

How do we accomplish regime change in Iraq given the complexities and challenges of the current regional environment? The deep Israeli-Palestinian conflict continues; our relations with Syria are proper though strained; we have no relationship with Iran; Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Jordan have warned us about dangerous unintended consequences if we take unilateral military action against Iraq; and Afghanistan remains a piece of very difficult unfinished business, an unpredictable but critical investment for the United States and our allies.

I can think of no historical case where the United States succeeded in an enterprise of such gravity and complexity as regime change in Iraq without the support of a regional and international coalition. We have a lot of work to do on the diplomatic track. Not just for military operations against Iraq, should that day come, but for the day after, when the interests and intrigues of outside powers could undermine the fragility of an Iraqi government in transition, whoever governs in Iraq after Saddam Hussein.

An American military operation in Iraq could require a commitment in Iraq that could last for years and extend well beyond the day of Saddam's departure. The American people need to understand the political, economic, and military magnitude and risks that would be inevitable if we invaded Iraq.

There was no such national dialogue or undertaking before we went into Vietnam. There were many very smart, well intentioned professionals, intellectuals, and strategists who assured us of a US victory in Vietnam at an acceptable cost. Well, eleven years, 58,000 dead, and the most humiliating defeat in our nation's history later we abandoned South Vietnam to the Communists.

Let me conclude by saying that I support regime change and a democratic transition in Iraq. That's easy. The Iraqi people have suffered too long, and our security and interests will never be assured with Saddam Hussein in power. The tough questions are when, how, with whom, and at what cost. I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses over the next two days on these critical questions.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 16, 2000 in San Diego, CA. Seven teenage boys, ages 14 to 17, attacked five elderly Latino migrant workers. The boys chased, beat, and shot at migrants living in a makeshift encampment in an isolated canyon. Ethnic slurs were used during the attack. The boys were charged with hate crimes, assault, robbery, and elder abuse in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and

changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

AFGHANISTAN FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act is similar to H.R. 3994, sponsored by the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Congressman HYDE. The House of Representatives passed this bill on May 16 by a vote of 390-22.

The Afghan Freedom Support Act comments the United States to the democratic and economic development of Afghanistan. In addition to the economic and political assistance found in Title I of the legislation, Title II seeks to enhance the stability and security of Afghanistan and the region by authorizing military assistance to the Afghan government and to certain other countries in the region, including assistance for counter narcotics, crime control and police training.

The United States must stay actively engaged in helping Afghanistan through a very dangerous and difficult transition to stability, security, and, ultimately, democratic government. We are at the beginning of a long process. We cannot be distracted or deterred from this objective. Our credibility, our word, and our security are directly linked to success in Afghanistan. And there cannot be political stability and economic development in Afghanistan without security.

This legislation authorizes \$2.5 billion over 4 years for economic and democratic development assistance for Afghanistan. This amount includes Senator LUGAR's proposal for a \$500 million enterprise fund to promote job creation and private sector development. In addition, S. 2712 authorizes up to \$300 million in drawdown authority for military and other security assistance.

This legislation includes a Sense of the Congress resolution, at the initiative of Senator BIDEN, which urges the President to commit the full weight of the United States to expand the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) beyond Kabul. The resolution calls for \$1 billion to support ISAF expansion for FY 2003 and FY 2004, if the President makes that call.

The main elements of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act are as follows:

It authorizes continued efforts to address the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan and among Afghan refugees in neighboring countries;

It also authorizes resources to help the Afghan government fight the production and flow of illicit narcotics;

It assists efforts to achieve a broad-based, multi-ethnic, gender-sensitive, and fully representative government in Afghanistan;

It supports strengthening the capabilities of the Afghan Government to develop projects and programs that meet the needs of the Afghan people;

It supports the reconstruction of Afghanistan through creating jobs, clearing landmines, and rebuilding the agriculture sector, the health care system, and the educational system of Afghanistan; and

It provides resources to the Ministry for Women's Affairs of Afghanistan to carry out its responsibilities for legal advocacy, education, vocational training, and women's health programs.

