Not content with his previous decision to permit police to eavesdrop on a suspect's conversations with an attorney, Bush now strips the alien accused of even the limited rights afforded by a court-martial.

His kangaroo court can conceal evidence by citing national security, make up its own rules, find a defendant guilty even if a third of the officers disagree, and execute the alien with no review by any civilian court.

No longer does the judicial branch and an independent jury stand between the government and the accused. In lieu of those checks and balances central to our legal system, non-citizens face an executive that is now investigator, prosecutor, judge, jury and jailer or executioner. In an Orwellian twist, Bush's order calls this Soviet-style abomination ''a full and fair trial.''

On what legal meat does this our Caesar feed? One precedent the White House cites is a military court after Lincoln's assassination. (During the Civil War, Lincoln suspended habeas corpus; does our war on terror require illegal imprisonment next?) Another is a military court's hanging, approved by the Supreme court, of German saboteurs landed by submarine in World War II.

Proponents of Bush's kangaroo court say: Don't you soft-on-terror, due-process types know there's a war on? Have you forgotten our 5,000 civilian dead? In an emergency like this, aren't extraordinary security measures needed to save citizens' lives? If we step on a few toes, we can apologize to the civil libertarians later.

Those are the arguments of the phony-tough. At a time when even liberals are debating the ethics of torture of suspects—weighing the distaste for barbarism against the need to save innocent lives—it's time for conservative iconoclasts and card-carrying hard-liners to stand up for American values.

To meet a terrorist emergency, of course some rules should be stretched and new laws passed. An ethnic dragnet rounding up visa-skippers or questioning foreign students, if short-term, is borderline tolerable. Congress's new law permitting warranted roving wiretaps is understandable.

But let's get to the target that this blunderbuss order is intended to hit. Here's the big worry in Washington now: What do we do if Osama bin Laden gives himself up? A proper trial like that Israel afforded Adolf Eichmann, it is feared, would give the terrorist a global propaganda platform. Worse, it would be likely to result in widespread hostage-taking by his followers to protect him from the punishment he deserves,

The solution is not to corrupt our judicial tradition by making bin Laden the star of a new Star Chamber. The solution is to turn his cave into his crypt. When fleeing Taliban reveal his whereabouts, our bombers should promptly bid him farewell with 15,000-pound daisy-cutters and 5,000-pound rock-penetrators.

But what if he broadcasts his intent to surrender, and walks toward us under a white flag? It is not in our tradition to shoot prisoners. Rather, President Bush should now set forth a policy of ''universal surrender'': all of Al Qaeda or none. Selective surrender of one or a dozen leaders—which would leave cells in Afghanistan and elsewhere free to fight on—is unacceptable. We should continue our bombardment of bin Laden's hideouts until he agrees to identify and surrender his entire terrorist force.

If he does, our criminal courts can handle them expeditiously. If, as more likely, the primary terrorist prefers what he thinks of as martyrdom, that suicidal choice would be his—and Americans would have no need of kangaroo courts to betray our principles of justice.

NOBEL LAUREATES ENDORSE GENUINE STIMULUS PACKAGE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 2001

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, nine Nobel laureates in economics as well as other leading economists have issued an appeal to the leaders of the Senate to reject the cynical and ineffective stimulus approach taken by the House of Representatives and instead pass a bill that will generate greater spending now through expanded unemployment benefits and other initiatives.

The need for expanded benefits for jobless Americans and their families is apparent to all but the leaders of the House of Representatives. The October increase in unemployment was the largest in over two decades, adding more than a half million jobless to the 1.1 million jobs already lost this year prior to the terrible events of September 11th.

The so-called stimulus bill passed recently by the House of Representatives lavished billions of dollars on the wealthiest of Americans—the same fortunate few who enjoyed most of the tax cut passed earlier this year. But the House offered only crumbs to the hundreds of thousands who have lost their jobs and whose families are on the brink of economic catastrophe.

The criticism of that House stimulus bill was by no means partisan in nature. This is a bill that, in the words of the Wall Street Journal's November 1 editorial, ''mainly padded corporate bottom lines.'' No less a conservative stalwart than Kevin Phillips compared the House-passed bill to ''war profiteering'' passed ''in the phony name of economic stimulus . . . Over three-quarters of the hundred billion [dollars cost] goes for business and upper income objectives . . . The only real solution is a public outcry, tens of millions of pointing finger and voices saying, 'Shame!' '' And that's just the conservative critique of the bill this Republican House of Representatives voted that provides $2.3 billion to Ford Motor Company, $1.4 billion to IBM, $830 million to General Motors, and $671 million for General Electric.

But under the Republican bill, Larry Johnson won't get a dime. Larry Johnson doesn't work in the corporate boardroom. He cleaned the bar and polished the floors at the World Trade Center, and now he's out of a job and denied unemployment benefits by New York.

