

List, will no longer be eligible for the Extended Health Benefits and the Supplemental Unemployment Benefit which are described below and you will lost your bumping rights within your employer's system.

Employees remaining on the Preferential Hiring List who have not been offered a job as of February 4, 2002 will be offered the right to bump within their employer's system.

#### 2. SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PROGRAM

This is a benefit being provided by the Building Service 32B-J Health Fund to all employees who meet the eligibility requirements set forth below. If you were employed as a security guard at the World Trade Center you will receive a benefit of \$93.00 per week. If you had any other full time job, you will receive a benefit of \$150.00 per week. If you held a part time job (less than forty hours per week), you will receive a benefit of \$112.50 per week.

In order to be eligible for this benefit you must;

(a) Have been eligible for health coverage under the Building Service Health Fund as of September 11, 2001, and

(b) Be named on the Preferential Hiring List described above at any time between October 2, 2001 and April 2, 2002, and

(c) Are not receiving a pension from the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund, and

(d) Have not held a full time job as of September 11, 2001 in addition to the one from which you were displaced on September 11, 2001.

You will continue to receive this benefit until the earliest of the following occurs:

(a) You are recalled to work by your employer.

(b) You accept a job from the Preferential Hiring List.

(c) You decline the offer of a job from the Preferential Hiring List.

(d) You fail to comply with rules established by the Health Fund to administer this benefit.

(e) You begin to receive a pension from the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund.

(f) You become ineligible for New York State Unemployment Insurance benefits because of any other job you may have taken.

(g) April 2, 2002, or the Health Fund has paid out a total of Six Million Dollars for this benefit, whichever shall first occur.

#### 3. EXTENSION OF HEALTH BENEFITS

Any employee who was terminated in connection with the World Trade Center disaster and who at any time between October 2, 2001 and April 2, 2002 is named on the Preferential Hiring List and his or her eligible dependents, shall continue to be covered for all benefits under the Building Service 32B-J Health Fund through April 30, 2001 or until he or she is removed from the Preferential Hiring List, whichever is sooner.

Remember, that you will be removed from the Preferential Hiring List if you decline a job offer or if you begin receiving a pension under the Building Service 32B-J Pension Fund.

Upon the termination of your extended health coverage, assuming that you have not received a job which would otherwise entitle you to benefits under the Health Fund, you will be entitled to elect COBRA continuation coverage. This means you can continue to receive health coverage for up to eighteen months provided you pay the Health Fund for the coverage. Your dependents may also be entitled to elect COBRA continuation coverage.

#### 4. ENHANCED PENSION BENEFIT

Any employee who was terminated in connection with the World Trade Center disaster

who was on the Preferential Hiring List as of October 2, 2001 and who on or before September 11, 2001, has reached his or her Fiftieth Birthday with at least five years of pension service credit, or has reached his or her Sixtieth Birthday, will be eligible to retire and receive an Enhanced Pension Benefit.

The Enhanced Pension Benefit will be equal to the pension benefit that you would be entitled to if you were five years older and had five more years of service credit. For example, if you are fifty years old and have ten years of service you would receive a pension benefit equal to the pension you would receive if you retired at fifty five with fifteen years of service, or if you were sixty years old with twenty years of service, you would receive the maximum benefit of \$1150.00 per month since you would be treated as though you were sixty-five years old with twenty-five years of service.

In order to be eligible for the Enhanced Pension Benefit you must elect this benefit and retire during the window period of October 4, 2001 through November 4, 2001.

If you accept the Enhanced Pension Benefit, you will be removed from the Preferential Hiring List and will no longer be eligible for the Supplemental Unemployment Benefit or Bumping Rights within your employer's system.

Additionally, you will no longer be entitled to the extended health coverage unless you had reached your fifty-seventh birthday by September 11, 2001. If you had reached your fifty-seventh birthday on or before September 11, 2001 you will receive health coverage until you reach the age of sixty-five as currently provided in the Health Plan for those who retire at age sixty-two or later.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a model for what other unions and what other private sector groups can do, taking the initiative, but it is not a substitute. There is no substitute for our government assuming its responsibility and providing a safety net for the victims and for the unemployed. We must do that, we can do that.

I urge this Congress to get on with the unfinished business of providing the safety net for those who need it most.

#### AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, after my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) had his presentation today on his perspectives on the United States foreign policy, I thought that it would be fitting that I present a similar point of view but not exactly in agreement with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). Although we are both people who love liberty and justice and value our freedom that we have here in the United States and in various countries throughout the world, we have a different view on exactly what policies the United States should follow to ensure that there is the maximum of peace and liberty and justice in this world.

Today I would like to talk a little bit about where we are at in the world and

why we are there and some thoughts, some basic thoughts about American foreign policy.

First and foremost on this subject, we must recognize that our military forces are at this moment in action in various parts of the world, especially in Afghanistan, and they are there and they are fighting and sometimes they are taking casualties in order to avenge the slaughter of nearly 3,000 of our fellow Americans on September 11 past. This forceful and deadly response in the form of American military forces being unleashed against persons in different parts of the world is totally justified. It will and, in fact, already has deterred other terrorist attacks upon us.

It is, yes, part of an act of vengeance, and I see nothing wrong with the United States Government avenging the death of 3,000 Americans who were killed, 3,000 innocent Americans, people who were not combatants who were slaughtered by evil forces overseas. And in this vengeance we will, as I say, deter other evil forces in this world from targeting Americans and from committing other heinous acts that have caused us so much grief here with the loss of friends and family.

