

what was going on in my district. I did not know where it came from, but when I got back to Washington and read what was going on nationwide, it is everywhere.

How does this contribute to our national security? How does it do anything except keep everybody off balance and crazy?

This ratcheting up the level of alarm is always followed by a pause though there is no change in the evidence or lack of evidence of a terrorists' ill-intentions and the relaxation of the tension is always followed by another call to fear.

There really are people out in the world who want to hurt us. Let us direct our attention to them. Let us work on the problem, instead of working on the nerves of the American people.

I do not want to anticipate that the Department of Homeland Security is going to fail. I want the Department to do everything possible to make us and our elections safe.

So I have some advice for the Department of Homeland Security, Madam Speaker. Stick to your knitting; try to keep the homeland secure; analyze the chatter; do not chatter yourself; do not add to the noise; do your job; do not stir up fear.

We are a vast and strong Nation. For the people in our government to be saying that if there is a terrorist event we will get rid of the election, excuse me? They do not do that in India. They do not do that in Germany. They do not do that in any country. You are acting like one event somewhere in this country is going to give the President the right to call off the election. Absolutely nonsense.

We got through the British burning the White House and the Capitol, this very building was burned to the ground in the War of 1812, without suspending an election. We got through the Civil War without suspending an election. You can go downstairs and see pictures of troops bivouacked on the campus of the Capitol, but we had an election in 1864. Some people thought it should be delayed, but it went right ahead. In a democracy you do not have to be afraid, and we will get through the election of 2004.

The Presidents who made these decisions to go ahead with the election, despite threats, were fighting ground wars right here in D.C. and in its suburbs, not 8,000 miles away. They had it right on their doorstep, but President Madison, who wrote most of the Constitution, and President Lincoln, who saved the Union, believed in this country and in its people. They believed that people would persevere and prevail, and that is what I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Members of this body and our administration to repudiate this fear mongering, the rumor generating, the chatter about delaying our elections. What kind of nonsense is that for the leadership in this country to be even talking about? It insults our

intelligence. It distracts us. It harms our country. It is ill-befitting of this American democracy that we are all so proud of.

NORTH CAROLINA'S FAVORITE SON, JOHN EDWARDS, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL TICKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, this evening I rise with several of my colleagues and a number from my North Carolina delegation to talk about our favorite son, JOHN EDWARDS, as well as our ticket.

JOHN EDWARDS is from a little place in Moore County called Robbins, North Carolina. He currently resides in our State capital of Raleigh.

I normally do not respond to things some people say on the floor, and I find it a bit of interest earlier that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle knew so much about him, they wanted to quote from the Wall Street Journal. There are a few people in North Carolina who read the Wall Street Journal, but if he really wants to know about JOHN EDWARDS, I would suggest he read the Raleigh News and Observer, probably the Charlotte Observer or a lot of our weekly papers, and he would find a lot out about JOHN EDWARDS.

If he had been in Raleigh on Saturday, he would have had the opportunity to see about 20,000 people standing in the hot July sun, over 90 degrees for 4 hours, to welcome home JOHN EDWARDS and Presidential nominee JOHN KERRY and their wives Elizabeth and Teresa to Raleigh, North Carolina. It was a wonderful celebration of the first North Carolinian on the Presidential ticket in modern times.

I will have more to say about this in just a moment, but first I want to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), for some comments.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be here tonight. I did not think I would be pleased to be here. In my office earlier, I was regretting greatly having agreed last week to come down tonight as I saw the time slip away and as I was, instead of dinner, eating the complimentary North Carolina peanuts that we pass out to our visitors, wondering when, if ever, tonight I would get dinner.

Then I heard the speeches of a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and by others on the same topic but from a different perspective, and I felt a new energy and a new enthusiasm for our task tonight, and I would like to address some of the questions that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the others asked about JOHN EDWARDS.

First, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) asked why it was that JOHN EDWARDS did not have to answer any of the insulting questions that were asked of Dan Quayle when the first President Bush asked him to run as Vice President in 1988, and I think that there is a simple answer to that.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said that Dan Quayle had been in Congress for 12 years, JOHN EDWARDS in the Congress for only six, but JOHN EDWARDS had not been asked why he was qualified to be President when that question was put very pointedly to Mr. Quayle. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said he believed it must be because of the liberal media. I think there is a different explanation.

JOHN EDWARDS is smart. JOHN EDWARDS is smart. Everyone knows he is smart. Everyone who has spent any time around him knows that. He is plenty smart enough to be Vice President. He is plenty smart enough to be President.

Second, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and all the others said that this is a ticket of two crazy liberals, wild-eyed crazy liberals, out of step with North Carolina or even, they suggested, with Massachusetts, and I just wish they would get their story straight.

JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS are the Huck Finns of American politics because they got to attend their own political funeral. In December of last year and early January, they appeared to be politically dead. Their campaigns were not going anywhere. The former governor of Vermont, Howard Dean, appeared to be walking away with the Democratic nomination. A respected political reporter here, Stuart Rothenberg, wrote a column that said, "It ain't over till it's over, but it's over." Howard Dean was assumed to be the nominee.

