dangerous fiscal policy; in effect subsidizing a politically unstable and economically irresponsible regime.

Last week 34 members of Prime Minister Ecevit's ruling party resigned in protest of the Prime Minister's refusal to step down as ruler of Turkey. Just yesterday two of the highest-level ministers resigned, economic Minister Kemal Dervis and Foreign Minister Ismail Cem, triggering calls within Turkey for new elections as early as September. Minister Dervis is widely recognized as the architect of the colossal International Monetary Fund bailouts of Turkey, which saved Turkey from immediate financial disaster but has put Turkey in debt to the IMF for a staggering \$31 billion.

The \$9 billion that were made available for release this year have not made any impact on the rapidly shrinking economy and massive unemployment in Turkey. We should not reward Turkey and put our own economy in further jeopardy without radical reform of Turkey's economic and trade policy. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. and international community may pour as much money into Turkey directly through fiscally careless legislation or indirectly through massive unprecedented IMF loans, but there will be minimal net benefits to the citizens of Turkey, and there are fundamental changes that are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop making special concessions for Turkey. Their blatant disregard for international norms, whether it is trade policy or their abysmal human and minority rights records, no longer can be ignored. I do not dispute that Turkey has been one of our closest allies in the war on terrorism, but that fact alone should not give them carte blanche to operate outside the boundaries of the American and European ideals that Turkish officials profess to honor.

CORPORATE CRIME

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this has been a week of disappointment. In

the effort to combat corporate crime, we heard from the President something that was more of a pep talk than a policy pronouncement. He called upon us to reenact all the laws and regulations we already have and to say this time we really mean it.

Let us face it. The biggest reason for crime is that under certain circumstances crime pays, and the biggest reason why circumstances arise in which people conclude that crime pays is inadequate law enforcement. That is true with grand theft auto. It is true with corporate grand theft. And unfortunately the other party for the last 6 years has been working to undermine the enforcement at the SEC. As David Ruder, a former Republican head of the SEC, said in 1995, the Republican Congress is dealing with the SEC as though it were the enemy instead of the policeman on the beat.

Earlier this year, the President put forward a budget to this Congress which cut the SEC budget in real terms, allowed no increase for inflation, and cut the enforcement budget. This spring, I proposed to the Committee on Financial Services an increase in the authorization of the SEC of \$120 million to focus enforcement on the financial statements filed by the thousand largest companies in America. Every Republican on our committee voted no, every Democrat voted yes, the amendment went down.

It is time for us, if we are serious about dealing with securities crime, to fund the SEC. But it is time for us to do more as well. The bill passed by the Senate, the other body, is a good first step, but I hope in conference, or perhaps in a second bill, that we go beyond that.

There are a whole host of ideas that we ought to include. We ought to explore the idea of having our thousand largest companies audited every 6 months instead of every year. We have been auditing every 12 months since the 1933 act. Certainly the speed by which decisions are made, the speed at which stocks are bought and sold, is far more than twice as fast as it was in 1933. And if WorldCom is going to try to misstate its income for five quarters, it is better that they are caught after two quarters than after four quarters, assuming the audit is competent. And I will get to that in a second.

In addition, the Federal Government ought to certify some stock analysts as being genuinely independent. And to be independent, under this standard, it is not enough that the particular analyst does not get direct cash from the issuer, but rather that the employer of the analyst do no underwriting, consulting or in any other way receive money from the very companies that are being analyzed.

Now, some may accept a lower standard, and they are welcome to, but to be certified as independent, I would expect an analyst to be loyal to his or her employer. And, therefore, it would be good to have analysts who are em-

ployed by those who are not getting money from the very companies that are being analyzed.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUBIN), was on the morning shows this past Sunday indicating that Arthur Andersen had a peculiar problem that has led to a great overrepresentation of Arthur Andersen among the problem audits. He indicated that the structure of that firm was such so that the engagement partner, the salesman partner, had total power, and the technical review partners were not necessarily even consulted before the audit was concluded.

I had put forward to our committee back in April a requirement that accounting firms dealing with publicly traded companies avoid that Arthur Andersen structure and use a structure that almost all of them have always used, and that is that the technical review partners who are insulated from the client make the final determination. Unfortunately, even while the Republican Chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is saying this is the problem, the Republicans on our committee are voting against a solution.

It is time that we go beyond rhetoric and adopt legislation. We have a long way to go in restoring confidence to our capital markets.

H.R. 5110. OMNIBUS CORPORATE REFORM AND RESTORATION ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are a number of issues that deserve the attention of this body, and I asked to address this House at this time because I have completed the assignment that was given to me, or the initial part of the assignment given to me by the pain of my constituents. Just a few moments ago I announced that I would file, and now I have filed, the Omnibus Corporate Reform and Restoration Act of 2002, H.R. 5110, an omnibus bill that lays clearly on this Congress an opportunity to make sweeping corporate changes now.

I said before that there is no pride of authorship. There should not be. We should work together on behalf of the American people. And if by chance this bill gets dissected and pieces of it pass, it may not be the whole but it will be the part. Right now, this bill encompasses a number of provisions that, if passed, could immediately address some of the concerns that we have.

We will never get to the point of restoring investor confidence until we stabilize and allow the American people to have a sense that we are inside the board room peering in to oversee

the proper activity of those who govern the corporations of America. We will never restore confidence until we again see corporate executives as leaders of United Way and Civic Citizens, that many of us have come to know and appreciate. We will never restore corporate confidence and investor confidence until we determine that those who have been broken and lost such large amounts of money, like the grandmother in my constituency that lost \$150,000 as a new investor. That is a lot for someone who is just exposing themselves to the market.

This bill will, in fact, do something historic and different. It will make for the first time unemployed employees, fired employees, whose company files bankruptcy, secured creditors. What does that mean? Just a few days before Enron filed bankruptcy, they gave \$105 million in retention bonuses to corporate executives. On Sunday, they filed for bankruptcy. On Monday, they laid off 5,000 of my constituents, many of them without severance pay, who lost their pensions and 401(k)s. For the last 6 months, we fought with the bankruptcy court because they were not secured creditors. They had no status in the bankruptcy proceedings. This bill will give them secured creditor status. They will be inside the courtroom to be able to fight for their benefits.

This bill provides for criminal penalties for altering or destroying documents. We know what happens with that. All of us panic sometimes. Everyone wishes they had not made the wrong decision, tearing up a piece of paper to cover up. Coverup is worse than a crime. So we need to make sure they do not run to their office by mistake or otherwise and tear up documents.

The bill provides for prohibition on loans to officers and directors. I frankly think we might be able to regulate it, but clearly we can see from WorldCom what can be done in crumbling one's own company. This will help in curtailing large loans by boards of directors to company executives; it will stop creating offshore companies and inside special companies that the board does not even know anything about and that is used to puff up the bottom line.

□ 1115

Also to protect the pensions of employees, and many others. I believe that the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, should hold hearings on whether or not enhanced criminal penalties or criminal initiatives need to be passed.

I move now to share with Members, we had a surplus. In fact, in March 2001, we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus with a decreasing debt. Because of the large tax cut that went nowhere and no one can remember, we now have no surplus. Yet we have the responsibility to our senior citizens because many of them are not able to pay rent or to get good food