All Americans should be grateful for the magnificent job that has been done by our military personnel, and let us remember as we are watching this great victory that we have just had in Afghanistan that there were naysayers who were warning us not to do anything militarily in Afghanistan, that it would become a quagmire and that any time we commit military forces anywhere that it is so risky that we should just forget it.

There is a saying of a captain of a ship, if a captain of a ship believes that his number one job is preserving the ship, well, then he will never leave port.

Well, the ship of the United States has one important purpose, they have many purposes, our ship of state, but the most important purpose of our Federal Government is to protect the people of the United States and to protect our freedom. It is not simply to watch events go by. It is not simply to have a military for which we pay for our military, only to see it there and to caress it and to salute it and to say good things about it. No, our military is there and the people who are in our military understand they have a job to do. At times that means that they must leave port and they must go to foreign destinations in order to protect the national security interests of our country and in order to prevent our people from suffering the kind of attacks that we suffered on September 11.

When we do not do that and when dictators and tyrants and evil-doers around the world see the United States has no more stomach for that type of conflict in distant places, then we will indeed become the target because there are evil people around the world who

hate everything that the United States stands for and envy the prosperity and freedom of our people.

The naysayers, if we remember, said the same thing about Saddam Hussein's attack and invasion and subjugation of Kuwait. The naysayers said we better not get into that war because Saddam Hussein kept playing on their psyche, the Vietnam psyche. This is going to be the mother of all wars.

Well, what happened in Kuwait and in Iraq 10 years ago and what just happened in Afghanistan in these recent months should indicate to us when America is on the right side and we are doing what is right and opposing aggression and supporting those people who believe in freedom and democracy, that we will, we will win, and that we will be on the side of those people in those areas on which we are fighting, and that it will not become a quagmire because we are doing what is right and just.

For the record, not aggressively responding to the invasion, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait or not aggressively responding to the atrocities committed against us on September 11 would have been a much riskier strategy than unleashing a military counterattack, which is what we did. But Americans need to understand that these two conflicts, while our military have went in in these conflicts and altered the course of history and defeated the tyrants, defeated the terrorists, the American people need to know that that military action might not have been necessary had we in place policies which would have prevented the attacks in the first place.

It was bad policy on the part of the United States that led Saddam Hussein to attack Kuwait. It was bad policy on the part of the United States that led bin Laden and the Taliban to conclude that they could conduct murderous attacks on the people of the United States and that they would not suffer the consequences.

The fact is in terms of Iraq, during the fast moving and somewhat confusing days at the close of the Cold War, a high ranking foreign policy official from George Bush's administration, meaning George Bush, Senior, the first President Bush, an Ambassador April Gillespie, misinformed Saddam Hussein as to our country's position on Iraq's claim to Kuwait. She stated that we considered Iraq's claim on Kuwait and the threats of Saddam Hussein to invade Kuwait to be an internal matter of Iraq.

□ 1445

She stated it very clearly and it has been printed since, an internal matter. That is what Saddam Hussein contemplated when he tried to decide whether to unleash his military forces against Kuwait. It was a miscalculation on his part, but due to a bad policy statement by our own government, a mistake by our own government, a mistake by the previous Bush administration.

Well, that classic misstatement on Ambassador April Gillespie's part led to the invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War that followed. That was a policy error, and I might add, when some people suggest when I criticized the last administration for its mistakes and misdeeds that they are claiming that I am being partisan, let me just note that I am fully recognizing that mistakes often have happened in Republican administrations, and I just gave an example of that.

What we must do in order to fully understand what happened on September 11 is to take a look at the government policies and the events that led up to September 11. I worked in the White House during the Ronald Reagan years, during those years when Reagan put an end to the Cold War, and ended those Reagan years with the dismantling of the Communist dictatorship that controlled Russia and the puppet states.

Part of that effort on the part of Ronald Reagan, of course, to bring the Soviet Union down or at least end the Cold War was President Reagan's strategy that the United States should support people throughout the world who are struggling to free themselves from Communist tyranny, especially those people who are struggling to free themselves from Soviet occupation.

The bravest and most fierce of these anti-Soviet insurgents were in Afghanistan, and the American people can be proud that we provided the Afghan people with the weapons they needed to win their own freedom and independence. That Cold War battle was a major factor in breaking the will of the Communist bosses in Moscow and thus ending the Cold War. By ending the Cold War, we made everyone on this planet, especially those people who live in the Western democracies, we made them safer, we made them more prosperous.

In our own country, it resulted in 10 years where spending on the military was able to decrease in the range of hundreds of billions of dollars, which then went into our economy in different ways, and all of this can be traced back to Ronald Reagan's strategies and traced back to the people of Afghanistan who fought for their freedom and independence and under the Soviet bosses and the crack in the Soviet leadership led to its downfall.

However, we must take a look here at this strategy and at this moment in history at the end of the Cold War to fully understand the crime of September 11. One of the common errors found in trying to understand September 11 is the suggestion that those holding power in Afghanistan today are the same people that we supported who were fighting against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s. This by and large is wrong. It is inaccurate.

Yes, some of those who are currently or were in power during the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, some of those in the Taliban regime did fight the Russians, there is no doubt about it, but by and large those people who were in the

leadership of the Taliban were not in the leadership of those people who fought with the Mujahedin that fought against the Russians, the Soviet Union. In fact, I do not know of one of the major factional leaders of the Mujahedin who fought the Russians when the Soviets occupied Afghanistan; not one of those became a major leader in the Taliban. So those who fought Soviet occupation, the Mujahedin, were different from those people who later took over as the Taliban.

