

Terry McAuliffe's comments were wrong and they were offensive to me, my family, to the thousands of South Carolina National Guard members fighting in the war on terrorism today. Apparently Chairman McAuliffe is unaware of the distinguished history of the National Guard, which is America's oldest military service.

The South Carolina National Guard dates back over 300 years to 1670 when colonists united to defend their homeland against Spanish invasion. In fact, the valor of those early guardsmen has been enshrined in the South Carolina State flag when they defended the Carolina coast with a fort built of palmetto trees during the Revolutionary War.

Perhaps Mr. McAuliffe is simply unaware that guardsmen fought on the front lines of World War I, World War II, the Cold War, the war in Vietnam, the Korean War, the Gulf War, and now the war on terrorism. And on the morning of September 11, when we were not sure how many planes had been hijacked or how many sites had been targeted, the President ordered the Air National Guard to fly combat patrols over Washington, D.C. and New York.

Thank you to the Guard's 119th Fighter Wing whose F-16s defended the skies over Washington that morning and to the Air National Guard 102nd Fighter Wing whose F-15s rose to the defense of New York City. At a time of great peril and uncertainty they were America's first line of defense and we will never forget it.

Right now there are more than 193,000 National Guard members and reservists currently serving our country in the war on terror. They are steadfast servants to our country, who have given up their own civilian occupations and left their homes and families to ensure liberty for others. Some of these men and women are on the front lines who serve as the wedge between terrorism and freedom. They are serving our country.

I find Chairman McAuliffe's characterization insulting and demeaning. Terry McAuliffe disgraces himself and insults the National Guard by saying it is not military service. His baseless insinuation diminishes the National Guard as an institution, and he owes an apology to the guardsmen and -women in uniform serving our country and protecting their fellow Americans.

Chairman McAuliffe has a right to speak freely. But it is shameful that in one statement he dishonors some of America's bravest service members.

Chairman McAuliffe's comments represent the worst of election year politics. President Bush has been talking about the issues that matter to Americans: strong national defense, tax relief to promote job creation, and quality education for our children. Yet the Democratic leader has chosen to engage in personal partisan attacks and reckless comments that insult our men and women in uniform and the families supporting them.

It is a sad day for the Democratic Party whose leader publicly denounces, degrades, and dishonors a fighting force that at that moment is fighting for freedom and democracy and have devoted their lives to fighting terrorists around the world.

It is a time for truth. It is a time to raise the level of public debate in this country. It is a time for accountability. It is a time for honesty. It is past time for an apology, and it is time for the Democratic Party to find new leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, I would like to offer, again, God bless our troops. We will never forget September 11.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE RAVAGES OF TERRORISM

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is once again the sad duty of a Member of the House, myself in this case, to talk about the ravages of terrorism and the damage it does. I was struck last week, as we all were, by the terrible depth of the tragedy in Spain when hundreds were killed by brutal thugs. But I must say I was also struck at the relative lack of attention to the deaths of 10 people in Israel who were also killed by terrorists.

Taking into account the very small size of Israel's population, the loss of 10 in that country is equivalent to hundreds in many other places, thousands in some others. The sad fact is that Israel has so frequently been the victim of brutal murderist terrorism, aimed wholly at people who are by no stretch of the imagination combatants, that the world has become a little numb to it. And that is a very sad fact.

Obviously victims of terrorism are, in the first instance, those who are killed, those who are maimed, those who love and care for them. And that is where our focus should be. But there is a second victim of terrorism and it makes this a self-perpetuating problem, and that is any serious effort to negotiate peace.

I have been one of those in this House who strongly supported the efforts of

former President Clinton and former Israel President Barak to reach peace. It was a terrible, terrible moment in Israel's history when Yitzhak Rabin, a great fighter for peace in the most literal sense of the word, was murdered, in this case by right-wing terrorists within Israel.

And I continue to believe that Israel should be seeking peace based on the two-state solution because, among other reasons, it is very much in Israel's interest. But those of us who hold that position must acknowledge that the continued pattern of terrorism, which the Palestinian authorities do little or nothing to oppose, makes the accomplishment of that goal extremely difficult.

I have been critical of some aspects of what the Israeli Government does. People say you cannot criticize another government. That, of course, is not true. People in this body spend most of our time criticizing other governments. It is perfectly legitimate to express points of view. Indeed, the more closely one feels allied to a nation, it seems to me the more your obligation is to speak out, if there are some differences, in a constructive and helpful way.

But those who are urging Israel to do more have to take due account of the steady, relentless pattern of terrorism of which it is the victim. Look what happened in Spain. Two hundred people were brutally murdered and a government fell, because they think it was an inappropriate reaction in terms of trying to blame people. But would anyone now be pressing the Spanish Government to enter into negotiations with al Qaeda which appears to be the author of this?

When the U.S. was the victim of thousands of murders and, given the population, Israel has seen a comparable number, if not more, murdered by terrorists, none of us here felt that the answer was to go further with negotiations.

I am not opposed to peace negotiations. I think it is very much in Israel's interest. I think the ability to get out of the settlements so that Israel can be a Jewish democratic state, setting an example for the world of how to achieve democratic values in the Middle East, that is very important. So I don't think the peace process ought to be abandoned. But I do believe it is important to take due note of what we are asking a democratic Nation to do: negotiate peace under difficult circumstances with an entity from which murderist terrorists come, and an entity which does too little to deal with it.

