

65 but you decide to keep working and not start taking those Social Security benefits, your Social Security benefits will increase by 8 percent a year for every year you delay taking Social Security benefits after 65. A lot of us are very healthy and want to keep working a few more years. If you wait 4 years and increase your benefits by 25 percent, if you are optimistic about your life span, then it becomes a good deal.

But the point is, if you retire earlier, then actuarially you are going to get less, but still have the option of retiring earlier. If you wait to retire, then you are going to actuarially have more benefits, but it is going to not cost anybody anything simply because, on the average, it is going to be actuarially sound.

PRSA account withdrawals may begin at 59½, as I mentioned. There are tax incentives for workers to invest an additional \$2,000 each year so that you have the same tax advantages as you would in a Roth savings account, or an IRA, to encourage that additional investment, especially for low-income workers where government would add to that investment in those retirement accounts.

It gradually slows down benefit increases for high-income retirees by changing benefit indexation from wage growth to inflation. Right now, we have a system where future benefits are indexed to wage growth which goes up much faster than the CPI, than inflation. So this changes that index.

Generally what I do to pay for this system is, I slow down the increase in benefits for high-income workers and increase them for low-income workers. But that is what helps pay for the transition into some private ownership accounts. We divide the PRSAs, like I mentioned, between couples. Widow's or widower's benefits increase to 110 percent. It repeals the Social Security earnings test, it is scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent, and it maintains the trust fund reserves. Some people have said, we need the trust fund reserves there, so I keep the reserves there as an additional safety net.

Right now, the average retiree gets about 30 percent of their last year's earnings. The current retiree gets, on the average, 30 percent of their last year's earnings. What we are suggesting is that we have the kind of guarantee that if an individual that is 20 years old today ends up getting, whatever, 50 percent of their last year's earnings, or as we have experienced in some counties down in Texas that decided to have private investments rather than the Social Security, they are receiving three and four and five times as much as Social Security would pay.

So if we say to the 55-year-old worker that, look, you go into the system, he comes up with funds in his personal savings retirement account that would accommodate, say, 20 percent of what he would have of his last year's earnings, then Social Security and govern-

ment would add the additional 17 percent to guarantee what he would have gotten under the old Social Security system. We can have the kind of safety net, because over the long term we can get a lot better return than the 1.7 percent of the average retiree.

Again, in closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to all of my colleagues, to everyone that might be listening to this presentation, that the longer we put off solving Social Security, the more drastic the solution is going to be. I think we cannot afford the imposition on current workers or we cannot afford to put the burden on future wage earners by not facing up and dealing with the Social Security problem.

ASPECTS OF THE WAR ON TERRORISM

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a very important aspect of the kind of war against terrorism which I think the United States should wage. I would like to talk about a dimension of that war which is very seldom discussed. We are in the process now of preparing for our budget. The vote on the budget may come as early as next week. In that budget, the largest increase is \$48 billion for the military and for homeland security, items which are designated as part of the war against terrorism. I want to talk about that in terms of its being utilized in a new way, of being expanded so that it has a greater impact against terrorism than the present administration foresees.

The emphasis of the present administration is too much on the military and too little on foreign aid and other kinds of necessities that are needed, both at home and abroad.

I think the discussion before on Social Security is relevant here, also, but today, earlier, we took some steps which I think weaken our war on terrorism. A bill was passed which erodes the ability of the American citizens to bring class action suits. For some time, since the Contract With America and the majority was taken over by the Republican Party, we have had an effort to erode the rights of citizens in our civil courts.

Certainly the effort to end class action suits as we know them has been going on for some time. That bill was passed today, by a narrow majority, but it was passed; and it is one more example of how we are restricting and oppressing, with a light hand, and swindling our own population. Every time we do that, every time an act takes something away from the American people, the citizens, who must be at the heart of fighting the war on terrorism, we are weakening our war against terrorism.

One thing this war needs is every American enthusiastically involved.

Every American must understand that the war is going to be a long war and the war is a war for people's minds across the globe. It is a war to show our compassion. It is a war to help educate the rest of the world. There are a number of items, of components in this war against terrorism which require massive help by our entire population.

□ 2015

When we make our own population a little less comfortable or disgruntled, we move in ways which are going to restrict the rights and freedoms of our own population; we are weakening our effort in the war against terrorism.

When we refuse to appropriate adequate funds for education, we are greatly weakening the ability to fight a war against terrorism. And over what? In the most elemental concrete way, the ability of our military to fight a war with high-tech weapons, very complex weapons, is dependent to some degree on the quality of the education of the personnel involved.

I am not a military expert; but the large number of accidents that have occurred, the large amount of human error and the number of casualties that were the result not of hostile fire but of our own mistakes, indicate that the quality of personnel could be greatly improved.

I am mindful of the time when, just a few years ago, we launched a new super aircraft carrier, the largest and most complex machine on the water, about 3 years ago was launched by the Navy, and they said that they were short 300 personnel. They could not fill 300 positions on that aircraft carrier because they could not find within the Navy the enlisted men who could do the things that were necessary, could operate the complex high-tech equipment. It was just one example of how education directly relates to our ability to fight a war. In this example it is obviously quite concrete and related to the military.