This legislation also strongly urges the President to designate within the State Department an ambassadorial-level coordinator to oversee and implement these programs and to advance United States interests in Afghanistan, including coordination with other countries and international organizations with respect to assistance to Afghanistan.

In general, the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act provides a constructive, strategic framework for our Afghan policy, and flexible authority for the President to implement it.

Let me add that this legislation is explicitly and strongly committed to increasing the participation of women in Afghan politics. One of the "principles of assistance" of this bill states that "Assistance should increase the participation of women at the national, regional, and local levels in Afghanistan, wherever feasible, by enhancing the role of women in decision-making processes, as well as by providing support for programs that aim to expand economic and educational opportunities and health programs for women and educational and health programs for girls."

We must not allow the Afghan government of President Karzai to unwind. The United States must make the necessary investment of resources to help stabilize and secure Afghanistan in order to support a democratic transition there. This bill addresses an urgent need. It is critical to America's security interest in Afghanistan and Central Asia. If Afghanistan goes backward, this will be a defeat for our war on terrorism, for the people desiring freedom in Afghanistan and in Central Asia, and for America symbolically in the world. This defeat would undermine the confidence in America's word around the world. Afghanistan is the first battle in our war on terrorism. We must not fail.

TRIBUTE TO MARY JANE SMALL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the work of the Senate would be impossible were it not for the talents and tireless efforts of our staffs. These are the men and women who serve behind the scenes, with few expectations of reward save for the opportunity to make a difference.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge a member of my staff who has worked for me on behalf of the people of West Virginia for 25 years. Mary Jane Small joined my staff on August 1, 1977. I was Majority Leader at the time.

She came to my office with 6 years of Capitol Hill experience, having worked for Congressman Ed Jones of Tennessee and then-Congresswoman BARBARA MIKULSKI from Mary Jane's own home town of Baltimore, MD.

Over the years, Mary Jane Small has worked in my legislative department, providing a much-valued link between my Washington office and the people of West Virginia. There have been a lot of changes in how Senators correspond with constituents since the time Mary Jane started working for me.

Back in 1977, no one had heard of e-mail. We did not have fax machines. Mary Jane joined my staff before we had computers. She was with me in the days when we produced letters the old-fashioned way—on typewriters—which must seem archaic to the younger generation of Capitol Hill staff.

But despite the lack of telecommunications and high-tech gadgetry, our staffs produced quantity and quality. I am proud to count Mary Jane as one of those staff members who has been with me through so much change. And though times are different, she still shines with the enthusiasm and drive that she had when she first joined my staff.

The work of Senators will be recorded in history. Our names, our speeches, our legislative accomplishments will have been printed in newspaper articles and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But most of the men and women who have toiled on our staffs will never get any public notice of their devoted service to their fellow citizens. Twenty-five years of Senate service is certainly deserving of recognition.

I thank Mary Jane for her dedication to the people of the State of West Virginia and for the work she has done for our country. And I look forward to the next 25 years with her.

IN MEMORIAM: HILDA MARCIN

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to share with the Senate the memory of one of my constituents, Hilda Marcin, who lost her life on September 11, 2001. Mrs. Marcin was 79 years old when the flight she was on, United Airlines Flight 93, was hijacked by terrorists. As we all know, that plane crashed in a Pennsylvania field, killing everyone on board.

Mrs. Marcin was born in Schwedelbach, Germany. When she was 7 years old, her family emigrated to the United States to escape oppression. Like many immigrants, her family left all possessions behind and came only with the clothes on their backs.

Her family settled in Irvington, New Jersey, where she attended local schools. She worked seven days a week in the payroll department of the New Jersey shipyards during World War II.

A friend arranged a blind date with Edward Marcin and they were married on February 13, 1943. They had two daughters, Elizabeth and Carole. The

Marcin family enjoyed participating in school functions, class trips, the PTA, and various church activities. Mr. and Mrs. Marcin were also socially and politically active in Irvington. Mrs. Marcin later worked as a special education teacher's aide.