During my time at the White House from 1981 to 1988, I had a chance to meet the leaders of the Mujahedin, and I found them to be a very interesting and many of them honorable men. Some of them were wild and woolly and others were quite a sight because I would take them sometimes to the dining room at the White House and would see these guys with their turbans and outfits there at the executive dining room at the White House.

I got to know them personally, and I got to admire them as individuals. Many of them were so courageous and they worked with me, and quite often I would be called when they needed help in procuring certain weapons systems, or time periods when even medical supplies were unable to get through they would call me to try to use my contacts at the National Security Council and the White House to break down the barriers, and I was able to do that successfully on some occasions.

I always told them that if I was going to help them I was going to personally be involved with their struggle against the Soviet army, that if, when I left the White House, if the war was still going on that I would join them at least for one battle, sort of put my body where my mouth is or my money where my mouth is, whatever we want to say it is, but I was willing to stand up with them rather than just give them moral support.

So after I left the White House and I was elected to Congress, I had 2 months between my election in November of 1988 and January of 1989 when I would be sworn in that were my last 2 months of freedom before I actually became a Member of Congress. During that time I disappeared and hiked into Afghanistan as part of a small Mujahedin unit and engaged with that unit in the battle against Soviet troops around the City of Jalalabad, and I marched in for several days through the Khyber Pass and around a side trail.

These people that I marched with, some of them were young, some of them were old. They were armed just with RPGs, rocket propelled grenades, and Kalashnikov rifles. These were very brave people, but let me suggest that they were not senseless killers and they were not people who would not have rather been with their families, but during the war in Afghanistan the Soviet Union had destroyed their ability to live at peace with their families. They destroyed their villages,

their water systems, et cetera, and more than that, they tried to destroy their ability to worship God as they saw fit.

As we were marching through the devastation of Afghanistan, as I have a sip of water right here, at times there was not even water for hours at a time and perhaps one full day of hiking, and these people did not have enough money to have canteens. They did not have enough money to have sunglasses. So they would put pencil lead into their eyelids and swirl it around so that a coating of pencil lead would serve as a shield against the sun as we marched across the desert. These people, as I say, had almost no food, very little water.

We gave them the arms they needed to fight for their independence, but every day they would pray five times, thanking God for what they did have. I got back right before Thanksgiving, and I had Thanksgiving dinner with my family that year, and we had so much, so much in abundance in the United States. Sometimes we forget how wonderful it is a place that we have. Sometimes we forget that we have so much to be grateful for, and in America, believe me, every day should be Thanksgiving Day. Every day should be a day when we thank God. These brave people did it five times a day when they had nothing, and it was their strength and courage, as I say, that helped bring the Soviet military to its knees and eventually forced them to retreat from Afghanistan.

After the Russians retreated from Afghanistan, the United States simply left. We had been providing them with a billion dollars a year to finance that war and then we simply walked away. We left the Afghans to their own fate after all of this destruction and death, after so many of them had become maimed, their children were maimed. They had no way to take care of their own families. We left them to sleep in the rubble. We did not even help them clear the land mines that we had given them during the fight against the Soviet army.

This was a sin that we committed against the people of Afghanistan, and it came back to haunt us. We left them, as I say, to sleep in the rubble, and we left them with no leadership. The leadership we supposedly left them with was that of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and these two countries, I might add, played a shameful role in Afghanistan in the years since the end of the Afghan war with the Soviet Union, and these two countries, supposedly our friends, the Pakistanis and the Saudis, they bear a great deal of the responsibilities, a great burden of the responsibilities for the fact that we suffered the attack on September 11.

So perhaps when we left Afghanistan, and then again this was not this administration or even President Clinton's administration, again it was at the Cold War, the end of the Cold War during President Bush, Senior's admin-

istration, perhaps that is one of the policies that we put in place that led to September 11.

After the collapse of the Communist regime in Afghanistan, the Mujahedin factions who had fought the Russians with no direction or no leadership from the United States began to bicker and to fight among themselves. This was one of my first years in Congress when this was going on, and I remember that even then I could see that it was important for us to try to support a positive alternative for Afghanistan. Why is it that the United States Government could not step forward with saying look, here is a positive alternative, let us push a plan of our own that, if it works, people will be able to live in peace, and if it works, the country can rebuild, but we had no plan of our own and in fact we left it to the Pakistanis and the Saudis.

I myself took it upon myself because I was involved in Afghanistan to go into the region and to go into Afghanistan and to argue aggressively that there was a strategy that would bring peace to Afghanistan and that was bringing back the old king of Afghanistan who had been overthrown in 1973, King Zahir Shah. Zahir Shah had been a coup. He had been removed from power in 1973, and that is what began the cycle which caused the horrible bloodshed.

All of the Afghan people had a warm place in their hearts for King Zahir Shah. King Zahir Shah was a man who, because he had such a good heart, some evil people felt that he was vulnerable and removed him in a military coup when he was visiting another country at one point, but Zahir Shah was so beloved by his people. I went to see Zahir Shah when he was in exile in Rome and he committed to me that if he would return to Afghanistan that he would lead a temporary government only that would stay in power long enough to institute democratic elections and permit the country's governmental infrastructure to be put in place, that would give the people of Afghanistan a chance, a chance to have a decent government and to have free elections and to bring in outside people to help them set up the democratic process and to observe the elections and permit the people throughout the country to form political parties. Zahir Shah had agreed to that because he wanted to go back to Afghanistan to prove to his people that during that time of their travail, when he had been forcibly removed from office, that he was with them and that he cared about them and that he wanted to make this last contribution because he was becoming an older man.