There are hundreds of thousands of Larry Johnsons, and something is very wrong here. While 97 percent of employers pay into the unemployment funds, less than 40 percent of workers nationally receive unemployment assistance, a substantial drop over the past 25 years. And in some states, the percent that qualify is much lower than that. Workers in the new economy—younger, immigrant, part time, lower-income, short-term—are especially hurt by inadequate UI coverage. And economists are predicting another 1.5 million could lose their jobs in the next 9 months. Even for those who do qualify, benefit levels are often below the poverty line, leaving millions of suddenly unemployed Americans facing poverty, joblessness and homelessness.

The Republican response to this crisis has been the misguided antidote of Herbert Hoover: help the rich and the poor will benefit from the improving economy. Prosperity is right around the corner. But we were not elected to ignore the suffering of our constituents.

When will the Congress hear the voices of our desperate countrymen and women and demonstrate its concern for the real victims of this recession? First, the House passed a $1.4 trillion tax cut, mainly for the wealthy. Then a $38 billion bail-out for the oil, gas, electric and nuclear power companies that earned more than $1.6 trillion last year. Now, a ''stimulus'' bill that showers tens of billions more on the wealthiest and most powerful in our nation, and only a fraction for genuine ''stimulus.''

The views of these Nobel laureates and others should guide us in crafting a genuine stimulus bill that helps hurting Americans instead of adding billions in additional tax breaks for the richest taxpayers and for corporations. I submit for the RECORD these views.

ECONOMISTS' STATEMENT—AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATORS TOM DASCHLE AND TRENT LOTT

The current state of the U.S. economy justifies further fiscal stimulus by the federal government. But the stimulus package passed by the House of Representatives will do little to assist a near term recovery and is likely to undermine growth in the long term.

The basic principles in designing an economic stimulus are: (1) that it be targeted to increase spending immediately; and (2) that it be temporary, phasing out when the economy recovers.

The bill passed by the House fails on both counts. First, it mainly provides permanent tax cuts rather than the temporary measures required by prudent fiscal policy. Second, most of the benefits go to the wealthy and to large corporations.

In addition to being inequitable, tax cuts for the wealthy are less likely to be spent quickly than are benefits to low-income families and the recently unemployed. The tax cuts for large corporations are particularly inappropriate. Large retroactive rebates to a few giant companies will do little to stimulate an economy suffering from insufficient demand. Moreover, the permanent nature of these tax cuts is likely to worsen the long-term budget outlook and may keep long-term interest rates high.

The package passed by the House should be rejected by the Senate and replaced with temporary measures, such as further expanded unemployment benefits, that will increase spending now.

George A. Akerlof, University of California, Berkeley; Kenneth J. Arrow, Stanford University; Martin N. Baily, Institute for International Economics; Alan Blinder, Princeton University; Jeff Faux, Economic Policy Institute; Lawrence R. Klein, University of Pennsylvania; Franco Modigliani, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Douglass C. North, Washington University; William F. Sharpe, Stanford University; Robert M. Solow, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia University; James Tobin, Yale University; Laura D'Andrea Tyson, University of California, Berkeley; Janet Yellen, University of California, Berkeley.

INDIA ILLEGALLY DETAINS WIDOW OF HUMAN-RIGHTS ACTIVIST

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 2001

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to read that the Indian government has once again put its utter contempt for basic human rights on public display. At a time when India is posturing as an ally in the fight against terrorism, it is commiting more terrorism against the minority peoples living within its own borders.

The Indian government is currently holding Mrs. Paramjit Kaur Khalra and six other Sikh human-rights activists in detention supposedly ''to prevent disruption,'' or in other words to prevent them from carrying out peaceful political activities. Mrs. Khalra is the widow of Jaswant Singh Khalra, the late General Secretary of the Human Rights Wing, who exposed India's brutal policy of picking up young Sikhs, torturing them, killing them, then declaring their bodies ''unidentified'' and secretly cremating them. Mr. Khalra published a report showing that there had been at least 25,000 Sikhs victimized by this brutal policy. The Khalra Mission Committee, which Mrs. Khalra heads, in conjunction with other human-rights groups, has subsequently shown that the number is in excess of 50,000.

After Mr. Khalra published this report, he received a phone call from a police official saying, ''We made 25,000 disappear. We can make one more disappear.'' On September 6, 1995, while he was washing his car, he was abducted by the police. One eyewitness who saw him while he was in custody said that he was severely tortured, to the point that he could barely eat. In late October 1995, Khalra was murdered in a police station. None of the police officials responsible for this heinous crime has ever been punished. All the Indian government has done is transfer them to other police stations, where they can find new victims to torture.