So all the right-wing commentators began talking about how the Democrats were going to nominate a crazy liberal in Howard Dean; and, to establish that contrast, they said the Democrats were rejecting sensible, thoughtful, moderate candidates like JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. Things did not go according to their script, and now the ticket is JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS, and those same thoughtful, sensible, moderate folks that just a few months ago they were praising, they now are tarring with the same brush that they tarred Howard Dean.

Also, they need to get their story straight because just last week, in the hours immediately after JOHN KERRY had announced that he had asked JOHN EDWARDS to run on the ticket with him, the first response from the Bush-Cheney campaign was a 26-page e-mail that outlined all of these differences, all these differences between KERRY and EDWARDS, they just had nothing in common, and it just showed how flagrantly political JOHN KERRY was to have asked someone with whom he

agreed so little to run as Vice President with him.

□ 2200

Very quickly they abandoned that. Now they say they are just alike. There is absolutely no balance to this ticket; they are exactly alike. The same voting record. They are two peas in a left-wing pod. Again, their story would have a little more credibility if they would stick with it for just a little while.

In fact, both JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY are moderate in the best sense, not in some voting record and how they have reacted in the last 2 years to take-it-or-leave-it propositions, bills that have not been put to them to vote "yes" or "no," bills that have not been compromised an iota. That is not the test of their moderation. It is their willingness to compromise, to try to find common ground, to try to find sensible solutions, to listen to everyone involved in the political debate, to listen respectfully, to respect their views and concerns, and to listen carefully because they might actually learn something. Would that not be refreshing to have in a President and Vice President?

I was also startled to hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY were out of touch and criticized them so sternly for being wealthy, for being rich. This is a party that treats the richest folks like rock stars. They are almost embarrassing in their fawning over rich folks. And the richer the folks are, the more fawning they are, the more unctuous they are around them. But that is not the point. The point is not the success JOHN EDWARDS has had.

Yes, JOHN EDWARDS has been very, very successful. We used to call that the American Dream. The point is where he started out and what he learned from that. JOHN EDWARDS, and I know they are tired of hearing the story of his being the son of a mill worker, but it is true and it is important. He understands what most folks' lives are like because that is the kind of life he lived. His father worked in the mill, his mother worked in the post office, as my father worked in the post office.

JOHN EDWARDS' life was like most Americans' lives. He had to depend on the public schools to get ahead, to have opportunities for him. Wallace and Bobbi Edwards, JOHN EDWARDS' parents, could not have sent JOHN EDWARDS to some expensive New England boarding school. He had to go to the public schools. And JOHN EDWARDS understands to the depth of his soul the importance of public education for middle-class Americans, the importance of public education in creating opportunities for ordinary Americans.

JOHN EDWARDS never got into any school on anything but his own merit. He never got into any college, he did not get into law school because of who

his daddy was. He got in because he earned his way. He has earned his way his entire life. He has never had anything given to him, and he will understand the lives of ordinary Americans because of that.

They have talked about his role as a trial lawyer and the money that he made and how that now puts him out of touch. I can tell you what a trial lawyer does. The suggestion that he handled frivolous cases and made a fortune off that is ridiculous. He took the cases that had merit. He took the cases where people had been harmed because someone had not done what they should have done.

JOHN EDWARDS had to explain to juries how people who had suffered a terrible injury, how their lives had changed. He had to explain what their life was like before the injury, what their hopes were, what their aspirations, what they wanted their future to be like; and then he had to explain to the jury how that had changed and what their life was like after the terrible injury that they had suffered. And he had to explain the lives of many different people from many different walks of life.

I can tell you this, before you explain something to a jury, you have to understand it yourself. He was past master at understanding intellectually and at the pit of his stomach what peoples' lives were like, the lives they led and how their lives changed. And that would be a wonderful asset to have as a President or as a Vice President.

Finally, I want to address the lack of experience, the issue that they raise. That was, of course, part of the Dan Quayle debate as well. I was very startled to hear the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) describe that JOHN EDWARDS had had less than 10 years of, his phrase was, public service, which I take to mean years in a political office. It was just 10 years ago that the members of the majority party campaigned for term limits. They characterized public service as career politicians. Now, 10 years later, they say that 6 years in political office is entirely too little experience, too little time in public life.

I think that the debate tonight of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) reminds us all how out of touch the majority party has become in 10 years and how if we want to have leadership in touch with the lives of ordinary Americans we need to change our leadership.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for joining us.

When we talk about this ticket, and certainly JOHN and his wife, Elizabeth, my North Carolina neighbors and all of our colleagues in North Carolina, their neighbors, and people from all walks of life are just thrilled to see this ticket, to see JOHN EDWARDS and Elizabeth really rise to national prominence, because they truly are one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn and yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), for his comments on this ticket.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking out this Special Order and giving us a chance to talk about a man whom we know very well and whom we know is prepared to serve this country very well.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), for listening so carefully to the preceding hour and the kinds of statements that were made on this floor. There is one that I thought was particularly striking, and I just want to check my recollection of this, if I might.

The gentleman from Georgia seemed to come over here and really challenge JOHN KERRY's faithfulness as a Catholic. That is what I heard him saying. That is extraordinary. That is extraordinary.