Hilda Marcin embraced life with enthusiasm and made the most of every minute. She adored her family and her granddaughter, Melissa Kemmerer Lata. She was an inspiration to those she touched, including the special needs children in the school where she worked. Her friends admired her positive attitude and her desire and ability to continue working during the later years of her life. Mrs. Marcin treasured freedom and democracy, and her American citizenship.

At the time of her death, Mrs. Marcin was flying to San Francisco to live with her younger daughter, Carole O'Hare. She is survived by her daughter, Elizabeth Kemmerer and son-in-law Raymond Kemmerer; daughter Carole O'Hare and son-in-law Thomas O'Hare; and granddaughter Melissa Lata and Melissa's husband, Edward Lata.

Mr. President, none of us is untouched by the terror of September 11, and many Californians were part of each tragic moment of that tragic day. Some were trapped in the World Trade Center towers. Some were at work in the Pentagon. And the fates of some were sealed as they boarded planes bound for San Francisco or Los Angeles.

I offer today this tribute to one of the 51 Californians who perished on that awful morning. I want to assure the family of Hilda Marcin, and the families of all the victims, that their fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, aunts, uncles, brothers and sisters will not be forgotten.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to help bring attention back to the issue of fiscal discipline and protecting Social Security and Medicare for the generation to come.

All parents want the best for their children. Parents will scrimp and save so that they can take care of their kids, buy them new clothes, and help them go to school. We do it because we love our children, and because it's the right thing to do.

On a societal level, we are doing exactly the opposite. Rather than saving for the future needs of the next generation, rather than paying down debt to prepare for their future needs, rather than investing in assets now so that we will be better able to provide for the next generation, the Government instead has decided to spend its resources and more on current consumption. And that's the wrong thing to do.

When we can see our children's faces and hear their dreams, we try to do whatever we can for them. But when we act as a society, when we make gov-

ernment policy, we seem unable to control our appetites for current consumption, we seem unable to do anything for the millions of our children's generation. And that is simply, on a moral level, the wrong thing to do.

For when we in this generation choose to spend on current consumption and to accumulate debt for our children's generation to pay, we do nothing less than rob our children of their own choices. We make our choices to spend on our wants, but we saddle them with debts that they must pay from their tax dollars and the sweat of their brow.

On top of that, the demographic wave of the baby boom generation adds another burden on our children's generation. We know now—there is no doubt about it—that our generation will retire in large numbers beginning in the next decade. By the nature of older age, we know that our generation will require increased spending on income support and health in the decade to come and thereafter. And by the nature of the Social Security system, and by the nature of Medicare and Medicaid, we know that the Government will have greatly increased obligations to fund. Even if we as a society choose to provide the baby boom generation with exactly the same benefits that society provided our father's and mother's generation, even if we do not provide for Medicare coverage of prescription drugs—and I believe that we should provide those benefits—we as a society will need to devote greater resources to these important programs.

We could at least in part prepare for those needs by paying down our Government debt now, so that the Government would have greater freedom to borrow in the decades to come. Some suggest that we could at least in part prepare for those needs by accumulating financial assets now, which the Government could sell in the future as an alternative to raising taxes in the future. These actions would be the functional equivalent of saving by the Government.

In the last year and a half, we have done exactly the opposite. We have chosen to do the functional equivalent of binge consumption. The Government has gone on a spending spree.

In February of last year, the Bush administration's Office of Management and Budget started with a baseline projection that the Government would run a surplus of \$282 billion in this year, fiscal year 2002. Earlier this month, in contrast, the OMB projected that we will in reality run a deficit of \$165 billion this year, a difference of \$447 billion between their initial baseline projections and their latest predictions for one year alone. In less than a year and a half, the deficit picture for this year alone has clouded by nearly half a trillion dollars.

The Bush administration's own numbers tell a similar story for the decade as a whole. Last February, the OMB projected baseline surpluses of \$5.6 trillion for the 10 years to come. Looking