On a larger scale, we need all the people we can to help educate the populations of certain nations, to help educate the leaders, to be able to spread the constitutional civilization that we enjoy, how you operate under a constitution, to be able to spread the economic system that we enjoy, the legal system that goes along with economic system. Capitalism cannot exist without a legal framework. There are a number of things that are not so simple that the rest of the world needs to learn, and one of the ways we are going to be able to win the war against terrorism is to have more and more people, ordinary people in the nations of the world, understand these complex processes.

So educated people in America will help not only increase our own level of prosperity, the ability of our own Nation to function, but also we are going to be needed to help spread democracy across the world and help democracy take a firm hold, to help improve the economic systems take hold.

The nation building that is going to have to take place in Afghanistan is just one example of a large number of people of all walks of life, technicians, mechanics, scholars. All kinds of people are going to be needed to help rebuild the nation of Afghanistan. We are not going to do it all. The United Nations is responsible for the nation building in Afghanistan, and that is the way it should be; but we must make a great contribution.

The larger war is one that we must understand how serious it is, the projection of a larger threat. It is not the kind of threat that we have faced before with the Soviet Union, the possibility of nuclear annihilation overnight, the possibility of them having more nuclear warheads than we had, the Soviet Union having better rockets than we had and the necessity to keep monitoring what the Evil Empire was doing. The Evil Empire, on the other hand, was monitoring us constantly.

We are in a different kind of situation, and the threats we face now are not as easy to describe or to imagine as they were before. But one thing that September 11 taught us is that we are vulnerable.

There is this great Nation, we are not an empire, call us the American colossus, with all of its strength in so many ways, which is very vulnerable, like any other civilized society is vulnerable. We did not know that on September 11 to the degree we know it now.

We are very vulnerable, because if you hit one nerve center, and in the case of September 11 they hit the financial center of New York, a communications center, two buildings. Large numbers of people died, but a lot of other repercussions took place as a result. It was a domino impact. A domino impact helped to make the recession worse, not only in New York City and New York State, but it had an impact right across the Nation.

We were vulnerable in that a relatively small group of people somewhere in the world, and they were based in Afghanistan, we have assumed, I think correctly, a small group of people struck down all the airplanes of the skies of the great United States of America. They were empty for a few days as a result of the actions of these few people.

So we are vulnerable, because the Internet connections and the television broadcast connections at the World Trade Center meant a lot of people found themselves without television service, and communications in New York is very much still affected by the fact there were telephone switching stations and complicated operations located near the World Trade Center.

So in a number of ways a very complex, modernized society is vulnerable. Now terrorists know it as well as everybody else; and we have to recognize that, sooner or later, the possibility of these things happening again is there. We will have other kinds of attacks.

We seem to be quite vulnerable here on Capitol Hill, when one letter going through the post office and then to Senator DASCHLE's office led to an anthrax scare. Appropriately, that shut down the whole Senate building. One-third of the Senate offices were shut down; employees were terrorized to some degree. Two postmen lost their lives as a result of the anthrax just passing through the post office machines, and all of us saw our mail brought to a halt. We did not receive mail for a couple of months. Our mail has to go through an irradiation process now.

A lot of complex things happened as a result of the relatively small anthrax attack. We are grateful for the fact that whoever perpetrated that attack did not send 10 or 20 envelopes through the mail at the same time.

So we are vulnerable now. We know we are vulnerable to an anthrax attack; and just as anthrax was sent through, you could have other kinds of biological attacks, very potent diseases. The smallpox virus, all kinds of things could be done in similar ways, through the mail and various ways dropped in areas where you have a dense population in our big cities. There are a number of ways that we can discern that we could be attacked by faceless, nameless, nationless people. We know that now, and so do a lot of other people out there know it.

How do we make ourselves safer? I do not have all the answers, nobody has all the answers; but we are evolving answers. One answer is to reduce the number of people in the world who would cooperate with terrorists, reduce the number of people in the world who would become terrorists, reduce the number of people in the world who would aid and abet terrorists. That is one way to begin to make a safer world.

In doing that, we have to have a foreign policy and domestic policy which put people first. I am not speaking as a pacifist. I am a follower of Martin Luther King, I believe in non-violence, but I also recognize that we have to, in some cases, go to war. The only way to stop certain kinds of threats is with violence matching violence, and that is what our military is all about.

I said the last time I was here in a small poem that I wrote that wars never leave us thrilled, but there are some maniacs who demand to be killed. Wars never leave us thrilled, but there are some maniacs who demand to be killed, and we would indeed be quite stupid not to recognize that after a long history of dealing with these maniacs.

Adolph Hitler was a maniac that could not be stopped any other way except with violence against violence. We had to have a military force to match his overwhelming military force. We thought after Hitler you would have a decrease in those kinds of maniacs. He was thoroughly punished as a result, and the nation that followed him was

punished as a result of his activities. That did not stop Pol Pot from arising. That did not stop Slobodan Milosevic from trying his hand.