He also, in the process, restated the establishment clause of the Constitution. He said the first amendment prohibits the establishment of a State religion. No, the first amendment prohibits the establishment by the State of religion. And I would not pretend for a moment that it is always a simple thing to balance that establishment clause and the free exercise clause and understand how it can be applied in specific cases, but I would think one thing it means is that one in our country and under our form of government is not to take a theological interpretation, let us say of when life begins and to make that the law of the land.

There are many ways that our faith informs our politics, and that is true of JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. It is true of the present President and Vice President, and we honor that. The wellsprings of political motivation and political values run very deep, and for most of us that involves our religious beliefs and our religious backgrounds. That is very different from saying, though, that we enact specific religious precepts as the law of the land; that we convert those into civil law when there is not widespread consensus on those precepts, as there came to be in the case, for example, of civil rights, and many other religiously grounded values. But where there is not that kind of broad consensus, over the years we have concluded it is best to leave conscience free. It is best to leave the individual and the collective expression of conscience free.

The gentleman from Georgia seemed to think that Mr. KERRY was being less than faithful because he was refusing to make that transition from a religious precept to the law of the land. And I wonder, where does that stop? Where does that stop? Where do you draw the line? Are there any limits to transforming religious precepts into civil law? Is there anyplace you draw the line, anything you would be willing to define as the establishment of religion?

No, there is great wisdom in that founding document, our Constitution. The State is not to establish religion. The State is not to interfere with the free exercise of religion. And I would suggest we would all do well to honor those precepts and to be very, very cautious in coming on this floor or going anywhere else and labeling a person unfaithful to his religious tradition because he happens to disagree with the interpretation of where these constitutional precepts apply.

I did not mean to start this way, Mr. Speaker, but the preceding hour was so extraordinary in some of the charges made and in some of the claims made that I felt I would add my contribution to what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) very ably lined out.

The gentleman from the second district will remember very well when JOHN EDWARDS first came to the U.S. Senate, and in that first year we had a serious test of our ability to deliver for North Carolina and to collaborate in the interest of our State a challenge that came in the form of a hurricane and a flood named Floyd. And that was a test for all of us, but it was particularly a test for our new Senator; and that is where I got to know JOHN EDWARDS best and came to appreciate the kind of energy and dedication to duty that he exemplifies and his effectiveness. We did get a great deal of support for our State, relief for our State; and JOHN EDWARDS was a very valuable leading member of the team.

We also know him for his leadership on many domestic issues. He is probably best known as the leader in the Senate, along with Senator JOHN MCCAIN from the other side of the aisle, of the fight for a Patients' Bill of Rights. Very, very effective legislative effort. So JOHN EDWARDS is well-known as a legislator who has looked out for North Carolina and who has looked out for the people of this country.

But in the few minutes I have tonight, I want to turn to another aspect of JOHN'S leadership and one that, again, our friends on the other side of the aisle seemed determined to denigrate, and that is his experience and his leadership in national security and in foreign affairs. Some have questioned that. But it is actually an important question to ask. Does a candidate for President or Vice president have credible experience and knowledge in foreign affairs, in security matters; and does he bring that to the table as he asks the American people to support him?

Let me just mention a number of aspects of JOHN EDWARDS' experience in terrorism and national security. On many occasions Senator EDWARDS has transformed key anti-terrorist proposals into law. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator EDWARDS has been an active leader on important issues related to national security, with particular focus on homeland security, intelligence re-

form, military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and U.S.-European relations.

For example, the Biological and Chemical Weapons Preparedness Act. This bill, introduced by Senator EDWARDS, along with Senator HAGEL, Republican of Nebraska, establishes a coordinated national plan for responding to biological and chemical weapons attacks and directs States to develop plans for dealing with such attacks. This was not just a proposal. Major provisions of this bill have been passed by the Senate in the Bioterrorism Preparedness Act.

The Airport and Seaport Terrorism Prevention Act. This legislation specified the use of new identification technologies to screen airport employees. Parts of that proposal were passed by the Senate and signed into law.

The Cyber Terrorism Preparedness Act. The Cyber Security Research and Education Act. These bills strengthen our Nation's preparedness and ability to ward off a cyberattack by terrorists. Parts of that bill were passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President.

The Name Matching For Enforcement and Security Act. Senator EDWARDS introduced legislation to improve the weak capacity of anti-terrorist watch lists and databases to match up variants of foreign names. This legislation was incorporated into the Border Security Act of 2002.

JOHN EDWARDS has been part of a working group of Senators focused on terrorism before 9/11. Before 9/11. In the summer of 2001, JOHN EDWARDS joined a working group of Senators from the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services who focused on the growing terrorist threat and considered possible responses. Many of these issues, many of these ideas, such as the mandatory sharing of intelligence between CIA and FBI and other agencies, and the training of Federal, State and local law enforcement officers to recognize and communicate critical intelligence information, these ideas were later implemented in legislation passed after September 11.

JOHN EDWARDS has met extensively with leaders around the globe, traveling in the Middle East, Asia and the gulf states, and Europe. He has wide exposure and wide experience internationally. As several of my colleagues have said, far, far more experience and exposure than our present President had when he was nominated. Present President had very, very limited international exposure, and actually seemed proud of that fact.