That was 10 years ago when I went to almost every area around Afghanistan, to almost every country around Afghanistan, as well as going into Afghanistan itself, to advocate that Zahir Shah be returned to Afghanistan, and guess what? Everywhere I went I was followed by a representative of the

United States State Department, and right after I would speak to the various leaders, the State Department official would announce that DANA ROHR-ABACHER is speaking for himself. It is not the position of the United States Government. In other words, they were saying do not listen to DANA ROHR-ABACHER because he is just a bunch of hot air, he represents nobody. What was the State Department's alternative? They had no alternative.

□ 1500

I do not mind people disagreeing with me. I do not mind people undercutting me. But the State Department was tearing my efforts down to bring back Zahir Shah to try to establish democratic government and they had no alternative. Their alternative was to let the turmoil continue in Afghanistan. Their alternative was to ignore what was going on in Afghanistan. That was our State Department's position. And that position continued into the Clinton administration, time and again undercutting Zahir Shah.

And what was their position on Zahir Shah? He is too old. Zahir Shah was too old. At that time, of course, he was younger than Ronald Reagan was when he ended the Cold War. Now, 10 years later, he is still alive and he is not too old now. No, there was something else at play. Whatever was at play, whatever convinced our State Department to undercut the efforts to have a democratic alternative during the early days after the Soviet troops left, they will have to explain someday. But as it was, this Member of Congress took enormous efforts, I took enormous efforts to try to have an alternative and offer that alternative to the people of Afghanistan. Because I knew that if our country did not do what was right, it would come back and hurt us someday.

And so I went forward over the years, and the confusion and the chaos continued in Afghanistan. And then, like a flash upon the sea, just a surprise move that was happening, being played by somebody, but all of a sudden there was another force at play in Afghanistan. And that was a force that was called the Taliban. In the mid-1990s, a fresh, well-equipped, well-armed, well-rested, well-trained military unit entered Afghanistan from Pakistan. These people by and large had not been fighting the Soviet Union but were, instead, kept out of the war and in schools in Pakistan. And at these schools, by the way, many of them were and continue to be illiterate.

The United States provided a great deal of money and resources for the Mujahadin during their war with the Soviet Army. That money went through the Pakistani, the equivalent of the Pakistani CIA. It is called the ISI. And apparently the Pakistani ISI had siphoned enough of our money off to keep that third force and to create that third force which would be used after the war to do their bidding. The

Taliban was the creation of Pakistan and the creation of the Saudis, and they were set up to be the attack dogs of these people in power in those countries so that they could dominate Afghanistan.

When the war with the Soviet Union was over, and after the bickering among the factions themselves, which of course had been instigated a great deal by Pakistan, who continued to support evil people like Hekmahtri Gulbahdeen, but when all the democratic forces, or people who wanted a decent government in Afghanistan, were blood white, the Taliban were just thrust upon the scene.

And, as I say the, Saudis were also involved. The Saudis bankrolled this effort. During the war with the Soviet Union, the Saudis had provided several hundred million dollars a year. The United States provided at times up to a billion dollars a year for the anti-Soviet insurgency in Afghanistan.

I once asked General Turki, who is the head of Saudi intelligence, why they should not bring back the King of Afghanistan, Zahir Shah, in order to end this bloody cycle; and that he could be someone who everyone could rally behind because they all trusted him not to kill them. Zahir Shah, while he was no one's first choice, everyone knew that Zahir Shah was incapable of committing atrocities against them, and they trusted him not to be someone who would hurt them. So at least he offered everyone safe haven. Well, General Turki, the Saudi general who was in charge of their intelligence, told me that the Saudis wanted nothing to do with King Zahir Shah and they had their own plan for this third force with Pakistan: the Taliban.

And when the Taliban arrived on the scene, let us admit that there had been so much chaos and confusion in Afghanistan, many people thought that they might become a force for stability; and they were welcomed in many parts of Afghanistan, mainly because the Taliban carried huge pictures of King Zahir Shah, claiming that they were going to bring back Zahir Shah. When I heard about those pictures, I said, well, maybe they will. Maybe they will create stability and bring him back. Maybe my conversations had some effect.

Well, it did not take long before the people of Afghanistan realized what the Taliban were all about. Luckily, they were not able to occupy the northern provinces of Afghanistan because the commanders there were very hesitant to let troops into their part of the country who they did not know anything about. So we soon learned that instead of a force for stability, the Taliban, which had been created by our Pakistani and Saudi friends, was a monster, a monster that threatened stability of the world, a monster that was eating up any chance for peace and any chance for a decent government and a decent standard of living in Afghanistan.

The Taliban were medieval in their world and religious views, they were violent and intolerant, they were fanatics; and, as such, they were an aberration of Islam. They were totally out of sync with Muslims throughout the world and even totally out of sync with the Muslims in Afghanistan.