On and on it goes. These maniacs will come. Saddam Hussein is another one of those maniacal creatures that exist. We cannot put our heads in the sand and pretend that they are ever going to be able to be stopped if you only have a nonviolent approach to them.

However, there are also the nameless, faceless groups out there that have not even formed yet, that can be dissuaded, stopped, if we remove the fertile ground for terrorism that exists among those groups.

I am a child of World War II. I was just a grade school student during World War II, and we lived with the possibility that the Nazis would prevail. In school we were told they wanted to take over the world. In black schools they were told they hate black people, and one thing worse than the Ku Klux Klan is the Nazi SS storm troopers. The terror of the Nazis we lived with until they were defeated.

Then we lived with the terror of the Cold War, the Russians are coming, the Evil Empire. At school we used to have drills and have to go under the desks because the Russians now had the atomic bomb and we might have nuclear war. So we lived through that. Even up to the time of my children in school, they still had drills and were very much conscious of the need to be afraid of an attack by the Soviet Union. All of that was horrible; and all of that, of course, left quite an impression on a lot of us.

But none of it was as horrible as 9-11. Even the attack on Pearl Harbor, we lived with the knowledge that the Japanese were very sneaky and they might attack, coming over California and into the heartland of America. That was another one of the nightmares that young people used to have. But the attack on Pearl Harbor, of course, brought the war home closer than any other war we had ever realized from a foreign nation; but at Pearl Harbor, at that time Hawaii was not even part of the United States, so it was a little more distant, and, of course, most Americans who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor were at least military people.

It was not until 9-11, nothing compares, nothing we experienced in World War I or World War II, the Cold War, the Korean War, nothing compares to the attack on America that took place on September 11. It brought home the fact that we are in a different kind of world.

The Evil Empire, as the Soviet Union was described, and I am sure they had descriptions for us that were similar, no longer exists. Russia and America now have generals and officers stationed in the missile sites, and we closely monitor each other and the number of nuclear weapons we promised to reduce. Certainly the rockets and their trajectories have been altered, and there are agreements that

make us all feel secure that the Soviet Union and the United States will never go to war. We are the only nations with the capability of delivering long-term nuclear weapons.

We are not happy and secure about the Chinese or North Koreans, but even then there is a nation to negotiate with; and America has negotiated with the North Koreans. Despite the fact that the President called them part of an "evil axis," we are still in negotiation with North Korea. It is a nation.

China, our relationship with China, there is a multiplicity of contacts and relationships. Capitalism has invaded China; and China has invaded our consumer markets, for good or ill. We are not that afraid that China is ever going to pull a sneak attack on us.

But those unknown, unnamed forces out there, in small groups, al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden is just one that we have profiled, a high profile, we understand. Who knows how many other there might be out there. But certainly al Qaeda gives us a good example of the kind of danger we face from stealth, stealth attacks, stealth violence, S-T-E-A-L-T-H. The world "stealth" is what every civilization has to fear from now on.

We have come to the point where weaponry is so complex and so powerful that small amounts of explosives and small bombs or small packages of lethal viruses or small packages of powder, like anthrax, can do tremendous, tremendous harm. We are threatened by stealth from possible terrorists in the future.

□ 2030

So they are and could be as numerous as the stars. We cannot ever be able to stamp out all of those possibilities out there.

The one way to guarantee that they are kept at a minimum and the one way to guarantee that they have an atmosphere and a milieu and an environment to operate which is hostile to them and protective of us is to try to make a world which includes justice, peace and compassion; a world where all the babies receive enough to eat; a world where young people are allowed and encouraged and supported to get an education which will allow them to look beyond hate.

A great deal has been said about the madrassahs in Pakistan. The madrassahs are schools in Pakistan which have come into great prominence and merited a great deal of attention and discussion because Pakistan as a nation abandoned its public school system. A very limited amount of money is appropriated in the Pakistan budget. This year they have done much better. Before 9-11, very limited amounts were being appropriated for education, huge amounts for the military, and other expenses; and parents seeing their children abandoned were happy, quite pleased that they could send their children to religious schools which not only gave them an edu-

cation, it taught them to read and write, but also provided some hot meals each day for them.

So large numbers of children, especially males, were spent to the madrassahs and the madrassahs, we know now, taught them to read and to write, but only a limited amount of reading and writing, not a broad education about the whole world, a limited amount, and taught them to focus on hatred for the West and hatred for certain religions and taught them to dedicate their lives to the eradication of what they call the Evil Empire, the decadent West and Christianity and a number of other kinds of things they were taught to hate. So many of them went off to the camps in Afghanistan to become a part of the Taliban and a part of the army of the Stealth Army of Osama bin Laden. So we have that example that we are watching. It is a case history.

Pakistan is an interesting case history for the United States, because Pakistan as a nation has always been an ally of the United States. From its inception, it has been a friendly relationship. The United States has rattled its sabers and flexed its muscles a few times to protect Pakistan from India, and in wars that India could have won easily if they had continued. I can remember the United States making veiled threats and telling them they needed to back down, and that has happened. On the other hand, Pakistan was a loyal ally during the Cold War. While India was far closer to the Soviet Union, Pakistan was very close to this Nation.