JOHN EDWARDS has been a member of the joint committee investigating the September 11 attacks. He has focused in on intelligence failures. He served as a member of the joint House-Senate panel investigating those attacks during the inquiry. He developed particular expertise on the shortcomings

of the FBI's intelligence-gathering efforts. He developed relationships with a broad range of experts specializing in intelligence and national security policy, law enforcement, and civil liberties, as well as receiving detailed briefings from the FBI and the director of the British Security Service.

Fourthly, JOHN EDWARDS has played a leading role in post-conflict planning legislation. He played a leading role in improving America's ability to ensure that post-conflict states, like Afghanistan and Iraq, can address security challenges and humanitarian needs and political development.

□ 2215

In 2003 Senator EDWARDS introduced the bipartisan Winning the Peace Act that outlined major reforms to enhance the government's capability to conduct post-conflict reconstruction. And then, finally, JOHN EDWARDS has worked tirelessly to improve our military. As the Senator from North Carolina, he represents Fort Bragg, the world's largest army complex, as well as the headquarters of the Marine Corps Antiterrorism Task Force. He has been active in the effort to improve the quality of life for all who serve in the military and to reach out to military families.

Madam Speaker, others want to speak. I am going to stop with that. I hope, though, that it is evident; and one reason I have mentioned all these various enactments and all these various initiatives is to underscore the point that these are not just empty claims. These are documented claims. This is a record for all to see. This is a Senator who, in his term in the Senate, has been deeply involved in national security and foreign policy issues. He has developed expertise. He has developed a network of people that he works with. He has put forward creative proposals, many of which have been enacted into law. It is an area where he has invested a great deal and where he is prepared to serve.

And I thank the gentleman for giving us all a chance to testify to our knowledge of JOHN EDWARDS's good work and our support for his present effort.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He certainly has represented the fourth district and part of the district that I had the privilege of having for a while and part of the district that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) has. He certainly knows what it takes to be a good legislator, and I appreciate his comments on that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for his comments as well. I thank him for joining us this evening.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) as we talk about the Vice Presidential candidate, JOHN EDWARDS, our friend.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man of distinction, of dedication, and of determination. He has been distinct in all that he

has undertaken. Distinguished personally, professionally, and politically. In everything that he has tackled, he has gone at it with integrity and with the utmost sincerity and authenticity to show that his heart, his mind, and his whole being is engaged. When he puts himself into it, he does it all the way in the best and in the most distinguished way possible.

He is dedicated. He is dedicated not only to the job at hand but dedicated to the people he serves. In fact, that is the hallmark of JOHN's life. He has always cared about people, shown that interest, and gone the extra mile to care for people whether they were in his hometown where he grew up in Robbins, North Carolina, whether it was the people he served and worked with when he was practicing law, or whether it is the people now who have served in North Carolina and that he, indeed, serves and will serve in our entire Nation.

And he is determined. He is determined to provide opportunities for all so that no one is left behind but that all have an equal chance to succeed in life, and this has been evidence in his life. His extraordinary vision will help lift America to a better and brighter tomorrow. Whether we are talking about the farmers to the factory workers, from health care to homeownership, from childhood to college, from the armed services to agriculture, from the environment to energy, from fighting crime to fighting terrorism, in every one of these areas, Senator EDWARDS has distinguished himself, shown his dedication, and lived out his determination.

In particular, when we talk about farmers, being a member, as I know the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is, as we serve together on the House Committee on Agriculture, we know that Senator EDWARDS's commitment to helping our farmers, too often the forgotten ones in today's society, but yet we know if we go over to the Library of Congress and walk into that great hall and look at all the disciplines of learning and science and engineering and literature, what is listed first? And they are not in alphabetical order, necessarily. What is listed first is agriculture. The great tillers of the soil and tillers of civilization, as Noah Webster once said.

And JOHN EDWARDS understands the needs of rural America. Having grown up in a small town, he understands small-town needs, small business, and the understanding of what it means to be able to try to make a living when economic circumstances are not the best. He spent time in rural America and in rural communities. He spent time on the farms and in the factories and in the rural health clinics and in the rural hospitals that I have spent time with myself and in the rural public school system such as the one we have in Robinson County, my home county, where we have spent time there together looking at students'

needs and spending time with students and administrators and parents.

JOHN EDWARDS also understands, as was mentioned a moment ago by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and I know, both representing Fort Bragg, that he understands our military. In fact, one of the first bills he introduced was to help with the pay raise for our military and to also offer better health care for our military. JOHN EDWARDS understands these practical needs, and he exhibits and lives the values of faith and family and freedom.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man of faith. In fact, not only has he been involved in the Senate Prayer Breakfast, which is nondenominational and bipartisan, but, in fact, he was co-chairman of the National Prayer Breakfast just a few years ago here in Washington. And we know the great importance that that has played historically in this Nation that every President since President Eisenhower, of both parties, has participated in. JOHN is a man of faith, and that is reflected in his passion for people and in the high integrity and ideals that he upholds and the way he conducts himself. He lives his faith and does not just talk about it.