Let us note the reason the Taliban were defeated so quickly was that the people of Afghanistan did not like the Taliban, which is exactly the opposite of what we were being told by the State Department and others all along. The Taliban are best known, of course, for their horrific treatment of women, but they were also the violators of human rights across the board. They jailed and threatened to execute Christian aid workers, allegedly for doing nothing more than espousing the belief in Jesus Christ. They ended personal freedoms, they ended freed of speech and freedom of the press. These things were not even a consideration. They ruled by fear.

This is the Taliban that was put in place by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, and it was clear that that was what was going on after a very short period of time. The Taliban believed they had a private line to God. The rest of us, who have different religious convictions, according to the Taliban, are not only wrong but we are evil, of course. And perhaps that is why they gave safe haven to the likes of bin Laden, a Saudi terrorist who has been in Afghanistan and was in Afghanistan for years training terrorists and planning his attacks on the United States and other countries.

Oh yes, by the way, bin Laden let us not forget this as well, had several thousand gunmen with him. We know that. We do not know where they have all gone, but during the time when the Taliban were in power in Afghanistan, bin Laden's armed militias or legions were marauding around Afghanistan murdering any Afghan that would try to resist Taliban power. So the Taliban and bin Laden were despised in Afghanistan, even though we were told by the State Department and others how horrific it would be for us to try to dislodge the Taliban from power.

Remember, during the years of the Taliban, they had the support from Saudi Arabia and Pakistan; and in fact during those years, during the 1990s, the Taliban captured all but a very, very small portion of Afghanistan. They beat back all of those people who were against them in the northern part of the country so only a sliver, only 10 percent, of the country in and around the Panjer Valley remained free of Taliban control.

The only reason they did not really take over the entire country is there was one leader in the northern part of Afghanistan who captured the imagination of his people and the people of Afghanistan and other people throughout the world. His name was Commander Masood. Commander Masood led his forces in the Shamali Plains and up in

the Panjer Valley, and he was never conquered by Soviet troops nor was he ever conquered by the Taliban.

I went to see Commander Masood in the mid 1990s, and through the years before and after that I maintained a relationship with him. I have spoken to his brother on many occasions and kept a line of communication going. Commander Masood was a very decent and honorable man and, as I say, a much beloved person. But the Taliban domination of Afghanistan was not bad enough for the United States to support Commander Masood or anybody else who was fighting against the Taliban.

For years during the Clinton administration I begged and I pleaded to provide some kind of help to the Northern Alliance, which were then resisting the Taliban in Afghanistan. In fact, the Taliban did not need to have taken over all of Afghanistan, except for that little 10 percent. The Taliban could have been stopped when it was holding perhaps 70 percent of the country or 60 percent of the country. But at no time was President Clinton and his administration willing to have anything to do with trying to resist the Taliban forces.

And every time I suggest that the Clinton administration policies of the last 5 years led to this atrocity committed against us on September 11, people go bananas. They automatically say that I am being partisan. Let me note that in this speech already I have highlighted several of the major mistakes made during Republican administrations. But let us not be so hesitant to place responsibility where it belongs when it comes to September 11. Today, I have no doubt that if the policies during the Clinton administration would have been different, the murderous attack on our people on September 11 would not have happened and we may well have spared the people of the world this horrendous, horrendous war that we are going through right now.

Of course, this war could be a lot worse than it is. The fact is our military is doing a terrific job. But this is not partisan. I am a senior member of the Committee on International Relations. And over the years, as I watched what was going on in Afghanistan, I realized that during the Clinton administration there was a pattern, a consistent pattern going on that appeared that the United States policy was not actually opposing the Taliban but, instead, we actually had a covert policy of supporting the Taliban.

Let me repeat that, in case anyone misses the significance of it. During the 1990s, when we had a chance to support those people who were opposing the Taliban, when we had a chance to undermine the Taliban's strength so that they could be replaced by others who were more closely aligned to democratic principles or even to bring Zahir Shah back and establish a democratic government, our government had exactly the opposite policies.

Every time the opportunity arose to overthrow the Taliban or to undermine the Taliban, the Clinton administration actually did things that helped bolster the strength of the Taliban.

When I noticed this trend as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I called on the Clinton administration and the State Department to provide me the documents so that I could peruse the official State Department documents, the cables coming in from overseas, the briefing papers, to determine what our policy was.

Now, I am a member, as I say, a senior member of the Committee on International Relations; I am on the upper rung there. When you see hearings, I am on the very top level of those hearings now because I have been a Member of Congress now for 14 years. My job in that committee is to oversee American foreign policy. Making a request to see documents of the State Department to determine what American foreign policy is is not only justified, it is something that should be expected of Members of Congress. Of course we should see the documents and find out what the policy is and talk with the administration and make sure that we are doing our oversight responsibility.

For 2½ years, the Clinton State Department refused to provide me the documents. It is called stonewalling.

□ 1515

The Assistant Secretary of State, Rick Inderfurth, repeatedly gave me documents that were irrelevant to the request that I made so he could claim that he gave me documents. Some documents included newspaper clippings, which is an insult, a Member of Congress asking for internal documents and getting newspaper clippings.

Why was the State Department stonewalling my request? Is it illogical for someone reading the RECORD or for me or my colleagues to believe that if I was stonewalled in a request for documents from the State Department and that I have a legitimate right to oversee that activity, that the State Department was trying to hide something from me and thus hide something from the American people? Is that irrational? No, I think that flows directly from that action.

During the latter part of the Clinton years, even though Secretary Albright agreed to provide me the documents necessary to determine America's foreign policy towards the Taliban, I was repeatedly thwarted from getting those documents, and I have to believe that Secretary Albright herself knew that I was being thwarted because she had been asked that in congressional hearings on the record in front of the whole world under oath.