Of course, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the key to the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by American-led Stealth forces supporting the Afghan people was Pakistan. Pakistan was the avenue through which the United States funneled its aid, its weapons, its military power. And it defeated the great Soviet Union as a result. Pakistan, in alliance with the United States.

But each time we have an engagement with Pakistan, each time Pakistan serves as our ally, we have not rewarded Pakistan. We did not reward them for the great service they did as a result of the Soviet defeat in Afghanistan. We did not reward them for all of the years that they served as our loyal ally during the Cold War. Pakistan was sort of left to drift when we got through with using them. So we missed a golden opportunity. A nation of more than 160 million people is no small nation. Compared to India with 900 million, 160 million may seem small, but among the nations of the Earth, Pakistan ranks among the top 10 in population.

Having deserted, left Pakistan alone, not rewarded Pakistan in any way, the establishment of a closer alliance with military aid, no Marshall Plan for Pakistan, no Marshall Plan, no continuing relationship, aid was very meager, and then when Pakistan, as they

have had unstable governments, each time there was a coup, we punished them by taking away something. They had given us the money to buy planes, we kept the money and did not give them planes. We had a meager amount of aid going to them, and we cut all of that off through A.I.D. Nothing happened as a result of punishing them for their own instability in their own government. For various reasons, Pakistan could be very disgruntled. However, Pakistan has risen to the occasion and was one of the first nations to respond to President Bush's call for allies in the war against terrorism.

Considering the fact that Pakistan has a huge border with Afghanistan, Pakistani response, the Pakistani support for the war on terrorism was crucial. We could not have reached the point that we have reached now in terms of pretty much containing the violent situation, the capacity of the Taliban to wreak violence on its population or anybody outside without Pakistan. We could not have reached the point where Osama bin Laden is on the run somewhere or hiding somewhere or maybe dead; we could not say that we have dealt a critical blow to terrorism if it had not been for Pakistan. We owe Pakistan a great deal.

I want to applaud our own administration. For once they have responded by rewarding the nation of Pakistan. There is a package that is part of President Bush's war against terrorism of \$500 million or \$600 million in aid, and some of that aid is earmarked for education. It is earmarked for education. More than \$100 million is earmarked to be spent only on education. There are other moves that have been made to aid education in Pakistan at the same time we are giving other kinds of aid.

So Pakistan is an ally that we are taking care of.

The rest of my speech I want to dedicate to the proposition that there are allies in the western hemisphere that we continue to ignore and take for granted at our peril. In a world where we face terrorism threats, where we face threats from unknown groups, some of them not even established yet, but we know the conditions that give birth to these kinds of terrorist groups, in that kind of world, we are at risk in our own hemisphere. We are ignoring the Caribbean Islands. We are ignoring the threat from the South American countries. We are ignoring the role that Haiti could play in a positive way or in a negative way. We are ignoring the fact that these nations in this hemisphere, close to us, have one great advantage and they can impact in a more meaningful way on our lives because they are so close, just because they are so close.

We are ignoring the fact that for years now, we have been fighting what we call a drug war, and the drug war has involved our deploying operatives to all of these nations of one kind or another related to the war against

drugs. Not just the island nations, but the nations joined to us at the southern tip of Mexico. Mexico and the island nations of the West Indies and Haiti, all have had serious problems with respect to either the growth and processing of drugs or the transshipment of drugs. If we ignore the fact that these nations already have a problem and that that problem may lead to a situation where the governments are forced to succumb to drug lords; there are some things worse in the world than the Taliban. The Taliban at least had religious rationale. It may be a phony religious rationale, but it was a religious rationale. The drug lords do not attempt to pretend to be moral in any way.

The primary problem between Haiti and the United States during the Clinton administration or during the last, for the last 20 years has been the fact that forces in Haiti, certain forces in Haiti were being financed by drug lord money. The problem of the President of Colombia is that Colombia is at the point where there is a danger that drug lords will take over the entire nation. Most Americans do not know that we spend more than \$1 billion in this little country called Colombia in South America. This is \$1 billion being spent in the war against drugs and we are continuing to invest. Unfortunately, it is a military war. We are giving aid to fight a guerilla army which is financed by drugs. We are giving aid to fight a population which has no other means. They see themselves as having no other means to survive, so they are part of the process of growing drugs and processing drugs.

Colombia is just the beginning. Colombia is right next to Panama, and Panama now is an independent nation. The canal is owned, operated; it is part of Panama, not America any more, and they are right next to Colombia. Drug lords could take over Panama sometime in the future if we do not understand that that kind of war is as important as a war against terrorism. In fact, it is a kind of terrorism, and it certainly could become a part of an income-producing empire for terrorism in the future. We have not talked very much, we have not heard much about the role of drugs in Afghanistan and how the Taliban and all of the forces in Afghanistan have been involved in selling drugs. Heroin, the poppy from which heroin is made is the number one product of Afghanistan, and the control of the heroin trade by these factions, including the religious Taliban, was one way in which they financed their operations, selling drugs. So it is not farfetched to say that the drug war in this hemisphere will become a major problem in the war against terrorism in the future.