JOHN EDWARDS is a man that does not have a shrill tone or speak with bombastic language or unacceptable language, but instead his message is plain. His message is positive. His message is powerful. His message is persuasive. And that is what has won the hearts and minds of so many people who have known him through the years. He will make sure that rural America, as well as urban and suburban America, will not be forgotten.

It says in the Old Testament that "Where there is no vision, the people perish." It has been evident in JOHN EDWARDS's life that he has always had vision. He has seen far beyond even what other people said he could not do, and he has helped take not only many people that he has served, our State but now our Nation, to the future. JOHN EDWARDS is that kind of leader, that kind of man that will help shape a vision for America.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for his comments. Certainly having come from rural eastern North Carolina, he understands what he is talking about and understands our friend JOHN EDWARDS.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), which really happens to be the State where our Vice Presidential nominee was born. We are just grateful his parents decided to come to North Carolina so he could be reared there and get an education and make his living there. But we are happy to have the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) with us this evening to share a few comments about our friend JOHN EDWARDS on our ticket with JOHN KERRY.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to come to the well tonight and to speak on behalf of one of our Nation's most promising leaders. I know that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) has spoken about his relationship with Senator EDWARDS. We have heard from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE); and they have talked about the experiences they have had with him as well as his record here in this city in our other body.

I was asked the other day by a friend why was it that I thought that JOHN EDWARDS was so optimistic about the future of this country when all the headlines around us seem to indicate something else. I said to him JOHN EDWARDS was born in a little town not far from the town where I was born, Sumter. I was born in Sumter. He was born in Seneca. Geographically it is somewhat of a distance apart, but he was born and reared in a value system that I am very familiar with. A value system that is grounded in his faith which can best be described by the words found in the Book of Hebrews: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." I think that JOHN EDWARDS is optimistic about the future of this country because he has that kind of faith that comes out of a value system that tells us all that, as was said earlier, "where there is no vision, the people perish." He has a vision for the future of this country, and he has expressed that vision time and time again throughout this Nation.

I heard it asked earlier what was the difference between JOHN EDWARDS and Dan Quayle. The difference is very stark. JOHN EDWARDS went before the American people. He laid out his life's history. He laid out his vision for the future. He told the people of this country where he would like to see us go, and he did so in such a way that exudes enthusiasm and optimism, and he endeared himself to the people of this Nation, and of course that is the difference. People got to know him. People got to see him. And people tell me that even when they did not vote for him because they may have thought someone else would make the better candidate, they really were moved by him. And today he is a part of what I consider to be one of the most promising teams of leaders this country has ever produced.

I want to close my comments tonight by dealing with an issue that I hear so much about: this issue of liberal versus conservative. In that little town of Sumter where I grew up, I was born and raised in the parsonage. My father was a fundamentalist minister who taught me in my early years that there are times when it is good to be conservative. He taught me that if I earn a

dollar, I ought to be able to save a nickle. He taught me that when I leave the room, I turn out the lights, I conserve energy. But on Sunday mornings after his sermon, he never asked his congregation to give conservatively. He always asked them to give liberally.

So I grew up thinking that it is good to be conservative at times, and it is good to be liberal at times. What life is all about is finding the balance that will make us all better for having lived it.

We see that balance in JOHN EDWARDS, and as we go forward with this campaign, I think the American people will see that balance in JOHN EDWARDS and JOHN KERRY and will entrust the leadership of this Nation to that team that I am sure will make us all proud and bring back the dignity and respect that this Nation has always enjoyed.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate being here.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his kind comments. And he is absolutely right. Elections are about the future, and this election certainly is about our future and the kind of balance we have. JOHN KERRY had the good sense to reach down and choose a man who really the people had already had a chance to see. And I thought the gentleman's comments were absolutely on target with that because never before have we had a candidate that our Presidential nominee reached down and chose as Vice President that they already had a chance to have a shake-down run at the level this one has.

I am also glad the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has joined us. It is great to have someone comment and join this group tonight. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me. And I noticed I guess I am the only Northerner here tonight. Everyone else has been either from South Carolina or North Carolina.

□ 2230

But I have to say when I listened to the other side of the aisle, to the Republicans this evening, criticize our candidates for president and vice president, I could not help but come down here and say a few words, because I have watched both of these Senators who are now our presidential and vice presidential candidates on the Democratic side, and I have been very impressed with them.

I really resented, I do not like to use the word, but I resented the fact that our Republican colleagues used all these labels, liberal versus conservative, rich versus poor, because I know when I listen to Senator EDWARDS and Senator KERRY, they are not looking at things that way, whether somebody is rich, or what somebody's ideology is. They are just looking at it practically. And I have watched what they said.

I particularly want to pay notice of Senator EDWARDS tonight, because he

is the newest person on the ticket and he is always looking at things from a practical point of view. The reason that he advocates change in the White House, and the reason I advocate change, and I think all of us do, is because we just do not like the practical impact of the policies of President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, particularly as it affects the little guy. Because when I listen to Senator EDWARDS, he is always talking about the little guy.