There have been some in the Palestinian Authority who want to show that they will make peace. But the role of Yassar Arafat has been so negative, so absent when it comes to any serious effort to preventing the terrorism, that it poisons the atmosphere.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we mourn the victims of terrorism in Spain, we

mourn the victims of terrorism everywhere. We should note that the victims of terrorism in the Middle East are not simply those who were murdered, as terrible as that is, but it is an effort to achieve peace.

I continue to believe that Israel should make every reasonable effort to achieve peace. I don't think we can fairly say to the Israeli Government peace must be achieved, because that is not entirely in their control. I remain, unfortunately, skeptical that they have a true partner for peace on the Palestinian side, although I think they should continue to see if they do.

But no one who understands democracy, no one who has seen the way we have reacted, the way Spain has reacted, the way other democracies have reacted, should feel that you can put pressure on Israel without taking into account the context of repeated murder in which they are asked to operate.

OFFSHORING AND ITS IMPACT ON U.S. JOBS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes to talk about the issue of offshoring, which is hotly debated and oft discussed as we focus on the question of jobs. It really comes down to two choices that we have here in the United States: We can try to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world or we can continue, as has been the case throughout recent history, to innovate and create better and better jobs for Americans right here in the United States.

After decades of American global economic leadership successfully competing in the worldwide marketplace and producing cutting-edge technologies and business practices, the economic isolationism option is clearly no option at all because of the success that we have enjoyed.

That leaves us with only one choice, Mr. Speaker, and that is to allow Americans to continue to innovate, grow, and create better jobs right here. In fact, innovation has always been the key to our global economic leadership. Our culture of creativity, independence and free thinking has created what the CEO of an Indian high-tech company recently called a, quote, "unique crucible for innovation."

He shared this anecdote in the New York Times recently talking about the very powerful force of innovation here in the United States. He said, "I was in Europe the other day and they were commiserating about the 400,000 European knowledge workers who have gone to live in the United States because of the innovative environment there. The whole process where people get an idea and put together a team, raise the capital, create a product and mainstream it, that can only be done in the United States of America," this Indian high-tech executive said.

Mr. Speaker, our longstanding position as the leading global innovator continues to be very strong. For example, the United States is by far the world's leader in producing new patents. In recent years, an average of 185,000 new patents have been granted here in the United States compared to 120,000 in Japan and only 45,000 in the entire European Union of all those countries combined.

Mr. Speaker, we also lead the world in research and development by a huge margin. The U.S. spends over a quarter of a trillion dollars on research and development every single year, while Britain spends about a tenth of that amount, Germany spends less than a fifth of the U.S. total, and France spent about an eighth.

Our growing investments in research and development have led to steady growth in the number of intervention disclosures and patent applications by academic and nonprofit research organizations as well. In 2002 these grew by 15 percent and they continue to increase.

These same institutions also are increasingly licensing their work in partnering with U.S. companies, primarily small- and medium-sized businesses, to apply their discoveries and innovations to our marketplace and to the global marketplace. This increased research and licensing lead has led to major breakthroughs in fields such as health care, including issues that are near and dear to virtually everyone here, cancer and Alzheimer's treatment, along with electronics with applications like improved cellular voice quality and computer monitors that create less stress on users' eyes, and even a new type of electric generator that can produce electricity with environmental-friendly hydrogen fuel at a fraction of the cost of current power plants.

Mr. Speaker, venture capital, by providing the resources necessary to turn ideas into new goods and services, is also a key component of our ability to innovate. Once again, the U.S. is the global leader. Business and individual investors provided over \$21 billion in venture capital in 2002 compared to just \$8 billion in European Union. That constitutes a 600 percent increase in U.S. venture capital over the past decade. This environment, Mr. Speaker, is the cornerstone of American prosperity.

□ 1500

It gives individuals the freedom to develop new ideas and concepts and encourages creativity and risk-taking. It has unparalleled financial markets and a venture capital system that are constantly helping Americans turn their dreams into reality. It has given American companies and individuals the power to invest, grow and create new jobs in cutting-edge fields, and it is our best answer to those who see offshoring as a reason to retreat behind the walls of economic isolationism.

We should not be trying to isolate ourselves from the worldwide market which would actually stifle our innovative environment and cede our position as the global leader. Instead, we should continue to allow our spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship to empower Americans as we lead the world and create better and better jobs right here in the United States.

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may use my 5-minute time at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HUNGER AND POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months I have spoken on this floor on a weekly basis about the scourge of hunger around the world, especially among children. I have talked about the importance of adequately funding the McGovern-Dole Food For Education and Child Nutrition Program, which would provide children around the world with a nutritious school meal.

If we are going to make this world a safer and better place, I strongly believe that we must eradicate hunger. This is something we can do. There are some problems that we cannot solve, but hunger is not one of them.

It is important, however, in any discussion about hunger that we not ignore the problem of hunger that persists right here at home. In the face of world starvation, Americans tend to forget that millions of people in this country continue to go without food every day. Thankfully, we do not have the rampant starvation that affects places like the Horn of Africa, but that does not mean people are not going without food every day right here in the United States.

When we talk about hunger in America, we are really talking about food insecurity. According to the Food Research and Action Center, food insecurity refers to the lack of access to enough food to fully meet basic needs at all times due to lack of financial resources.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, about 35 million people experienced food insecurity