We need to look at all of the nations in this hemisphere in terms of what is our relationship to them, why do we continue to take them for granted, why can we not have a Marshall Plan for the western hemisphere on a scale

similar to the Marshall Plan which saved Europe after World War II? Why can we not have a Marshall Plan which develops an economy, helps to develop the economy of the Caribbean Islands? It would not cost very much. Why could not we have approached Colombia with aid for economic development and other kinds of things, rather than only aid for the military? I am sure if we spent \$1 billion for economic development in Colombia, we would get a better return on our investment than we have gotten for the dollars that we spend on military aid in Colombia. They are fighting a guerilla group, a guerilla operation which could not exist if it did not have the support of a large percentage of the population. Why does it have the support of a large percent of the population? Because a large percent of the population make their living growing cocaine, the coca leaf, and that is where they have an affinity with the lawlessness of the drug lords.

What would happen if in the future in this hemisphere we are surrounded by all of these nations and they are taken over by drug lords, they run the governments? That means that drug lords have a vote in the United Nations. There are a lot of small nations in the Caribbean Islands that are right now directly threatened by drug lords. There is one island where the chief law enforcement officer was murdered by a local drug lord. Everybody knows who killed that person. Everybody in the islands is afraid to participate in the process of apprehending and prosecuting the murderer. That is just a small island and one dilemma which foretells the future of a lot of others.

There are some larger islands which have recently had violent outbreaks in certain parts of the island, and Jamaica is one, where the battles were fought in Kingston, where the police were outgunned by modern weapons that the criminals had. How do criminals in a small island get such modern weapons and are able to outgun the local police? Through the financing of the drug trade. There are some islands where drug lords are known and despised by the population; but if a drug lord gives a birthday party, your top officials of government go to the birthday party. You are eroding slowly the respect for the civilian governments, you are eroding the authority of governments, and you are saying to the population, that process is saying to the population that drug lords are all powerful.

□ 2045

It is like in our neighborhoods in New York and some other big cities where powerful people demand a lot of money and forces, and young people begin to look up to them because they have money, they drive the big cars, and they have the best wardrobes, et cetera.

In the island nations, we have the same development of powerful forces

that may get out of hand. If we really want to fight terrorism, and we have \$48 billion in the present budget, I am not way out in left field, I want to stay on the subject, if we have \$48 billion in the budget to fight terrorism and for homeland security, then a portion of that money ought to go to looking at this hemisphere and what we can do in this hemisphere at a much lower cost now than we would have to pay in the future if we had to fight empires of drug lords with votes in the United Nations and all kinds of influence in the future.

I want to use Haiti as a case history, because I am quite disturbed, and we have good reason to be disturbed, by the present policies of the United States Government toward Haiti.

Haiti has a long history of being a loyal ally of the United States, just like Pakistan, way back when, when Haiti was the second nation in this hemisphere to gain its freedom. The United States became an independent country in 1776. Haiti came second in this hemisphere as an independent nation.

When the British tried to undo the Revolutionary War and to subdue the infant nation of America in the War of 1812, Haitian soldiers fought on the side of American soldiers. Haitian soldiers were sent or came to this nation.

Throughout the history of Haiti and the relationship between Haiti and the United States, the Haitian people have never raised their hands against the United States. They have never been disloyal. Yes, we have done some terrible things to the Haitians. We occupied their country for more than 30 years. But the Haitians have never done anything to subvert the United States. Neither Hitler nor Castro nor Osama bin Laden has been able to drive a wedge between the Haitians and the people of the United States.

That ought to stand for something. We ought to be interested in rewarding Haiti. Haiti would be a good example to hold up to the rest of the countries in this hemisphere as to what it means to be a friend and ally of the United States. Let us take care of our friends at home, as well as seek to make new friends across the world.

Vice President CHENEY is on a tour throughout the world to build up alliances, to get alliances for the American-led war against terrorism. That is probably altogether fitting and proper. He should do that. But in the meantime, the nations in this hemisphere are being treated very badly, and I begin with Haiti.

Haiti is at the point right now where it may cease to exist as a nation. Haiti may implode or explode and just fall apart completely because of the hostile policies of the United States. The key to the death of Haiti would be the policies of this nation. Haiti does not deserve to die. The second oldest independent nation in this hemisphere, the nation of Haiti has been driven to the brink of chaos and dissolution by a hostile U.S. foreign policy.

Seven years ago, the U.S. reneged on a \$200 million development fund promised to Haiti. Now the U.S. is presently blocking humanitarian aid in order to bolster the position of a destructive opposition in Haiti. For petty political reasons, Haiti is being strangled to death, but Haiti does not deserve to die. Haiti is being cruelly smothered by a small group of petty, but powerful, decision-makers here in Washington.

Long before the recent Haitian election controversy, and there is now a controversy in Haiti about the last election of people, and we are using the fact that that election was not a perfect election as an excuse to hold up aid to Haiti and to block aid to Haiti from other sources. That election in Haiti probably was far more reasonably executed and implemented than the election in Florida. But we are using that as a way to deny aid to the present administration.

But long before that, long before the Haitian election controversy, for personal, ignoble, and irrational reasons, a noose was tied around the neck of President General Bertrand Aristide's first administration.