If you look at what happened over the last 4 years under President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, it is the middle-class, it is the little guy that has been hurt, whether it is gas prices or it is healthcare costs or it is education costs, or the fact that over the last 4 years we have had a loss of over 2 million jobs and the jobs that are now being created are not as good as the ones lost. This is what our Democratic candidates are all about.

The ultimate irony, I have to comment a little bit on some of the comments made about Senator EDWARDS being wealthy. He is wealthy, there is no question about that. But here is a guy who grew up in a small town, it has already been described, born in a small town in South Carolina, raised in a small town in North Carolina, from a very modest family. I have a little bit of his biography here.

His father Wallace worked in the textile mills for 36 years. His mother Bobbie ran a shop and worked at the post office. He worked alongside his father in the mill. He was the first person in his family to attend college.

This is a self-made man. This is a guy who went to a state university, North Carolina State University, graduated as undergraduate, then went for his law degree, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, a very good school, but also a public state university. He is self-made.

This is the very thing the Republicans keep talking about. They always use the example of Abe Lincoln, born in a log cabin and became president of the United States. Well, this is what we have here. This is not some guy who was born wealthy and was given everything. He had to work for it. That is what it is all about.

Then when I listened to some of these statements about the fact that he was a trial lawyer and how bad that was, well, you know, let us not put labels on people. I am sure there are some trial lawyers that are bad, but there are a lot of trial lawyers that are good. It depends on what you do.

The fact of the matter is that when I listened to, I think it was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is a physician from Texas, a Republican, who got up and started criticizing EDWARDS because he was a trial lawyer, am I to assume that everybody who is a physician is good and everybody who is a lawyer is bad? Is that what we have come to now, this sort of divisive element in looking at things? Well, it is just ridiculous.

If you look at EDWARDS' background, he was always fighting for the little guy. I just want to give you a couple of these cases, because I heard the gentleman from Texas, the Republican, talk about what is fair. Well, it is not fair if there are people who are injured and they do not have some way to redress their grievances.

This is an example. This is a very good example. I wanted to use one of the cases that EDWARDS tried. It is Jennifer Campbell, who suffered severe brain damage because of a doctor's mistake and the hospital's complacency.

EDWARDS represented Jennifer Campbell, who was born in April of 1979 with severe brain damage because of medical malpractice on the part of her mother's doctor and hospital. Despite the clear signs of fetal distress during labor, the doctor failed to deliver the baby by C-section and the hospital's nurses failed to help Jennifer by reporting the doctor's conduct up through the hospital's chain of command.

Now, am I to assume that in that case the doctor did the right thing and the doctor was the good guy, and the lawyer, in this case JOHN EDWARDS, who defended Jennifer Campbell who suffered from severe brain damage should not have had somebody to try her case, her malpractice case?

I am all in favor of malpractice reform. I do not see any problem. I have even voted for a cap on tort cases in some instances. But I am not going to suggest that it is not a good thing for a trial lawyer to take a case like that, where somebody has been severely injured.

Another case, I will give one more, this was a Methodist minister. Greg Howard and Jane Howard were killed in an auto wreck with a truck, left behind an orphan five-year-old son. EDWARDS represented Golda Howard, who lost her son Gregory in a car wreck with a truck.

The truck driver was driving too fast and following the car in front of him too closely, and when the car in front of him braked, he swerved across the center line into Greg Howard's 1984 Honda civic head-on. Both Gregory Howard, a 31-year-old minister and Methodist camp director, and his wife were killed. They were survived by their 5-year-old son Joshua, who was not in the car. They are not supposed to be defended in this case?

Clearly there is no question that EDWARDS is someone who has cared about the little guy, and he saw being a trial lawyer as a way to give back and effectively represent people who had been seriously injured. These are not frivolous suits. That is not what we are talking about here.

I just want to give one more example, because I know the time has basically run out. I think it was my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina

(Mr. PRICE), or maybe it was the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), who mentioned EDWARDS' passion on the issue of Patients' Bill of Rights.

I remember, because you have been to some of our Health Care Task Force meetings that I chaired in the last few Congresses, and one day we invited Senator EDWARDS to come over to from the Senate and talk to our Health Care Task Force about the Patients' Bill of Rights, because it was something we were trying to get passed on the floor of this House.

He came over and was one of the best presenters and speakers that we ever had. I had never even met him before. This was a few years ago. I was so impressed about his passion and caring about patients and how they had to have their rights protected.

This is something that we still need. If a case arrives where an HMO says that a person is going to be denied care because they cannot have a particular procedure or cannot go to an particular emergency room because they need care, that is what this is all about in this House, representing the little guy, the person who is damaged, the person who needs healthcare.

He was a guy who came to our Health Care Task Force and talked with passion about how we had to get this bill passed. And we still need to get this bill passed.

It is somebody like him, as vice president, joining with JOHN KERRY as the president, that we can get something like that passed, because you know that President Bush and Vice President CHENEY have been very much against the Patients' Bill of Rights. They went to the Supreme Court and got the Supreme Court to basically void the Texas Patients' Bill of Rights.

So we need leadership. We need leadership in the White House. We need leadership at the vice presidential level as well, if we are going to see patients protected. That is what this is all about.