Thus, the Clinton administration when it came to the Taliban made a joke out of Congress's right to oversee American foreign policy. Well, guess who the joke is on? The joke is on the American people, but nobody is laughing after September 11.

The Clinton administration, I repeat, was involved in policies that actually supported the Taliban. This at a time when we knew their nature. This at a time when we knew that they had terrorists there, bin Laden, who had already killed Americans; this when we knew they were some of the most horrendous human rights violators on the planet.

An example of ways the Clinton administration helped support the Taliban, in 1996, for example, the Taliban had overstretched their forces. This is at the beginning of their rule. Thousands of their best fighters were captured in northern Afghanistan. I was watching this very closely. The Taliban regime was vulnerable as never before and never since. It was a tremendous opportunity, and by then we knew that the Taliban were going to be the monstrous regime they proved to be.

The Northern Alliance, which existed then, had defeated the Taliban in a way that made the Taliban incredibly vulnerable. A knockout blow could have been unleashed easily by the Northern Alliance and the Taliban could have been kicked out.

At the time I was in personal contact with the leaders of the Northern Alliance, and I recommended to them a quick attack and bringing back the old King Zahir Shah until the democratic process could be established; and, thus, we could turn around the whole situation in a very quick movement. Who saved the day? Why did the Northern Alliance not take advantage of this opportunity? I can tell Members who saved the day. President Clinton saved the day. Probably personally he made the decision. Again, I beg Members of Congress, please do not dismiss what I say. Any time someone says anything bad about Bill Clinton, it is suggested to us that we are being partisan. Please, that is not the case. We are talking about policies that were in place. We are not talking about individuals. His actions and policies saved the day, and those decisions were made and responsibility should be placed.

What happened was at this moment when the Taliban could have been eliminated, President Clinton dispatched Assistant Secretary Rick Inderfurth and Bill Richardson, who was then our United Nations ambassador, to go personally to northern Afghanistan and convince the anti-Taliban forces not to go on the offensive, but instead to accept an immediate cease-fire and an arms embargo.

Mr. Speaker, these people in northern Afghanistan were pretty impressed by the United Nations ambassador and the President's personal representative flying into northern Afghanistan. They wowed the Northern Alliance, and the advice of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the State Department did everything they could to convince them to ignore what the gentleman from California was saying.

This was like having a time when Adolf Hitler could have been elimi-

nated, but we were convincing the forces in Germany to sit down and talk with old Adolf. Instead, they decided to accept a cease-fire and an arms embargo. The minute there was a cease-fire, the Saudis and the Pakistanis began a massive arms resupply of the Taliban.

So the Clinton administration instituted an arms embargo against the Taliban's opponents, at the same time that we knew, our CIA clearly knew what was going on, that there was a massive arms resupply of the Taliban. Within a very short period of time after the Northern Alliance was crippled by an arms embargo and the Taliban was smothered in new weapons and supplies, the Northern Alliance was driven almost completely out of the country. Only 10 percent was left after the Taliban offensive.

For years I begged the Clinton administration to support those who were resisting the Taliban regime. Not only did they not support those who resisted the Taliban, but they actually undermined their efforts. I said, what about King Zahir Shah? And again, Zahir Shah was not acceptable. Too old. There was every reason in the world why we could not do anything to oppose the Taliban in terms of actual actions instead of just words, confetti words that America's President was just throwing out.

Bin Laden was even able to kill Americans and kill military personnel while in Afghanistan, and we still did not take the actions necessary to try to overthrow the Taliban. We shot off a couple of cruise missiles. We destroyed a few mud huts. All of the while bin Laden, who has killed American military personnel already, was given a safe haven to set up a terrorist network throughout the world. During that time period, some of bin Laden's network tried to assassinate the Pope in the Philippines. Throughout Southeast Asia, terrorist groups were forming, all with the support of bin Laden having been given safe haven in Afghanistan.

I believe that the United States did this and that the Clinton administration was involved in this because they had made some kind of deal or had some kind of understanding with Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. And Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, they have their own reasons and their own motives and their own value system; but let us take a look. Pakistan is not a democratic country today. Musharraf, the guy who is in charge there, is a general who overthrew a democratically elected government. If he wants to bring peace to that country, I hope that he provides the reform and heads back toward a democratic regime. I suggested when he took power that he have a plebiscite to give himself the legal authority to conduct that reform. He decided not to do that.

The Saudis, of course, are a medieval dictatorship, a family that controls their country, these people who basically have some of the same anti-Western feelings that bin Laden has. No, the

Saudis do not have our same values. They have been allies to the United States, and I give them credit. We should not forget that during the Cold War, the Saudis were allies, as were the Pakistanis; and for that we should be grateful. But we cannot let our gratitude for Saudi support during the Cold War, and Pakistani support during the Cold War, to bind us into policies that will undermine our well-being in a totally different world that is emerging since the post-Cold War.

Bin Laden, of course, was a Saudi, and I say "was" because we still do not know where he is. Let us hope that bin Laden has moved on to his just rewards, and that would be burning in hell right about now. He was preaching that the killing of innocent people, of thousands of unarmed people was in some way consistent with his faith. There are Muslims all over the world that would call him to task for such an obscene statement. And I am sure that he is finding now that he is not surrounded by all these dark-eyed virgins that he was promising these people who committed these atrocities against us. He is finding that he and the rest of his gang are heading in a different direction than that.