As the democratically elected president was returned, with the support of the U.S. military, President Clinton and the international community promised Haiti an economic aid package vital to the survival of the country. The start-up and kingpin donation was to be \$200 million from the U.S. That was going to be the start-up, and the other nations, using that or recognizing that \$200 million, would create an infrastructure, an administrative infrastructure, which would allow Haiti to make use of additional aid.

They promised to give additional aid. Other nations, Canada, France, Japan, they promised to follow the lead of the U.S. with a sum total of more than \$1 billion. In other words, let me make it clear, if the United States had followed through on its promise to give \$200 million, the rest of the nations of the world would have chipped in and the amount of aid that Haiti would have gotten 7 years ago was \$1 billion or more.

But the U.S. did not follow through on its promise. There were certain powerful people in Washington who said that Haiti would never get a dime from the United States because they personally would see to it that it did not happen. There are a few people in Washington who are just that powerful.

Unfortunately, certain power brokers within our midst counted themselves as close friends of the old oppressive ruling class in Haiti, and they thus became sworn enemies of President Aristide. The president of Haiti who was elected with an overwhelming democratic vote of the people was targeted by the U.S. right wing for punishment.

What was the U.S. right wing? Certain people in high positions in the Congress of the United States were part of it; certain people in the CIA

were part of it. They had all surfaced during the years that Aristide was in exile and had spoken against Aristide in various ways. We know who they were; we know who they are.

Despite the fact that Aristide's administration was in no way corrupt, and Aristide obeyed his own nation's constitution and he stepped down at the end of the 5-year term, the U.S. allowed a ruthless and shortsighted few to condemn Haiti to death by neglect, death by abandonment, death by the denial of vital aid for survival.

Let me repeat: Aristide's administration was in no way corrupt. We could find no fault with Aristide. Aristide returned after being in exile for 3 years. He was elected, and the army staged a coup, and they forced him out of the country. He was in this country for 3 years. He went back. He had only 2 more years to serve in his term. He had a right to make a claim that he had been exiled and was not able to fulfill the wishes of his people, and he had a right to say, "I should be allowed to stay 5 years." But no, he accepted the constitution and wanted to promote the authority of the constitution, and he stepped down after serving for 2 years, 3 years in exile and 2 years after he went back. We asked him to do that. The United States Government wanted that to be done.

He did everything we asked; but nevertheless, a ruthless and shortsighted few decided to condemn Haiti to death by neglect, death by abandonment, death by the denial of vital aid for survival.

We descendants of Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Martin Luther King should no longer tolerate the lynching of a nation before the eyes of all who can see in this hemisphere and the rest of the world. That is what is happening: We are lynching the nation of Haiti. We are strangling a nation to death. We are assassinating a nation. That is the charge I make, and I think that the facts will bear it out. The policies of the United States Government at this point are destroying the nation of Haiti.

Haiti does not deserve to die. As I said before, in the War of 1812, after the vengeful British had burned the White House and were threatening to recolonize the fledgling American Republic, Haiti sent troops to aid in the defense of our new nation. Since that time, Haiti's hand has never been raised against this land. Neither Hitler nor Castro nor Osama bin Laden could break the bond that exists between the U.S. and the people of Haiti. Haiti does not deserve to die at the hand of the United States foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, today I am inviting all of my colleagues to unite with the Congressional Black Caucus to rescue a Haiti that is being unjustly subjected to cruel and inhuman torture. Haiti is being unjustly subjected to cruel and inhuman torture. The denial of humanitarian aid to Haiti right now is being used as a political sledgehammer. We

are coupling humanitarian aid, aid that is designed to help people, aid, most of which would not go to the government, it would go through non-governmental organizations, we are denying that aid as a way to force Haiti to do some things we want done which would benefit the opposition in Haiti, the opposition that has been favored by the right-wing forces in the United States since the very beginning of Aristide's term.

I am asking my colleagues in the House to join us in an appeal, asking both Houses of Congress to join us in an appeal to the rest of our colleagues to try to save Haiti. Join us in the appeal for a special initiative by President Bush and Secretary Powell. We want to ask them to review and reconsider the Haiti policies that they are presently promulgating.

The President showed great animosity towards Haiti, even during the campaign for his election. Haiti was singled out in two of the debates as being the kind of place that President Bush felt we should not have given aid and help, so we know that there are problems in this administration.

Secretary Powell recently went to a CARICOM conference. CARICOM is an organization of the island nations of the Caribbean. He went to a conference and talked about punishing Haiti further by denying or continuing to deny aid. This administration should immediately deliver, this administration should immediately deliver to Haiti, first of all the \$200 million that were promised in 1994, or promised several years ago. After that, it should follow up with the humanitarian aid that is being denied right now.

I would like to say to my colleagues that if our own Nation will not yield, if our own Nation insists on pursuing this course of destruction of Haiti, yes, it is an assassination course, we are assassinating a nation, I can think of no terms that would be too harsh for what we are doing, if we continue to pursue this assassination course, then I would like our colleagues to consider joining us, the Congressional Black Caucus, in an appeal to the United Nations. Why not ask the United Nations to try to bring some sense back to the situation?