According to ''The Politics of Genocide'' by Inderjit Singh Jaijee, the Indian government has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, over 75,000 Kashmiri Muslims since 1988, and thousands and thousands of Dalit ''Untouchables,'' Tamils, Manipuris, Assamese, tribal people all in pursuit of ''Hindutva''—a Hindu state, society, and culture. Last year, a government official was quoted as saying that everyone who lives in India must either be a Hindu or be subservient to Hindus. That is not democracy, Mr. Speaker. It is theocracy. It takes more than elections to make a democracy; it takes genuine respect for basic human freedoms.

I have serious misgivings about current U.S. plans to resume arms sales to India. We should very cautious in considering such an aid resumption, especially given India's terrible human-rights record. We should also support a free and fair plebiscite on independence in Khalistan, Kashmir, Christian Nagaland, and all the countries seeking their freedom from India. This is the best thing we can do for freedom, peace, prosperity, and stability in South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place an article from Burning Punjab on the detention of Mrs. Khalra into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Burning Punjab News, Nov. 2, 2001]

MRS. KHALRA HELD

(Our Correspondent)

Amritsar, November 2—The police today early morning arrested Mrs Paramijit Kaur Khalra of the Khalra Mission Committee to prevent disturbance of the peace in the state.

She reportedly was arrested at 4:30 a.m. hours before the arrival of the Prime Minister at 10 a.m. today reportedly from her residence here. The police also rounded-up six others, including Kirpal Singh Randhwa PHRO vice-president.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of November 14, I had to depart early for a previously scheduled meeting at the White House. As a result, I was not able to be present for rollcall votes Nos. 439 and 440. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on both measures. I request that this statement appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT CORNEL NELSON OF ILLINOIS

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 2001

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned last night of the death of one of the giants of the labor movement in Illinois—Robert Cornel Nelson. Bob died in his sleep on November 7, 2001, just two days shy of his 52nd birthday. He was laid to rest today in Glenwood, Illinois.

At the time of his death, Bob Nelson was national vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees' (AFGE) seventh district, which encompasses Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, and was recently elected to the position of vice president of the Illinois State AFL–CIO.

Bob began his union career as a member of AFGE's local 375 at the Railroad Retirement Board, and throughout the years, he held a number of union offices, including second vice president, first vice president, and ultimately, president.

From 1974 to 1980, Bob also served as president of the Chicago Area Council of AFGE locals and in 1974 was elected president of the AFGE Railroad Retirement Board Council—a position which he held until he was elected to the seventh district national vice president's position in October 1986, and was reelected to that position five times.

As national vice president of the seventh district, Bob sat on AFGE's national executive board and chaired both the legislative and legal rights committees. Every two years, Bob held a legislative breakfast here in Washington, where the AFGE members from his region would come to Congress to press their legislative agenda. But, Bob was active and engaged in the legislative process 365 days of every year.

This past summer, I reconstituted the First Congressional District's Labor Task Force and convened a meeting on a very warm day in Chicago. Bob was one of the first union representatives to confirm his attendance and he was there, struggling to walk with a leg brace and a walker that was the result of earlier surgery on his leg. He was looking forward, he said, to getting out of the brace and walker, to be able to get on with his union's business and the business of the larger labor family at his previous speed. Bob's previous speed often rivaled the speed of light, and even with the leg brace, we struggled to keep up with his pace.

Mr. Speaker, I will greatly miss Bob's dedication, unfailing humor and support. My prayers and heartfelt condolences go out to his wife, Judy, and his brother, Ron, and his children: Robert, Jr.; Aaron; Daron; Eric; Cornel; Erica; and Shannon.

Chicago, and the Nation, have lost a labor giant.

BEST PHARMACEUTICALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 13, 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to comment on H.R. 2887, the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act, and would like to command the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, the sponsor of this bill, and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for bringing this legislation to the House Floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is unaware of any Member of Congress who opposes the appropriate testing, evaluation and proper labeling of prescription drugs for use in children. We need to ensure that medicines are safe and effective for both children and adults. The only question for debate is how to accomplish this critical public health objective.

As you are aware, the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act would continue a program that grants prescription drug companies an additional six-month patent exclusivity, as an incentive for them to test their drugs on children. While pediatric exclusivity has resulted in an increase in the number of pediatric drug studies and has provided valuable information to pediatricians about how to use drugs in children, this Member is concerned about the current law for several reasons.

Most importantly, the law has imposed higher prices on consumers because it delays the introduction of lower-priced generic drugs for an additional six months. This Member is also concerned that the pediatric exclusivity provision provides substantial incentives to drug companies to test drugs that have high sales, particularly among adults, rather than those drugs which pediatricians need more information. It appears that brand name drug companies are receiving six months of exclusivity for