I warned again and again, yet the Clinton administration did nothing; and it did come back to hurt us. I am on the record on at least 14 different occasions suggesting that unless we changed our policy against Afghanistan, it would have serious repercussions for the United States of America.

Bad policy is at fault. Something else is at fault for what we suffered, and we need to face that as well. The bad policy I hope has changed. Although since our offensive in Afghanistan, let me note that some of the same people in the State Department and elsewhere, even after the attack on September 11, were hesitant to suggest that the Taliban be eliminated from power. In fact, some were suggesting that our game plan should be a coalition government between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance, and all the Taliban had to do was give up bin Laden. That is like asking Rudolph Hess and some of the rest of the Nazi crowd to give up Hitler, and they can stay in power. Well, thank goodness we have a President of the United States that was smart enough and courageous enough to ignore that kind of advice and told the Taliban that they are part and parcel of this, and made a goal of eliminating the Taliban regime from power.

Our forces did this job in such a professional way. We worked with those people in the Northern Alliance. Remember when we were told that the Northern Alliance would take months and months and it would be such a quagmire. The Northern Alliance have proven to be fighters able to defeat the Taliban.

The Northern Alliance has won, and we have to make sure now that we do not walk away again. We have to make sure that we do not leave the Afghan

people to sleep in the rubble; that we stick with those people who are anti-Taliban who worked with us to eliminate bin Laden and the Taliban. Let us help them rebuild a democratic, strong, prosperous Afghanistan.

Already there is thought that the King of Afghanistan should be coming back to Afghanistan. This after 12 years. Let me say, 12 years ago I was told he is too old. The State Department would tell me he has no support. He is too old. The King of Afghanistan is the only one who has the loyalty of the hearts of the people of Afghanistan. They love that man because he is a father figure who was King at a time period when there was no killing.

□ 1530

There was no chaos. People lived at peace with their families. They remember that. The sooner the King gets back to Afghanistan, the better.

I was able to go to the conference in Bonn after we had basically won on the ground in Afghanistan in which the Afghan leaders got together and chose an interim leader, Prime Minister Karzai, who is there now. I was there to talk to them about the King and about Mr. Karzai and talked to the various factions in Bonn, and it was my honor to have been there, and I hope I made a small contribution to laying down a plan that would permit Afghanistan to have some stability and prosperity and peace in the future.

We do that by what was the original plan, and this is ironic. The King has agreed to come back and open a Loya Jirga, which is a meeting of the elders of his country. That meeting will help establish the rules for a constitution which, over a transition period, will become a democratic government for the people of Afghanistan. Finally. But we cannot walk away.

They had a meeting in Tokyo a few days ago for donor countries. The United States has committed, I think, about \$350 million or so. I will have to say I do not think that is legitimate. I will have to say that I think the United States Government over a period of time should be kicking in much more than \$300 million to help the people of Afghanistan.

To put that in perspective, we have been able to spend hundreds of billions of dollars less every year on our military for all these years since the end of the Cold War because the Afghans helped us end the Cold War. For pete's sake, let us help the Afghans build their country. They have only provided \$27 million for demining in that country, \$27 million. They think there are 8 million land mines. Three hundred children every month end up becoming maimed by land mines in Afghanistan that have been planted there. Think of the drain that would be on our society, much less their society.

Let us make sure we ensure the peace and do the right thing, and the right thing is making sure we do not walk away; that we bring the King back; and

we make sure there is an inclusive government, not like the Taliban. They had their exclusive clique who had their own vision of God, which they superimposed on everybody else. Let us instead, let us instead, support an inclusive government, and that is what Zahir Shah would do.

Unfortunately, now there are several people in Afghanistan, Mr. Khalili and some others, Ismail Khan and some others, who worked against the Taliban, who feel they may be being left out. We should not let any government leave anyone out, and our own United States Government should express its appreciation to those on the other side, whom Mr. Khalili and Ismail Khan and others are associated with, and others like that who fought against the Taliban, and everybody should be included.

By the way, the Iranians, the Iranians are promising \$560 million worth of support, 50 percent more support for Afghanistan than the United States of America. That is not right. We have benefited by the end of the Cold War. We should make sure we repay the Afghans amply, and that is what is right, and that will be good for us as well.

Let us remember as we move forward, now that the resistance of the Taliban is gone down to just a few areas, there are a few hot spots left there, but there is still a threat to democratic government in Afghanistan. We must play a positive role, both in the economy and in establishing democratic government. Mullah Omar, the head of the Taliban, is still there somewhere with a thousand or so fighters in Afghanistan. We have to make sure Mr. Karzai's interim regime is successful in establishing the foundation that will sweep away the Mullah Omars and bin Ladens forever, because the people of Afghanistan are not fanatics. They are not fanatics.

The people who flew the airplanes into our buildings on September 11 were not Afghans. They were, by and large, Saudis. The people of Afghanistan are devout in their faith, but they are not fanatic about their faith, and Muslims throughout the world resent bin Laden and his murderers for trying to talk for their religion.

President Bush has been magnificent in his outreach to the Muslim countries of the world, letting them know that we will not succumb to the temptation that bin Laden would like us to succumb to, which is making an enemy out of all Muslims in the world. In fact, we are not only not making enemies out of the Muslims from Afghanistan, we in fact are reaching out to them, and need to do so with a heavier financial commitment to help them rebuild their country.