A very small group of very powerful people in Washington is using power to destroy a nation of between 7 million and 8 million people. Something should be done. I would like to ask our colleagues to join the Congressional Black Caucus in an appeal for help. If the United Nations will not do it or is slow, an appeal for help from some of the other more moral nations of the world. Why can we not appeal for help to Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Denmark? Somewhere, someone on this globe should be able to understand the situation and come to the aid of Haiti.

I recall that Norway, a very unlikely place for the solution to be worked out in the Middle East, but Norway took the leadership in developing a dialogue between Israel and the Palestinians.

□ 2100

The peace process that was started and later brought to fruition by President Clinton, which led to Arafat and Rabin shaking hands in the White House garden, was started by Norwegians. So maybe we can appeal to the Norwegians or the Swedish or the Netherlands or Denmark or some other nation, some other decent, civilized nation, Germany, to help, because our Nation is locked in a position which is inhuman and disgraceful and murderous for a whole group of people.

Perhaps we should follow the moral example of Australia. Australia sent their soldiers to stop the bloodshed in East Timor. At the request of the United Nations, Australia sent their soldiers to stop the bloodshed in East Timor, and the Australians did not leave and say we are not going to engage in Nation building the way certain people insisted we leave Haiti: The United States should not stay in Haiti; we should not have to help to build a Nation; we restored the President, let us get out. No, the Australians stayed under the supervision of the U.N., and they have helped to build a nation in East Timor.

East Timor is today being celebrated as a new democratic Nation. Pretty soon East Timor will take their place in the United Nations as an independent nation. It could not have happened without those outsiders, those white Australian troops, going to the aid of a nation in distress and committing themselves under the supervision of the United Nations to a moral and very civilized venture to save human beings, to restore a government of the people, and to help to build a government of the people in that far-flung corner of the world.

It is a decision of the Congressional Black Caucus that we send out pleas throughout the whole globe in search for some nation that will help us to aid Haiti, if our own government will not. We are going to appeal first to those Members of the Congress. We are going to appeal to President Bush. We are going to appeal to all the forces in this Nation to take a hard look at what we are doing and to back away from a foreign policy.

If that does not happen, we intend to go to the United Nations and to the civilized nations of the world. Haiti does not deserve to die. If we fervently seek it, then somewhere in the civilized world there must be enough compassion and mercy to save the long-suffering people of Haiti. Haiti does not deserve to be strangled at the hand of our government. Haiti does not deserve to die.

This is a very strong language. I have lived with the problems of Haiti for a long time. My district has the second largest concentration of Haitian Americans in America. Miami has the largest concentration. The congressional district of the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has the largest concentration of Haitian American; I have

the second largest. Together, we in the Congressional Black Caucus have sought to try to establish a new relationship between the United States and Haiti since the days when Haiti had democratic elections and President John Bertrand Aristide was elected by something like 80 percent of the voters.

Because he did not follow its precepts and was not a puppet of the oppressive ruling class, ruled for a long time, the Army staged a coup and Aristide barely escaped with his life. He spent 3 years in this Nation, in Washington here, while we tried to get a negotiated return of Aristide to his rightful place in Haiti. However, because the people in power, the army leaders who staged a coup, were so well financed by drug lords that they did not have to worry about economic sanctions, that they did not have to worry about their own income, they would not budge. They would not yield.

There were several negotiations with them which almost came to the point of reaching some agreement, but it turned out they were just leading us on and had no intention whatsoever of ever letting Aristide back in the country. All the way, they had their lines into the drug lords. Haiti was a major transshipment point for drugs.

Raoul Cedras, the commander of the Army, his second in command Biamby, Michel Francois, they were all on the payroll, well financed by drug lords. Michel Francois was later indicted by the United States for his role in drug transshipment.

So the long history between the United States and Haiti has not been a good one from the time that the occupying forces left Haiti. First of all, we occupied Haiti for 32 years, which is most unfortunate. I will not go into the circumstances that led to that, but after we left Haiti, we left in charge and had bonds between a ruling class that had the benefits of an army which was trained by the United States. The Haitian army and the ruling class that had been very oppressive for the rest of the Haitian people ruled for a long time.

Francois Devalier was elected as president. He made a bond with the ruling class and the Haitian army and created his own army called the Ton Ton Macoutes, which was a civilian militia, death squads that were feared by the people, and the combined balance of the Haitian army and the Ton Ton Macoutes kept Haiti in a state of terror for more than 40 years.

Finally, they got a decent election under pressure from the United Nations and the United States. They had a fair election and President Aristide was elected, and of course, I have told my colleagues before, the army immediately overthrew the elected president, forced him into exile. He barely escaped with his life.

President Clinton, responding to the repeated request of the Congressional Black Caucus trying to shape a decent Haitian policy, after many, many at-

tempts to negotiate with the leaders of Haiti, decided to restore John Bertrand Aristide to power in Haiti through the use of military intervention. Our troops went into Haiti, and as I told the President, he does not have to worry about the people fighting the United States troops. The people will welcome the United States troops with open arms. They will cheer the troops as they come in.