I am just so proud to be here tonight to say how proud I am that we have this great ticket that includes a North Carolinian.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from New Jersey. Let me also thank the gentleman for being here and joining us this evening on this evening of special orders to talk about our ticket and for those of us from North Carolina to have a little swelled up pride about having a North Carolinian on the ticket for the first time in actually 140 years. We have to remember that really the person that was on there 140 years ago really was from Tennessee. He just was born in North Carolina.

So we have a great deal of pride in JOHN EDWARDS and the fact that our presidential nominee JOHN KERRY had, as I said earlier, the vision and the wisdom to reach out and touch him and bring him and Elizabeth along. I think they will add a great deal to the ticket, and I thank the gentleman for his comments and leadership.

As we said earlier, this thing of elections is really about the future. It is about our hopes, it is about our dreams. It is about responsibility on the part of individuals. But it is also about people who care. The gentleman's point was on target.

We are elected, all of us, here in this House and over in the Senate, to represent the people of this country. Every person that has a grievance, within reason, ought to be able to have us to deal with it in some way. If they do not get their shot and only those who have the money and the influence to have people to get things done, then the average person gets left out, and that questions a whole lot of things.

We talked earlier about our vice presidential nominee in JOHN EDWARDS. I like to think of the values that JOHN EDWARDS learned growing up in Moore County, in North Carolina, and they are the same values that I think I picked up growing up on a farm down in Johnston county.

When you grow up in a rural area, you learn you have to depend on your neighbors. I told a group the other day, I remember, today we would not think about going to our neighbor and saying I want to borrow a cup of sugar or a cup of flour or some coffee. But that is the way it was in rural North Carolina when JOHN EDWARDS was growing up. People would go over and do it, and then return it. Today we hop in the car and go to the store and get it, because you have a few more resources.

But I think among those shared values that he picked up and he learned were the value of hard work, love of family, faith in God and in our country, and a dedication to the larger community, where neighbors look out for one another, and everyone has a decent shot at the American dream.

JOHN certainly lives his faith every day. He is not the type of person that you see wearing it on his sleeve, where he talks about it. It is a part of him. I know actually even before he was in the Senate, our children, our two older children attend the same church he does in Raleigh, and he is faithfully there with his children every Sunday now that he is in the Senate, and he was before when he was in Raleigh.

He is really in touch with the American people, because he never lost touch with where he came from. Even though he grew up in Robbins and went to North Carolina State University and on to the University of North Carolina to get a law degree, he helped earn that money along the way to get his degree.

Yes, he has been successful, because he has worked hard. There is nothing wrong with a person working hard and being successful, as long as they are honest in what they do. That is what the American dream is all about. That is what public education is about, getting an opportunity to make it. And whether the issue is working to improve our schools, or bolster economic development to create good jobs, or making healthcare, as you have talked

about, a little more affordable for working families and available for those who have been injured, JOHN EDWARDS always had the family of small town America in mind, because that is where he comes from, where you grow up and the values you learn are the values you carry with you all your life.

Just like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), when you grow up in a small town, you may move to the big city, but the old adage has been said, you can take the boy out of the country, but you cannot take the country out of him when you bring him to the city. JOHN EDWARDS is the same way. You have those things, those values you learned, that make all the difference in the world.

I once had the occasion to work in a cotton mill for about a year. We did not call them textile mills then, we called them cotton mills. There was a reason for that, because there was a lot of dust and lint in the air and they were hot, they were dusty and they dirty.

It was good work, and there were great people that worked there. They were great people. They were God fearing people that cared for their country and helped one another. But it is hard work, it is hot work and it is dirty work. His dad worked there for 36 years, and I can tell you it is hot in the summer because there is very little breeze.

I have heard some on the other side question why JOHN frequently mentions his father's work in the textile mill. I think it is an important point to make. I think he makes it because he wants people to understand not only does he care about his parents, but he cares what they taught him. Those are the values that he carries with him today.

JOHN KERRY recognized that when he said, "I want JOHN EDWARDS to join me," and he made that call last week. He understood it. He saw it in him.

I think JOHN EDWARDS is the embodiment of the notion that in America, the son or daughter of a mill worker has just as much right to run for higher office as the son or daughter of a President or a corporate tycoon.

I predict to you he has already shown himself to be capable and able, but I think the American people will see over the next several months and learn to love him; a young man who came from Robbins, North Carolina, married his college sweetheart, and has done quite well. He has the tools to be a great vice president.

I guess one of the other things I like about JOHN EDWARDS is he and I share probably only one other thing: He and I were both first in our family to go to college.

□ 2245

Madam Speaker, you have a heavy obligation when you do that, because you have an obligation to help others. He has a strong and abiding commitment to helping working families get

access to college, because he understands education is the one thing that levels the playing field. It does not make any difference what one's ethnicity or economic situation is, or who one's parents are or where you come from; if you get an educational opportunity, you have a chance to make it. He knows firsthand that a quality college education really is the key to the American dream.