Now, as we proceed, as I say, let us note that in the war against terrorism there will be steps one, two and three. Number one was in Afghanistan, and it is coming to a close, although it is not at a close right now. Step two may be in Southeast Asia. I just returned from



Malaysia where they have found bin Laden's network. In Singapore, they just arrested 13 people who were part of bin Laden's network who were planning to blow up a bus that carried American people from our embassy every day. So there would have been 60 or 100 Americans who would have been murdered there by bin Laden's terrorist network in Singapore.

In the Philippines we have already some Special Forces on the ground, after 10 years of ignoring, by the way, during the Clinton Administration. Again, I would say we have got to help the Philippines. I realized that. I went to the Philippines time and again to try to get them together. They were a target of the Communist Chinese and they were a target of bin Laden's network.

Today we have a chance to save the Philippines, but it will be close. We need to work with the Philippines. We have some Special Forces teams on the ground, and we need to make that commitment. I think President Bush has made that commitment. Whether or not that is going to be the next front in the war against terrorism or whether it will be to finish the job that we did not do against Saddam Hussein, this will be a war on terrorism, and it will be a war that is conducted sequentially, and it will be a war that we will be proud of because we will be standing for freedom and democracy and peace.

I salute the members of our Armed Forces who have conducted such a gallant fight, who are leading us on to victory and to create a better world, and to have a better world we must have the courage to do what is right and stand for the principles our country believes in.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. INSLEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for January 23 on account of official business in the district.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for January 23 and the balance of the week on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 30 and 31.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 25, 2002, at 10 a.m.

#### MOTION TO DISCHARGE A COMMITTEE

JANUARY 24, 2002.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XV, I, JIM TURNER, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 203) entitled, a resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, which was referred to said committee on July 19, 2001, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Jim Turner.
2. Stephen Horn.
3. Christopher Shays.
4. Michael N. Castle.
5. Lindsey O. Graham.
6. Todd Russell Platts.
7. Marge Roukema.
8. Ken Lucas.
9. Brad Carson.
10. Thomas H. Allen.
11. Sherrod Brown.
12. Marion Berry.
13. James H. Maloney.
14. Leonard L. Boswell.
15. Ron Kind.
16. Robert E. Andrews.
17. Joseph Crowley.
18. Louise McIntosh Slaughter.
19. Nick Lampson.
20. John Lewis.
21. Hilda L. Solis.
22. Zoe Lofgren.
23. Steve Israel.
24. Gary L. Ackerman.
25. James R. Langevin.
26. Michael M. Honda.
27. Dale E. Kildee.
28. Ted Strickland.
29. Joseph M. Hoeffel.
30. James P. McGovern.
31. Jay Inslee.
32. Rush D. Holt.
33. Darlene Hooley.
34. Carolyn McCarthy.
35. Ellen O. Tauscher.
36. Charles A. Gonzalez.
37. Shelley Berkley.
38. Lynn C. Woolsey.
39. Ruben Hinojosa.
40. John B. Larson.
41. Amo Houghton.
42. Stephanie Tubbs Jones.

43. Mike McIntyre.
44. Baron P. Hill.
45. Earl Blumenauer.
46. Rick Larsen.
47. Brad Sherman.
48. John W. Olver.
49. Grace F. Napolitano.
50. James C. Greenwood.
51. Xavier Becerra.
52. Ciro D. Rodriguez.
53. Gene Green.
54. Steven R. Rothman.
55. Susan A. Davis.
56. Barney Frank.
57. Steny H. Hoyer.
58. David E. Bonior.
59. Charles W. Stenholm.
60. Peter Deutch.
61. Nancy Pelosi.
62. Charles B. Rangel.
63. Maurice D. Hinchey.
64. Michael E. Capuano.
65. Eva M. Clayton.
66. Edward J. Markey.
67. John F. Tierney.
68. Henry A. Waxman.
69. Jerrold Nadler.
70. Nita M. Lowey.
71. John Elias Baldacci.
72. Lois Capps.
73. Martin T. Meehan.
74. James P. Moran.
75. Sam Farr.
76. Chet Edwards.
77. Tom Udall.
78. Jim Davis.
79. Tim Holden.
80. Luis V. Gutierrez.
81. Tom Sawyer.
82. Frank Pallone, Jr.
83. Richard A. Gephardt.
84. Ken Bentsen.
85. Allen Boyd.
86. Diane E. Watson.
87. David E. Price.
88. Chaka Fattah.
89. Gerald D. Kleczka.
90. Jim McDermott.
91. Rosa L. DeLauro.
92. Bob Etheridge.
93. Ed Pastor.
94. Mike Thompson.
95. Melvin L. Watt.
96. Nydia M. Velazquez.
97. David D. Phelps.
98. Adam B. Schiff.
99. Betty McCollum.
100. Robert A. Borski.
101. Bob Filner.
102. Robert T. Matsui.
103. Peter A. DeFazio.
104. John M. Spratt, Jr.
105. Tammy Baldwin.
106. Ike Skelton.
107. Bob Clement.
108. Diana DeGette.
109. Dennis J. Kucinich.
110. Robert Wexler.
111. George Miller.
112. Janice D. Schakowsky.
113. Lane Evans.
114. Jim Matheson.
115. Constance A. Morella.
116. Brian Baird.
117. Benjamin L. Cardin.
118. Lucille Roybal-Allard.
119. Silvestre Reyes.
120. Harold E. Ford, Jr.