Exactly what I predicted and told the President would happen, happened. The Haitian army was made up of 4,000 folks who were thugs and cowards, and they ran to hide when the army came in, and the people cheered the United States forces. Aristide was restored to power, and the leaders of the Haitian army were sent into exile.

Military leaders like Cedras and Biamby were exiled to Panama on October 13, 1994. The U.S. provided an airliner which shipped them out of the country. Michel Francois had escaped. We believe he went to the Dominican Republic, but he was later convicted in exile of drug transshipment and of murder. However, I have a brief chronology here which I will quickly go through as a backup for what I have said before of our relationship with Haiti.

On 15 October Aristide returned to Haiti, and Aristide, at the part of the United States Government, called for reconciliation and an end to violence. He did not call for retribution. He did not call for trials to punish the traitors. He followed the example of Nelson Mandela and the leadership of South Africa, and he sought reconciliation with the opposition forces.

On 11 October, Aristide moved to reduce the army. Already most of them fled, but he reduced the army to 1,500 troops from a strength of 7,000, and he offered the soldiers of that army that had deposed him jobs within the community and preference for new positions in the government.

On November 4, Aristide appointed a new prime minister in accordance with their constitution and the parliament approved that new prime minister.

On December 17, Aristide, by presidential decree, established a commission on justice and truth to investigate crimes committed by military regime. The commission on justice and truth is the exact same name that was used by Nelson Mandela and the people of South Africa and Bishop Tutu as they sought to unravel the relationship between the oppressive whites of South Africa and the new black-dominated government without bloodshed, with a minimum of bloodshed.

February 9 of 1995, the multinational force of the United Nations collected 20,345 weapons, including 5,853 grenades and 1,736 machine guns from the remnants of the Ton Ton Macoutes and the Haitian army.

January 30, 1995, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution which extended the United Nations mission in Haiti until July 31, 1995.

March 31, 1995, President Clinton made a trip to Haiti, the first President to set foot on Haiti since Roosevelt; and President Clinton went to oversee the transition ceremony which reduced and established the pattern for the pullout of all the United States forces and handed over the multinational transition of Haiti Government to the multinational forces of the United Nations.

On April 28, Aristide did the most important thing of his career. He dissolved the Haitian army. If he had not dissolved the Haitian army at that point, we would not be standing here, about the point that he was not re-elected after he gave up his presidency; and he is now the president of Haiti, but he is hated by right-wing forces in this nation, and we determined that he will not let Haiti die.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for March 12 and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. Jo ANN DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today and March 14.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 14.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, March 19.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5862. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Operations, PWBA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Class Exemption for Cross-Trade of Securities by Index and Model-Driven Funds [Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2002-12; Application No. D-10851] received February 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5863. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories: General Provisions; and Requirements for Control Technology Determinations for Major Sources in Accordance with Clean Air Act Sections, Sections 112 (g) and 112 (j) [FRL-7155-8] (RIN: 2060-AF31) received March 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5864. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); 50 U.S.C. 1730(c); 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c); (H. Doc. No. 107-188); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

5865. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contractor Responsibility, Labor Relations Costs, and Costs Relating to Legal and Other Proceedings [FAC 2001-03; FAR Case 1999-010 (stay); Item I] (RIN: 9000-A140) received February 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5866. A letter from the Director, OPM, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Locality-Based Comparability Payments (RIN: 3206-A181) received February 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5867. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Miscellaneous Changes in Office of Personnel Management's Regulations (RIN: 3206-AJ54) received February 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5868. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended: Automatic Visa Revalidation—received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5869. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment Revisions [Docket No. FAA-2002-11483; Amendment No. 13-31] (RIN: 2120-AH21) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5870. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, TSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Aviation Security Rules [Docket No. TSA-2002-11602; Amendment Nos. 91-272; 107-15; 108-20; 109-4; 121-289; 129-31; 135-83; 139-24; 191-5] (RIN: 2110-AA03) received February 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5871. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Design Standards for Highways [FHWA Docket No.

FHWA-2001-10077] (RIN: 2125-AE89) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5872. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E5 Airspace; Andrews—Murphy, NC [Airspace Docket No. 01-ASO-15] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5873. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-56-AD; Amendment 39-12601; AD 2001-25-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5874. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment, Redesignation, and Revocation of Restricted Areas; NV [Airspace Docket No. 00-AWP-13] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5875. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, TSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Programs for Aircraft 12,500 Pounds or More [Docket No. TSA-2002-11604] (RIN: 2110-AA04) received February 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5876. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Honolulu Class E5 Airspace Area Legal Description [Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-29] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5877. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; Accessible Pedestrian Signals [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2001-8846] (RIN: 2125-AE83) received February 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5878. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the Carload Waybill Sample Reporting Procedures [STB Ex Parte No. 385 (Sub-No. 5)] received February 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5879. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Eglin AFB, FL; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 02-ASO-3] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5880. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to Class E Surface Area at Marysville Yuba County Airport, CA [Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-22] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5881. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Hillsboro, ND [Airspace Docket No. 00-AGL-29] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.