I predict to my colleagues that as Vice President, he will fight to promote education, because he does know, as I have already said, it levels the playing field for everyone and gives them that chance for success. Those are the values that have made America great, and those are the values that he brings to this ticket. Those are the values that JOHN KERRY saw in JOHN EDWARDS when he made that decision. I predict to my colleagues that they will make a great team. They will make a difference in America; and that, as has been said by all of my other colleagues this evening in one way or another, they will give America hope again, because there are those who want to provide fear. They are about optimism and hope and dreams and possibilities and opportunities, so people can feel good not only about America, but our position with our allies and friends around the world, and that every person takes responsibility for themselves as we move forward into the 21st century.

Let me now close by thanking my colleagues for joining me this evening. And since I only have a couple of minutes, I want to close with a little poem. I think it says a lot about this ticket of JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS. It is written by the person who writes more lines than anyone else. It is anonymous. It is entitled "The Builder." It goes like this.

"I watched them tear a building down, a gang of men in a busy town. With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell, they swung a beam and a side wall fell. I asked the foreman, 'Are these men skilled, the kind you would hire if you had to build?' He smiled and said, 'No, indeed. Common labor is all I need, for I can wreck in a day or 2 what men have taken years to do.' I thought to myself as I went my way, which of those roles have I tried to play. Am I being careful to measure the world by the rule and a square, or have I been content to roam the town, content to do nothing but tear things down?"

Madam Speaker, I predict to my colleagues that JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS will be builders. What this country needs is people with a good attitude, with a vision to build, bring people together, and let America be America again.

SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I have one issue that brings me to the floor tonight and that I hope to get to in a moment. As I listened, however, to my colleagues, it does come to mind that there would undoubtedly be a new vision for America if the ticket that they were extolling the virtues of actually becomes the leadership of the country as President and Vice President. It is true that there would be a difference in the way we look at life, the way we look at government in particular. It is certainly true that for those people who believe that the government is the primary focus of all of our activity and strength as a Nation, those people who believe that taxation can be euphemistically described as investment; those people who believe that the Constitution is really nothing more than a document that deserves to be interpreted, restructured, and changed by courts and judges; those people who believe that America's best days are behind us, those folks will indeed be happy if, in fact, the Kerry-Edwards ticket prevails.

Good men, I think, all good men are running for the office of President and Vice President of the United States. Certainly good things can be said about all. But it is undeniably true that we can also talk about the fact that incredible differences exist between the ways in which these people view their responsibilities as chief executive, as Commander in Chief; the way they look at the role of the United States in the world. One sees the United States as being subservient in many ways to international bodies, world courts, United Nations, other international organizations that I believe Senator KERRY and Senator EDWARDS think should have priority in terms of deciding how America actually goes about its business and determines its own policies.

Or President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, who recognize that although interaction with the world community is important, America must be strong enough and resilient enough to actually establish its own set of goals and purposes, and then act to achieve them, hopefully with the agreement of a large part of the world community; but even if that agreement were not to be reached, to understand that our goals may be unique to us, and that, therefore, we may have the responsibility of trying to achieve them, even by ourselves.

So there are certainly differences, undeniably true. That is the one thing with which I can totally agree with what our colleagues on the other side were talking about for the last hour, the differences that exist. But I believe that when the final tally is made, that most Americans will decide that the person who will decide who, for instance, is on the Supreme Court of the United States and will be making laws, interpreting laws for the next generation or two, because that is really how much of an effect it will eventually

have if two or three members of that Supreme Court have to be, or actually end up being, changed.

And when people think about the fact that we are in a war that does threaten our very existence, even if it is not described on the front pages every day as a war between armies and one moving and advancing, but one retreating, but nevertheless an understanding that we are in a clash of civilizations; when one thinks about these things, one will come to the conclusion that it is better to have people in charge who think about the Constitution as strict constructionists do, that it is a document to be adhered to because it was divinely inspired. They will think about the fact that those folks who they want making a decision about their national security are people who are desirous of having the support of the international community, but not willing to be subservient to it; and, I think, of course, they will come to the conclusion that they will keep the President, the present President and Vice President on for the next 4 years.

But that really was not the main purpose of my coming down to the floor tonight. When I came to this Congress in 1998, I determined that there were a number of issues that I wanted to focus on. One of them dealt with a situation that was developing in a land far, far away, a land that very few people really knew much about. I had become acquainted with it mostly through discussions at my church about the persecuted Christians throughout the world.

This land is known as Sudan. It is one of the largest countries in Africa. It is the poorest country in Africa. It has suffered through an enormous amount of pain. It has sustained itself after 27 years of internal strife. Two million, at least 2 million, are dead; four million, at least, displaced in this civil war that has been ongoing, as I say, for over 25 years. Little is known about it. Certainly, in 1998, very few people thought much about Sudan or, frankly, almost any other country on the African continent. But certainly, Sudan was not on the top of anyone's list as a nation that we should be concerned about, a nation that had any relevance for us in the United States or really anywhere else in the world. Yes, it was just another one of those countries that was involved with internal strife.

Many people died, but that is just the way it is over there, and that was the thought. That was, to the extent that anybody gave it any thought, to the extent that Sudan mattered to anyone, it was just another place on the African continent where people were dying and were dying because of the internal conflicts that we thought we had nothing to say about.

Well, in fact, several Members, including myself, Senator BROWNBACK, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) talked about this issue at great length every time we had the opportunity. Anyone who would listen, we