

Army will be lasting. Quite simply, he made a difference.

There are no words that can lessen the sorrow his family, friends, and colleagues are experiencing. It is always difficult to cope when someone is taken before their time, but the sense of loss is somehow amplified by the tragedy of these horrific circumstances. I hope that his family is comforted by the knowledge that he was admired, respected, and appreciated by all of us who knew him on Capitol Hill. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting General Maude. We will miss him.

STATEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 225—
EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT EVERY CITIZEN IS ENCOURAGED TO DISPLAY THE FLAG

SPEECH OF

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 2001

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to vote for this resolution that I co-sponsor with my colleagues urging people to fly the American flag. Tuesday's act of terrorism is one of the greatest challenges in the history of our country. In times of austerity, in times of national tragedy—and this is the greatest we have ever seen on U.S. soil—it is important to unite, to come together, to comfort, indeed, to 'rally around the flag.'

In light of the tragedy that has struck directly thousands of families, we urge people to fly the flag as a show of solidarity with all the victims of this horrible assault on humanity, on the United States. The flag is an enduring symbol of American democracy and American freedom. It is a symbol of the courage and the bravery and the essential human kindness of our people. Its display—especially at times of national tragedy—is yet another in a number of spontaneous and empowering, very human responses that we have witnessed in the last 48 hours.

Let the flags around the country as they fly and are displayed in neighborhoods and on our buildings, send the signal that the United States remains united. We are so sorry and in such sorrow at the horrible loss of life and the unspeakable agony of those affected by this event. We are equally determined to ensure that the perpetrators of this crime will be found and properly punished. We will do everything in our power to make sure that what happened a couple days ago never, ever happens again. Finally, we are determined to adjust and adapt to this new world to give our government and our country and our people and institutions the support and unity which all of us need at this most trying moment for America and the American people.

TO CITY OF KEWAUNEE

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 2001

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 788 is special legislation which transfers a surplus

piece of Federal property to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin. This piece of property is no longer needed as an Army Reserve Center nor is it needed for any other federal government purpose.

I would like to thank the Gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN, for working with me to address my concerns regarding this piece of legislation. I know it was his desire to have H.R. 788 passed prior to the House breaking for summer recess. However, by waiting until today, we were able to work together over the recess period and produce a stronger bill.

The bill before us is significantly different from the bill as it was originally introduced. I will highlight the differences quickly. The bill specifies that the property must be used and occupied only by the City, or by another local or State government entity approved by the City. In addition, the bill includes a reversionary clause which states that, during the next 20 years, if the property is not used as intended, it will revert to the federal government. Furthermore, the bill states that the property cannot be used for commercial purposes.

In the 1949 Property Act, Congress lays out how surplus federal property is to be disposed. GSA is instructed to sell property for the most profit possible. Monies received are used for a number of things including environmental clean-up and land preservation.

However, the Act also listed a number of ways a piece of property can be transferred free of charge under what is called a "Public Benefit Conveyance" exception. Congress decided that the public interest in giving property away for "public benefit" outweighs potential profit from public sale. Included in the 1949 Act were four such public benefit exceptions: health, education, park and recreation, and historical monuments. Since 1949, the Act has been amended numerous times to add more public benefits. These additions are wildlife refuge, ports, prisons, airports, homeless, self-help housing, and law enforcement/emergency response.

The City of Kewaunee is interested in using this former Army Reserve Center to house its city hall, city council, and senior center. Those types of use do not fit into any of the 11 current exceptions. Therefore, the federal government cannot transfer this property free of charge without special legislation like that which is before us today.

Although I am pleased that the City of Kewaunee is able to benefit from this property transfer, this bill should not in anyway be seen as setting a precedent for future special legislation. Congress can and should amend the Act if it determines that city halls or other exceptions should exist. With proper hearings and mark-ups, the Committee on Government Reform may decide that the definition of public purpose should be expanded. It may decide otherwise.

THOUGHTS ON THE WAR AGAINST
TERRORISM

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 2001

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share these thoughts by Mark Helprin

in the September 12, 2001 Wall Street Journal. His argument makes an excellent case for a total and committed defense of our nation against the elements of international terrorism.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 12, 2001]

WE BEAT HITLER—WE CAN VANQUISH THIS
FOE, TOO

(By Mark Helprin)

America, it is said, is slow to awaken, and indeed it is, but once America stirs, its resolution can be matchless and its ferocity a stunning surprise.

The enemy we face today, though barbaric and ingenious, is hardly comparable to the masters of the Third Reich, whose doubts about our ability to persevere we chose to dissuade in a Berlin that we had reduced to rubble. Nor is he comparable to the commanders of the Japanese Empire, whose doubts about our ability to persevere we chose to dissuade in a Tokyo we had reduced to rubble. Nor to the Soviet Empire that we faced down patiently over half a century, nor to the great British Empire from which we broke free in a long and taxing struggle that affords a better picture of our kith and kin than any the world may have today of who we are and of what we are capable.

And today's enemy, though he is not morally developed enough to comprehend the difference between civilians and combatants, is neither faceless nor without a place in which we can address him. If he is Osama bin Laden, he lives in Afghanistan, and his hosts, the Taliban, bear responsibility for sheltering him; if he is Saddam Hussein, he lives in Baghdad; if he is Yasser Arafat, he lives in Gaza; and so on. Our problem is not his anonymity but that we have refused the precise warnings, delivered over more than a decade, of those who understood the nature of what was coming—and of what is yet to come, which will undoubtedly be worse.

The first salvos of any war are seldom the most destructive. Consider that in this recent outrage the damage was done by the combined explosive power of three crashed civilian airliners. As the initial shock wears off it will be obvious that this was a demonstration shot intended to extract political concessions and surrender, a call to fix our attention on the prospect of a nuclear detonation or a chemical or biological attack, both of which would exceed what happened yesterday by several orders of magnitude.

It will get worse, but appeasement will make it no better. That we have promised retaliation for decades and then always drawn back, hoping that we could get through if we simply did not provoke the enemy, is appeasement, and it must be quite clear by now even to those who perpetually appease that appeasement simply does not work. Therefore, what must be done? Above all, we must make no promise of retaliation that is not honored; in this we have erred too many times. It is a bipartisan failing and it should never be repeated.

Let this spectacular act of terrorism be the decisive repudiation of the mistaken assumptions that conventional warfare is a thing of the past, that there is a safe window in which we can cut force structure while investing in the revolution in military affairs, that bases and infrastructure abroad have become unnecessary, that the day of the infantryman is dead, and, most importantly, that slighting military expenditure and preparedness is anything but an invitation to death and defeat.

Short of a major rebuilding, we cannot now inflict upon Saddam Hussein or Osama bin Laden the great and instantaneous shock with which they should be afflicted. That requires not surgical strikes by aircraft based